

come sufficient to raise their families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

43. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Edward B. Morris, secretary, Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., requesting that legislation be enacted which would create a transportation commission for the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

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

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

Eternal God, Father of our spirits, whose power is unsearchable and whose judgments are a great deep, at the beginning of the day we would quiet our hearts in Thy presence. We would be still and know that Thou art God. As amid the earthquake, wind, and fire of this violent world we wait for Thy still small voice, give us sensitive hearts to listen, teachable minds to learn, humble wills to obey. Let some revelation of Thy light fall on our darkness, some guidance from Thy wisdom save us from our bewilderment, some power from Thine infinite resource strengthen us in our need.

We acknowledge our oneness with all humanity. Humbling ourselves in penitence for our boasted pride, confessing our share in the evil that has brought confusion and ruin on the earth and praying for an ordered society of nations that shall give substance and hope to man's dream of brotherhood, we ask 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 Thursday, February 8, 1951, 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.

#### ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(At the request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, the following remarks by Mr. HENDRICKSON and editorials submitted by him in connection therewith were ordered to be printed at this point in today's RECORD:)

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are met here today on the anniversary of the birth of the sixteenth President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln. There may be some who will disagree when I say that Abraham Lincoln was the greatest of all our Presidents, but I make that statement, believing firmly that it is so. Some historians, some students, and some political writers may disagree, but I say that it is so because Mr. Lincoln lived in

the most crucial hour of the Nation's history, an hour even as crucial as that in which we are living today, and he led us to safety and security once more. As we of the Senate, when we pay tribute to the first President of the United States, George Washington, on his birthday, recognize that none of us possess sufficient eloquence to pay just and fitting tribute to him, and therefore substitute for our lack of eloquence the reading of his own eloquent Farewell Address, therefore, Mr. President, in recognizing the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, I think we must also recognize that in his case, as in the case of Washington, we who serve in this body lack the eloquence to pay to the martyred President the full tribute which is properly due him. Perhaps the greatest epitaph ever written of Mr. Lincoln was written by his great Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, when at the time of Mr. Lincoln's death, Mr. Stanton said—despite the many bitter differences of opinion which existed between Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Stanton—"Now he belongs to the ages."

Mr. President, as we pay Washington a tribute by reading the words of his Farewell Address, so now I endeavor to pay appropriate tribute to Mr. Lincoln by reading a few words from his second inaugural address, delivered on March 4, 1865, which are as appropriate today as they were when they were uttered at the end of the War Between the States. In that address Abraham Lincoln said:

Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

And then he said, as we remember his famous words:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Mr. President, I think those words in themselves pay Mr. Lincoln all the tribute which any mortal could hope to pay to him. They are his own immortal words—almost as eloquent, indeed, as the words of his Gettysburg address.

Mr. President, some of the great newspapers today have paid tribute to Mr. Lincoln more eloquently than I could ever hope to do. Therefore I shall ask unanimous consent to speak through them and to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three stirring, thought-provoking editorials in honor of Lincoln. They should be read by every Member of the Senate. One is from the Philadelphia Inquirer, and is entitled "Lincoln's Way Can Still Save America and Freedom."

Another, entitled "The 'Lincoln Idea'," is published in the New York Times for today. I hope every Member of the Senate will take the time to read this edi-

torial in the light of the situation existing in the world today.

The third editorial, entitled "The Universal Lincoln," appears in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune. It constitutes another thought-provoking discussion of a great man.

Mr. President, I cannot say any more that would raise the name of Lincoln higher than he himself raised it throughout his entire life, and up to the time of his death. We should be grateful that our people show an ever-growing recognition of his greatness, and are reflecting that recognition in their everyday lives.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that these remarks and these editorials may appear in the RECORD at the beginning of the proceedings for today, rather than at the end of them, as a further tribute to Mr. Lincoln.

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

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 12, 1951]

#### LINCOLN'S WAY CAN STILL SAVE AMERICA AND FREEDOM

On this birthday of Abraham Lincoln the great question is whether this is the glorious Nation he fought so hard and so well to save.

Are its people as determined in 1951, as they were in 1861, to preserve its freedom? Are they as eager to struggle against terrible odds to continue America on the path to still greater destinies?

We believe that to all such questions an affirmative answer can instantly be given and that Lincoln himself, who once fervently spoke of the promise of "man's vast future" in our country, would without hesitation render the same verdict.

The Rail Splitter, as he was about to become President, saw the enormous perils that were rushing upon the Nation and remarked: "The man does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am, none who would do more to preserve it, but it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly."

Look at his subsequent course: he sought peace, but with never a thought of appeasement. Up till the first shot at Sumter and throughout the war which followed he repelled every attempt to bring about its end on terms that would weaken the Union.

Lincoln, who knew how to deal with Copperheads and traitors, faintheart's and appeasers, has virtually given us a chart for national conduct in dealing with the Reds and fellow travelers of 1951 and the dangers they represent now.

There were timorous Americans in 1861 who wanted to "let the erring sisters go." They wanted to give up the Union—they wanted peace at any price. Throughout the war there were disloyal people who secretly or openly tried to aid the enemy.

Abraham Lincoln's steadfast wisdom overcame them all. With similar but greater perils from the Red menace confronting us today we need to cling to the Great Emancipator's way as the only way to discharge our duty of world leadership; to save America and with it human liberty on this earth.

[From the New York Times of February 12, 1951]

#### THE "LINCOLN IDEA"

It might even be true, as some scoffers say, that Lincoln has become "the great American myth." It could be true that the cult of "Lincolnatry" has obscured the man and most of the facts about him. Nevertheless, the man and his meaning have an indisputable and an unshakable place in

American life and in the hearts and minds of almost all Americans. There is definitely such a thing as the "Lincoln idea." The name is a symbol, and its connotation is much the same wherever it is spoken.

To invoke the name of Lincoln is to place first emphasis on complete integrity. This feeling has now gone far beyond the "Honest Abe" of his contemporaries. The man symbolizes for us the positive conception of personal goodness and social righteousness. The image of Lincoln is recalled when we, as persons or as members of a social group, are asked to choose between right and wrong, good and evil. That image strengthens our resolution. It may, indeed, dictate our choice.

To most Americans, also, the name Lincoln connotes the true dignity of a great simplicity. It is the foe of artifice, the destroyer of vanity. If Americans are, as they should be, humble in his presence, it is in the realization that he, too, was humble in the presence of the great tasks with which he was confronted.

That sense of integrity and simplicity is carried over into the application of the "Lincoln idea" to matters of Government and the affairs of the state. It is partly because Lincoln himself was so much of the people that he could speak persuasively of government by and for them. He gave us our most eloquent and, at the same time, our simplest real definition of government by the consent of the governed. He made us feel that we were our masters so long as we kept faith with the ideals that had been set up for us.

Surely, this Lincoln's birthday is a time when we can once more call upon his image and what it represents for the strength and encouragement that we need. We are still engaged in a great struggle to see if our society, founded on the concepts of freedom, can survive and endure. From Abraham Lincoln we can once more hear a call for a new dedication to that struggle and once more determine that we shall, under God, have a new birth of freedom.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 12, 1951]

#### THE UNIVERSAL LINCOLN

One can imagine that Abraham Lincoln would chuckle a little wryly if he were to witness all the causes that in later days were to seek the support of his name and the shelter of his tradition. It is the fate of every national hero to have his words and deeds cited by future generations in new contexts, but few have been so variously honored in this way as Lincoln. Doubtless he would have some earthy frontier narrative to fit the case, as he did for the episodes of his years of trial. Yet it is part of the quality of the man, his universality, that so many should turn to him, so long after his death, for wisdom and inspiration. Perhaps they misread the message of his life, perhaps some distort it. Nevertheless, that grand figure, looming through the mists of time, seems to absorb the misconceptions and the distortions of praise as he once withstood those of blame, and is not lessened thereby.

Even in his stormy lifetime, when the unperceptive looked upon him as a strange and comic creature from a rude environment, facing responsibilities beyond his grasp, the magic of Lincoln's personality was at work. Those who cheered the pompous oration of Edward Everett at Gettysburg and jeered at the concise power of the President's address were nevertheless uneasily conscious that the latter was the product of no mean mind. Those who were shocked at tales of Lincoln's crudity or fastidiously repelled by his tall, gaunt form, heard him, at his second inauguration, speak words of enduring majesty. And when his assassination tore away the veils of hatred, misunderstanding, and partisanship that had shrouded him, the upsurge of respect and affection swept over the bounds

of section, faction, and Nation. There was no more felicitous epitaph than that of Stanton, as Lincoln died: "Now he belongs to the ages." If, sometimes, posterity tends to squander this rich legacy unworthily, it does not matter. Lincoln's heart, as Emerson said, was as great as the world; there is enough for mankind to share.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that I think we all appreciate the splendid tribute paid by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey to the great American, Abraham Lincoln. I know that we should all be happy to be identified with that fine expression, both of patriotism and of important national history, especially in times like the present, when the spirit of Lincoln, above all things, is so needed in our own national life and in the life of the world.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO REPORT BILLS DURING THE RECESS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Finance may have the privilege of filing reports during the recess of the Senate between today and Thursday next.

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

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

#### FEDERAL REGISTER—UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE—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 document, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to article 36, section 1, Public law 506, Eighty-first Congress, I am transmitting herewith a copy of part II of the Federal Register, February 10, 1951, in which there are set forth the rules and regulations which I have promulgated to implement the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 12, 1951.

#### BOARD OF VISITORS TO MILITARY ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to law, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

#### BOARD OF VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to law, the Chair appoints the Senator from

South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

#### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Mrs. Harry Lee Brittingham, of East Orange, N. J., relating to the budget and defense spending; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, favoring the creation of a transportation commission for the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., etc., to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The petition of Domingo S. Romau, of San Juan, P. R., relating to relief for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mrs. Constance Darling, of Dolgeville, N. Y., relating to the withdrawal of all United Nations armed forces from Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., relating to the donation of certain funds in the form of currency by the public to assist quadruple amputees; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., protesting against the shipment of all materials having any value to Communist China; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to promptly take all measures necessary to complete the St. Lawrence waterway

"Whereas representatives of the Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada in 1941 consummated and signed an agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence, both for navigation and power purposes, so as to permit free passage of ocean-going ships from the Atlantic Ocean to the head of the Great Lakes and into the heart of the American Continent, and make available the development of this great potential source of electric energy for necessary public use; and

"Whereas the Presidents of the United States for the past 31 years have committed themselves to the development of the St. Lawrence River and President Harry S. Truman has characterized the St. Lawrence project as of economic value comparable to the Panama Canal and a vital necessity as a defense measure; and

"Whereas world developments of the past few months and the existence of the present national emergency require in the national defense the development of this inland waterway as an additional means of transportation for the great industries located on the Great Lakes and the agriculture of the northwest States; and

"Whereas the State of Minnesota, through its legislature, for the last 31 years, has affirmed its continued support of this project; and through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Minnesota has continuously promoted the development of the St. Lawrence River, believing that the project is a vital necessity for the stimulation and development of the resources of this State and of the entire Northwest, as well as a great economic advantage to the

Nation, and that the project has already been too long delayed: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the senate, the house of representatives concurring, commend and support the President of the United States in his steadfast, consistent and energetic support of this project, and urge the Congress of the United States, without further delay, to take all measures necessary to bring about the speedy completion of this great project as a vital defense and economic necessity; be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"G. ELMER ANDERSON,  
"President of the Senate.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.  
"Approved February 8, 1951.

"LUTHER YOUNGDAHL,  
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

**AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY LEADERSHIP—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES**

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received an important resolution from the Wisconsin Council of Churches pointing out America's heavy responsibilities to continue to provide international leadership through the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

Whereas the armament races by separate sovereign states have been and are now an unsatisfactory means for the settlement of international disputes and as now developed threaten the destruction of society, and whereas, we believe that our Nation has no alternative but to build up its armed strength so long as the United Nations does not have the power to give all nations security, and whereas, the strengthening of the United Nations so that it may unite the peoples of the earth in peace and justice while preserving the freedom of different peoples to pursue their separate ways of life would represent the implementation of our Christian faith in the brotherhood of man: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Council of Churches call on the Congress and the President of the United States to declare that it is a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations, with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, incorporation, and enforcement of world law. Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of our Wisconsin Representatives in Congress and to our United States Senators.

**ACTIVITIES OF SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS**

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received an important resolution from the Secretary of the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, Herbert Myer, of Baraboo, Wis. This resolution was adopted at the February 1 meeting in Madison of this association and it pertains to the vital

subject of the continued activities of the Soil Conservation Service in the United States Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

**WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION  
OF SOIL CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT SUPERVISORS,  
Baraboo, Wis., February 2, 1951.**

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

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As secretary of the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, representing 61 county-wide districts in the State, I have been instructed to transmit to you the following resolution:

"Whereas conservation of our soil and water resources is essential to the vigorous health and high morale of our people, a strong national defense, and our democratic system of government, is an established and accepted truth; and

"Whereas soil conservation districts, democratically organized and locally controlled local units of State government, have proved to be an effective group through which this vitally important national assignment can be accomplished; and

"Whereas soil conservation district supervisors have secured excellent cooperation from State and Federal agencies and organizations, particularly the Soil Conservation Service, in working toward a well-rounded program of proper land use and soil and water conservation, and since continuation of this essential work is dependent on keeping a strong and adequately financed Soil Conservation Service; and

"Whereas rumors in the press indicate that various reorganization ideas are under consideration which would weaken or destroy the direct technical assistance the Soil Conservation Service is giving districts: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Members of Congress and the United States Secretary of Agriculture be informed that soil conservation district supervisors in assembly at a State meeting in Madison, Wis., on February 1, 1951, hereby enthusiastically endorse the work of the Soil Conservation Service and do further petition that this agency be administratively strengthened, kept a separate bureau in the United States Department of Agriculture, given full responsibility for Federal help on soil and water conservation, and given adequate appropriations to take care of technical needs of farmers of the Nation through the medium of our soil conservation districts."

Your consideration and support of our resolution will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT R. MEYER,  
Secretary.

**SUPPORT OF UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION BY CITIZENS OF ARLINGTON, TEX.**

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a document entitled "The Arlington Resolution." This is a resolution adopted by a group of prominent citizens of Arlington, Tex., urging the revitalization and strengthening of the United Nations.

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

Whereas we, the citizens of Arlington, Tex., recognize the grave situation that threatens our American way of life: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we will support with our every effort every member of our national administration and of the Congress who will put aside all party politics and remember that his first duty in this crisis is to America and the American people. To this end, we stand ready to do our full share, pay our part, and give our lives, if need be; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we expect our Congress to take immediate steps toward revitalizing and strengthening the United Nations into an effective force to halt aggression and establish and preserve world peace, with each member nation contributing its fair and proportionate share; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we call upon our neighbors throughout our Nation to support the principles embodied in this resolution so that, through our united efforts and our prayers to Almighty God, our way of life will be preserved for our children and our children's children.

Authorized this, the 16th day of January 1951.

A. E. Betzel, Chairman, Owner-Manager, A. E. Betzel Engineering Co.; B. C. Barnes, Mayor, City of Arlington, Tex.; E. H. Hereford, President, Arlington State College; Bob Cooke, President, Bob Cooke Motor Co.; Duncan Robinson, Head, Publicity Department, Arlington State College; J. E. Vernon, President, Southern Industrial Steel Corp.; George W. Hawkes, Editor, Arlington Citizen, President, Arlington Rotary Club; D. J. Hood, Owner-Manager, Hood Auto Supply Co.; C. Albert Altoegg, Jr., Editor, Arlington Journal; F. J. Vandergreif, President, Chamber of Commerce; W. H. Winslink, Superintendent, Arlington Public Schools; Frank A. Raines, Manager, Midway Inn; Joseph H. Elder, Jr., Police and Fire Commissioner, City of Arlington, Tex.; J. E. Ferguson, Owner-Manager, Ferguson Lumber Co.; O. B. O'Dell, City Manager, City of Arlington, Tex.

**RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 90)**

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted, pursuant to law, its fifth report with respect to studies of the relationships between the United States and international organizations in which the United States participates, which was ordered to be printed.

**BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED**

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

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 844. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Cashin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 845 (by request). A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating to reinstatement of war risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 846. A bill for the relief of Harold Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 847. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 848. A bill for the relief of Adam Papatristopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 849. A bill to provide for an unemployment reinsurance fund; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Igo Sobel;  
S. 851. A bill for the relief of Reiko Tanaka;  
S. 852. A bill for the relief of Jorma Haakon Romppanen;

S. 853. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ying Tak Chan; and

S. 854. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Winternitz and Jenta Winternitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 855. A bill to provide for free transmission of official mail of members of certain United Nations commands; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 856. A bill for the relief of Sana Treger;  
S. 857. A bill for the relief of Fausto Leonardo Marcal; and

S. 858. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pauline J. Gourdeaux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 859. A bill for the relief of the Rubbercraft Corp. of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 860. A bill to provide for the payment of a disability retirement annuity to Joseph J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (by request):

S. 861. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 862. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 863. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edna M. Cook, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 864. A bill to provide that the widows and children of persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces during the present hostilities shall be entitled to pensions for non-service-connected death on the same basis as widows and children of veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Finance.  
S. 865. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 866. A bill to extend the requirements for fixing the minimum number of deck officers and licensed engineers on steam vessels to certain additional vessels of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### UNCLAIMED MONEY IN THE TREASURY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and I ask that I may have 5 minutes in which to explain it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

The resolution (S. Res. 73) submitted by Mr. LANGER was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to unclaimed moneys, bonds, and other securities in the Treasury of the United States with a view to ascertaining the extent to which the inability of the Treasury Department to determine and locate the persons entitled to payment of such moneys, bonds, or other securities is due to a lack of a sufficient number of civil-service employees qualified to perform such duties.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the United States Treasury today has nearly \$2,000,000,000 of unclaimed moneys belonging to individuals from every State in the Union, to which the Treasury has no title, and under the law cannot use as a result of a Supreme Court decision because it is the escheatable property of the State in which these funds originated.

Under this decision, *United States v. Klein* (303 U. S. 276) it is plainly stated that the Federal Government has no power of escheat of unclaimed moneys, but that unclaimed moneys in the Federal Treasury belong to the State in which these unclaimed funds originated.

Some of these moneys have accumulated and been lying in the United States Treasury since 1790. Some are unclaimed Civil War bonds. Some are unclaimed Liberty bonds and Victory notes from World War I. Some are Armed Forces leave bonds, United States savings bonds, Treasury tax and savings notes, Treasury savings certificates, Treasury bills, certificates of indebtedness at various interest rates, which are carried in the daily statement of the United States Treasury, in the first statement of each month under the heading "Matured debt on which interest has ceased" and "Debt bearing no interest."

The total of these unclaimed securities as of January 2, 1951, was \$561,734,147.76. In addition to these unclaimed securities of the Federal Government, there are many millions of dollars of unclaimed tax rebates which, under the Supreme Court decision, belong to the State in which the unclaimed funds originated. There are unclaimed Federal court funds in every State in the Union which have been remitted to the Treasury yearly by the clerks of each district court since these courts were organized and which, under the Supreme Court decision referred to above, have been adjudicated as belonging to the State in which the funds originated.

There are approximately 22 categories of these unclaimed amounts, with a possible total of \$2,000,000,000, which would enrich the school funds of every State in the Union in an entirely legal manner at a time when the States are struggling so hard to maintain their high standard of education in this period of tremendously rising costs.

At least two States in the Union, Florida and California, have already passed laws on the subject and are claiming these unclaimed Federal funds but are being opposed at every step, in spite

of the Supreme Court decision referred to, by which Pennsylvania secured title to unclaimed Federal court funds in that State.

Of the \$561,734,147.76 in bonds referred to, the unclaimed amounts are increasing at the present time by roughly \$100,000,000 a year. This rapid increase is due to approximately \$55,000,000,000 of E-bonds outstanding, a small portion of which, for various reasons, never appear for redemption. The unclaimed securities category is expected to reach at least \$1,000,000,000 by the time these 10-year bonds mature.

It is likely that after the States get their share of approvable claims, a large proportion of this \$2,000,000,000 will be left, and provision should be made whereby that sum could be prorated among the States.

It is my further belief that this entire matter ought to be investigated, and I have, therefore, submitted today a resolution to ascertain how much of this money belongs to civil-service employees, whether there are sufficient employees in the civil service properly to untangle this matter so that from this involved bookkeeping it may be ascertained how much each State is entitled to receive, and whether it is necessary to have more civil-service employees work on this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement rendered by the Federal Treasury as of January 2, 1951, may be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

| <i>Matured debt on which interest has ceased</i>   |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| Old debt matured—issued prior to Apr. 1, 1917 (excluding Postal Savings bonds).....  | \$1,381,220.26          |
| 2½ percent Postal Savings bonds.....   | 169,340.00              |
| Liberty bonds and Victory notes, at various interest rates.....  | 8,908,000.00            |
| Treasury bonds, at various interest rates.....   | 189,160,600.00          |
| Adjusted service bonds of 1945.....  | 6,514,900.00            |
| Treasury notes, at various interest rates.....   | 14,098,400.00           |
| Certificates of indebtedness, at various interest rates.....   | 27,849,150.00           |
| Treasury bills.....  | 15,494,000.00           |
| Treasury savings certificates.....   | 107,050.00              |
| Treasury tax and savings notes.....  | 40,399,700.00           |
| United States savings bonds.....   | 228,873,562.50          |
| Armed Forces leave bonds.....  | 28,778,225.00           |
| <b>Total matured debt on which interest has ceased.....</b>  | <b>561,734,147.76</b>   |
| DEBT BEARING NO INTEREST   |                         |
| Special notes of the United States: International Monetary Fund series.....  | 1,270,000,000.00        |
| Other:   |                         |
| United States savings stamps.....  | 47,631,965.73           |
| Excess profits tax refund bonds.....   | 2,854,656.16            |
| United States notes.....   | 346,681,016.00          |
| Less: Gold reserve.....  | 156,039,430.93          |
| <b>Total.....</b>  | <b>190,641,585.07</b>   |
| National and Federal Reserve bank notes assumed by the United States on deposit of lawful money for their retirement.....  | 346,356,563.50          |
| Old demand notes and fractional currency.....  | 2,020,270.51            |
| Thrift and Treasury savings stamps.....  | 3,719,918.25            |
| <b>Total.....</b>  | <b>593,224,959.22</b>   |
| <b>Total debt bearing no interest.....</b>   | <b>1,863,224,959.22</b> |
| Total gross public debt (including \$8,469,696,080.52 debt incurred to finance expenditures of Government corporations and other agencies for which obligations of such corporations and agencies are held by the Treasury)..... | 256,707,571,188.72      |

#### COMBAT PAY FOR INFANTRYMEN IN KOREA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate a bill (S. 579) which would provide combat pay of \$50 a month additional for enlisted men and \$100 a month for officers on duty in Korea. This bill is designed to correct an injustice of the current Army pay system under which the infantryman, who endures the greatest hardships, receives no additional compensation, while members of other services, such as the Air Force and the submarine service, draw extra pay for hazardous duty. Needless to say, I hope this matter will receive the early and favorable attention of the Armed Services Committee.

In connection with the subject matter of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two excerpts from the newspaper column of Mr. Drew Pearson.

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

EN ROUTE TO WASHINGTON.—Under the current Army pay system, the real heroes in the Korean war are drawing the least pay. They don't even get a fair share of the glory when the publicity and medals are dished out.

These unsung heroes are the infantrymen, who form the Army's battering ram, but who are not paid as much as the technical men and pencil pushers behind the lines.

It used to be that infantrymen could collect \$10 extra each month for combat work. If they wore the combat infantryman's badge, it was good for a \$10 monthly bonus. However, even this has been taken away from them in Korea, despite the fact that combat airmen and submarine men still draw \$20 to \$75 per month extra for hazardous duty.

Meanwhile, it's the infantrymen who feel the bite of enemy bullets, who slog through mud, sleep in foxholes, and live on cold K rations, who have little chance to take a bath, see a movie, attend church, write letters, or sleep with their shoes off.

Nevertheless, in Korea, the average monthly pay of a man in an infantry rifle company is \$135, compared with \$226 for an Air Force combat crew man and \$172 for a submarine crew.

Highest-paid troops in the Army are ordnance men, followed by signal corps, armored force, quartermaster, antiaircraft, field artillery, engineers, medical, and, last on the list, the infantry.

It's the same story with other awards. During World War II, infantrymen suffered 70 percent of the casualties but got only 11.6 percent of the medals. The Air Force was decorated with 76.2 percent of the medals, while other branches got the remaining 12.2 percent.

Now that the Korean war is nearly won, the Army should give fair pay and recognition to the foot soldiers who did the slugging and the slogging.

Senator LONG TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, in addition to helping steer United States foreign policy, is never too busy to fight for the little fellow. He is now about to win an important financial victory for American doughboys in Korea.

On October 21, Senator CONNALLY spotted an item in the Washington Merry-Go-Round which read:

"Under the current Army pay system, the real heroes in the Korean war are drawing the least pay. They don't even get a fair share of the glory when the publicity and medals are dished out.

"These unsung heroes are the infantrymen, who form the Army's battering ram, but who are not paid as much as the technical men and pencil pushers behind the lines.

It used to be that infantrymen could collect \$10 extra each month for combat work. If they wore the combat infantryman's badge, it was good for a \$10 monthly bonus. However, even this has been taken away from them in Korea."

Senator CONNALLY clipped the column and sent it to the Army, together with a letter wanting to know why combat men were being discriminated against. He has now received a letter from the Army indicating that it would urge a \$50 bonus monthly for combat enlisted men, with \$100 a month for officers.

What the Army told Senator CONNALLY in summary follows:

"The Department of the Army recognizes the plight of the infantrymen who in past wars and in the Korean operation have borne the brunt of the fighting. We intend to do everything possible to give the deserved recognition and compensation to those combat fighters upon whom the success of all our military efforts ultimately depends.

"From the standpoint of extra compensation for the combat fighter, the Army has prepared and submitted to the Department of Defense a proposal to ask Congress for extra pay for each month of combat duty in Korea. The Department of Defense has indicated considerable interest and we anticipate early submission of the proposal to Congress."

#### PROPOSAL TO DRAFT 18-YEAR-OLD YOUTHS—LETTER FROM SHEBOYGAN (WIS.) COUNCIL OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in Wisconsin, as throughout the rest of the country, there is a tremendous interest and controversy on the subject of the drafting of 18-year-old youngsters. Naturally, this issue touches the heart of every parent, in addition to affecting veterans and other large groups.

I believe that a letter which I received a few days ago from the Sheboygan, Wis., Council of Parent-Teachers Association well expresses views on at least one side of this picture which have come to me from other P.-T. A.'s and from numerous educators throughout Wisconsin.

I would not, of course, attempt at this time to offer a final evaluation of this subject, because, like my colleagues, I am naturally awaiting the expert report of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I feel, however, that this Sheboygan communication is very indicative of widespread sentiment. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of this letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

SHEBOYGAN COUNCIL OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, SHEBOYGAN, WIS., January 26, 1951.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In view of the fact that at present there is a bill before the Congress of the United States to draft 18-year-old young men for military service, and realizing we are not in a position to know whether or not our country really needs the 18-year-olds for our country's service, we, the Sheboygan Council of Parents and Teachers, wish to urge that a provision be made to insure that each young 18- or 19-year-old

student have a chance to finish his high-school course before entering military service.

Very few young men in our community, and in many others, finish high school before becoming 18 and many are 19 years old because of regulations relative to entering school or for various other reasons during their primary and secondary education. We cannot overlook the many advantages of a high-school education, not only to the young man himself, but also to our country as a whole. To insure the young men a high-school education is to strengthen our country's defense. He may then look forward to higher education or work in the field of his choice upon discharge from the military service.

Our group represents a true cross-section of parents and teachers in our community of more than 40,000 population and we feel a definite need for such a provision which will be a constructive step forward toward ultimate peace, which is the thought uppermost in the minds of all of us today.

We wish to commend the action of Congress in regard to college students being able to finish their terms at present and would like to count on a provision being included in the present bill before Congress to insure the opportunity which would enable the 18- or 19-year-olds to finish high school in the event a bill to draft 18-year-old young men is passed.

As a chosen representative of the people, your leadership and action relative to this matter is desired.

Yours truly,

#### THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY, EDITORIAL COMMENT, AND RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE COMMON COUNCIL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on February 10, an editorial from the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, a resolution of the Milwaukee Common Council, and an editorial from the Minneapolis Star, all relating to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### THE TREASURY-FEDERAL RESERVE DISPUTE—ADDRESS BY AUBREY G. LANSTON

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Aubrey G. Lanston, president of Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., before the fifty-fifth annual meeting of group II of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association, held at Philadelphia on February 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SOCIAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM A. CALVIN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on social security delivered by William A. Calvin on January 27, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MEETING THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE WORLD SITUATION—ADDRESS BY JAMES B. CAREY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, on January 6, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PRICE CONTROLS—STATEMENT BY THE MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association on the subject of price controls, which appears in the Appendix.]

**MR. TRUMAN DECIDED IN FAVOR OF INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS STAR**

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman Decided in Favor of Inflation," published in the Minneapolis Star of February 7, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

**NEED ARMS FIRST—ARTICLE BY MARCEL WALLENSTEIN**

[Mr. CARLSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Need Arms First," written by Marcel Wallenstein, and published in the Kansas City Star of February 7, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

**POLITICAL BASIS BEHIND ANTITRUST PROSECUTIONS—ARTICLE AND EDITORIAL**

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Jackson Grows Candid," published in the New York Times of Wednesday, January 24, 1951, and an editorial entitled "Candor," published in the New York Wall Street Journal of January 26, 1951, which appear in the Appendix.]

**LABOR UNIONS HELP WIN FREEDOM FIGHT—AN EDITORIAL FROM LOS ANGELES DAILY NEWS**

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Unions Help Win Freedom Fight," written by its editor and publisher, Mr. Manchester Boddy, and published in the Los Angeles Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

**ADDRESS BY EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER**

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on last Friday evening ex-President Hoover made a very important contribution to the so-called great debate on American foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address, as published in the New York Times, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Fellow Americans, I have been urged by many thousands of you to again discuss with you our foreign policy.

A responsibility rests upon me to speak out from 50 years of personal experience with most of the peoples of the free world and with Russia and China. I have been entrusted during 35 years with high responsibilities by my countrymen.

I should like to address you through the rose-colored spectacles of idealism and the need of free nations to defend freemen.

But I would be doing my country a disservice if I did not take into account the realities in this endangered world.

There is nothing sacrosanct about foreign policies, as witness the tombstones which have been erected over many of them in the last 10 years. They bear the inscriptions "Undeclared war, the alliance with Stalin, Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, dismantling of German peacetime industry, the promoting of Mao Tse-tung."

Many men, including myself, have demanded the revision of these policies at each wrong turning.

The rightness of our many proposals has been proved by time. I shall recall only two of them for your test.

Seventeen years ago, as President, I refused recognition of the Soviet government. I knew from ample experience, and their own documents, that this bloody conspiracy

against mankind would flood our country through this open door with fifth columns and spies; that they would sabotage our national life and Government. Every American knows they have done just that.

**ADVICE ON STALIN AND HITLER**

About 10 years ago, on June 29, 1941, in a great crisis I urged the revision of our policies to meet the greatest danger that had come to the American people.

Mr. Roosevelt had proposed a tacit alliance of the United States with Stalin and his Communist Russia. Britain was then safe because of the diversion of Hitler's armies to an attack on Russia. A few sentences from that address were:

"Now we find ourselves promising aid to Stalin and his militant Communist conspiracy against the whole democratic ideals of the world. \* \* \*

"It makes the whole argument of our joining the war to bring the 'four freedoms' to mankind a gargantuan jest. \* \* \*

"If we go further and join the war and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in this world."

I said these two dictators—Stalin and Hitler—were locked in deadly combat, that statesmanship required the United States to stand aside in watchful waiting, armed to the teeth; that the day would come when these nations "will be sufficiently exhausted to listen to the military, economic, and moral powers of the United States and at that moment and that moment only can the United States promote a just and lasting peace."

Remember this was in June 1941, almost 10 years ago. Need I remind you that the grip of communism in this decade has spread slavery from 200,000,000 to 800,000,000 people? And we have no peace.

I could recall a dozen more instances, some within the past 12 months.

**SIX FACTORS TO BE APPRAISED**

In order to reach any conclusions as to the wise course for America to pursue in the critical issues which confront us we must again and again appraise the constantly shifting forces moving in the world.

The problems which we face are of far larger dimensions than the current discussion on sending contingents of American boys to Europe.

Their appraisal must also include:

1. Land war strengths.
2. The defense of the American people and the Western Hemisphere.
3. Our economic capacity over a long period.
4. The United Nations.
5. Our policies in the Far East.
6. The North Atlantic military alliance.

Policies in these six categories cannot be separated from each other—they are all interlocked.

We must appraise the somber facts around these points before we can map a national direction. We must not shrink from clear-minded appraisal of our strengths, our weaknesses, and the attainment of the purposes to which the Congress has committed us.

**GROUND FORCES COMPARED**

We may again appraise as best we can the present military strengths for land war in the world.

I am fully aware of the shortcomings of the term "divisions" as a measuring device for comparative military strength, but it is the nearest to a common descriptive unit that we have.

The Kremlin-directed horde has under arms and in reserves probably 300 combat divisions, with 30,000 tanks. I am now told they have over 20,000 mostly tactical planes and they have with their satellites 50,000,000 men available for cannon fodder.

In World War II, when Russia was without the satellites, the Germans failed with 240 well-equipped divisions to overcome her. With her allies of General Manpower, General Space, General Winter, and General Scorched Earth, she had stopped the Germans even before lend-lease had reached her.

The nations of Europe in the Atlantic Pact have at the present moment less than 20 equipped and trained combat divisions available for European action.

There is here a stark reality upon which our foreign policies must be based. With any seaable land forces from non-Communist nations, even including the United States, a land offensive against the Communists could bring no military victory, no political conclusion. But that does not mean that there are no other methods of stopping the Kremlin's ambitions.

The second stark realism upon which our foreign policies must be based is the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Its defense is not only in our interests but in the interests of free men everywhere.

Much criticism is offered, even to a discussion of this question. An atmosphere of hurry, rush, anxiety is being developed the effect of which is to make it difficult, if not impossible, for the American people to judge their own situation.

I may say at once that with proper economic action this hemisphere can be made self-contained in critical raw materials. From a long professional career and from years as Secretary of Commerce dealing with such questions, I might qualify in this field.

Further, unless we so dissipate our strength as to become a beaten and crushed people, we will be able to keep sea lanes open.

Moreover, this hemisphere can be defended from Communist armies, come what will. It is still surrounded with a great moat. To transport such invading armies either 3,000 miles across the Atlantic or 6,000 miles across the Pacific would require transport ships and naval protection which the Russians do not possess and could not build or seize, no matter what further countries they occupy.

If we have a proper naval and air strength, we could sink them in midocean. With somewhat more attention paid to our defense, this would apply to invasion via the Bering Straits. Hitler could not even cross the English Channel. Atomic bombs do not transport troops over the ocean.

Communist armies can no more get to Washington than any allied armies can get to Moscow.

No responsible military man denies these two conclusions.

The American people should not be frightened into rash action by fear that we cannot survive. I am not advocating isolationism. But if other nations should fail, we may be isolated by force of circumstance and against our will.

We might go into a period hard to endure, but this Nation can stick it out.

**STRAIN ON ECONOMIC CAPACITY**

The third stark realism upon which our policies must be built is our economic capacity. The bleak outlook of the world may well last more than a decade—possibly two of them.

The new budget calls for Federal spending of over \$71,000,000,000. This \$71,000,000,000 alone, plus state and local expenditures, is about 37 percent of our national income.

That is beyond the long endurance of any nation and fatal to the preservation of a system of free men.

The President has asked for a large increase of taxes. We will need also to increase State and local government taxes.

This burden is going to fall on people with smaller incomes. The proof of this is easy.

If all personal incomes above the level of a United States senator were confiscated it

would yield only about \$2,500,000,000 of additional revenues. But confiscation would stop most people earning the \$2,000,000,000. We must also remember that excise and corporation taxes in most part are ultimately passed on to the consumer or these milch cows would die.

Grim austerity must enter the door of every American home.

Even before these burdens are actually imposed there are stark signs of economic strain. The purchasing power of the dollar has fallen 20 percent in 6 months. The stock boom indicates that many people are seeking flight from inflation.

Our already gigantic Government debts permit little expansion without inflation of credit. Two wars prove economic controls cannot wholly stop inflation. The surest road away from inflation is to accept the President's wise proposals to "pay as you go."

But we simply cannot carry this expenditure or such tax load for long.

Spending, taxing, and inflation of ourselves into exhaustion is one of the means by which Stalin hopes to overcome the United States.

The economic destruction of the United States is one of the means by which Stalin hopes to overcome us.

#### UNITED NATIONS COMMITMENTS

The fourth focal point of our thinking must be the United Nations.

Our stark reality here is the lack of cohesion and unity in the free nations. Even some of our European allies are anxious to appease the Chinese branch of the Kremlin on policies of the United Nations.

Despite this, we must not forget that the aspiration of mankind for over a century has been to find peace by collective action against aggressors. The United Nations was built on this same central idea as the concert of Europe and the League of Nations. Halting and faulty as it may be, we cannot abandon this idea and this hope.

But it must be clear that the UN for the present will not be a substantial protection from Communist aggression.

Our men are holding heroically to the mission assigned us by the United Nations in Korea. We are suffering great losses. General Marshall says we must send 15,000 men a month. We cannot yet see the end. But if we were to drive all the enemy out of Korea, how much of our armies must remain there to protect it?

Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines are vital links in our national security. This must not be minimized by nations anxious to direct our energies to Europe. We will need to retain much military strength in the Pacific to protect those areas.

Certainly there is little stark reality in talking about American ground divisions in Europe in view of our involvement in Asia.

#### ATTACK AS SIGNAL FOR TROOPS

The sixth consideration in our decisions revolves around the North Atlantic Pact and the proposals to start another American expeditionary land army to Europe.

Current statements stretch this pact far beyond its text. The pact provides that the nations shall aid each other in case of attack. There has been no attack.

Moreover, at the time of ratification of that alliance the administration, through the Secretary of State and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, gave positive assurances that under the pact no expeditions of American ground troops would be sent to Europe.

That certainly meant no forces to Europe prior to attack. Our participation, prior to an attack, was to be limited to munitions. The pact being the will of the American people through the Congress, and in the faith of the text and those assurances, I supported the alliance.

But last fall it became evident that the Administration was contemplating sending ground troops to Europe.

It was also evident that after years of gigantic American subsidies, the European Atlantic Pact nations had done nothing of consequence toward their own defense. Former Prime Minister Churchill had repeatedly and forthrightly stated this fact—the last occasion being only a few weeks ago.

I made two addresses in protest. Judging by the scolding of the European press, I may have helped to start them thinking.

Then General Eisenhower was appointed to organize their military strength. And the general has become the potent symbol of the policy of at once sending American ground troops to Europe.

The American people are indebted to General Eisenhower for many great services. He has magnificent fitness both for the command and the stimulation of spirit and action among the allies in Europe.

But his appointment does not commit the American people as to policy.

#### EUROPE AS RUSSIA'S CHOICE

The stark realities in western continental Europe are their large Communist parties and the disunities which gnaw at their vitals. Their prejudices prevent taking Spain into the alliance with 20 divisions and the most defensible area in Europe. For some reason Turkey and Greece are excluded from the alliance.

Equally vital is the fact that there is little hope of adequate land defense of Europe without West German participation. Two months ago detailed plans and great progress were announced. Now it is decided that West German military participation is out or can wait.

From press reports based on information from European officials and from General Eisenhower's statements, it would appear that his army, including the two American divisions now in Germany, would start with 9 or possibly 10 divisions; by the end of 2 years, including American divisions, it would seem to be 35 or 40 divisions.

The stark reality is that such an army is small compared to the strength of the enemy.

America is at present the major deterrent to the Kremlin's ambitions of world conquest. There is nothing that Stalin would like more than to get the United States into his clutches by fighting us on the ground in Europe. There lies his overwhelming strength.

Disaster could thus come to the American Hemisphere with no salvation to Europe.

The American people should have more information before they risk trying a third expedition of ground troops to Europe.

Any defense line in Europe must be over 400 miles long. Will our responsible leaders make a public statement that the forces so far proposed can defend this line against odds of 3 or 4 to 1? We have tried this in Korea.

Will our responsible leaders tell us whether they contemplate the proposed American contingent as only an installment? Does not this contribution and our huge increase in the Army budget imply many more American divisions? Do the American people know all the facts?

#### AIR-SEA POWER AS DECISIVE

Despite all these stark realities and these problems, I have believed there is a way to at least an uneasy peace for the world.

In my address of 6 weeks ago, I stated that we should not land men or send money to Europe until large European forces were in sight. I was well aware of the obligation assumed by Congress to give aid in case of attack. It was my view that we should hold to that provision of the pact and I urged "arming our Air and Navy to the teeth."

I suggest that air power and the Navy is the alternative to sending American land

divisions to Europe. With our gigantic productive capacity and within our economic strength we can build and sustain overwhelming air and sea forces held on our home ground ready in case of attack.

Stalin well knows we could carry on that kind of war for his destruction for indefinite years.

The air threat has been during 4 years the most powerful deterrent to any attack on Western Europe. It is far more powerful than pouring American divisions into the reach of this Asiatic horde.

I am suggesting no attack. I am suggesting the very protection for Western Europe and our own defense which the Senate contemplated when it ratified the Atlantic Pact.

There are other reasons for such a policy—both military and economic.

#### LESSON OF STRATEGY IN KOREA

Manifestly if attack on Europe came, the free world would be inferior in ground forces. Such a ground war would at best be a war of defense. In the air we would have the offensive. An air force has range, speed, flexibility and striking power which can come nearer gaining a decision than allied ground armies.

Especially is this true, for in an air war the Communist horde would be without a large part of its ground allies—General Manpower, General Space, General Winter, and General Scorched Earth.

The whole Korean tragedy is developing proof that the way to punish aggressors is from the air and sea and not by land armies. It would be indefinitely less costly in dead and disaster.

The unbearable strain on our economic system will come from trying to do five things at the same time. That is, to maintain armies in the Pacific; to build up an air force; a naval force; to furnish munitions to nations who are determined to defend themselves; and to send land armies to Europe. Our economy cannot carry this load for long.

I can give you an indication of the lesser economic strain to attain the same or more power by air than ground forces.

To train, equip, place in Europe, and maintain for 1 year 10 of the usual combinations of American divisions would cost about \$4,500,000,000. This same sum would for example, purchase and man 390 B-26 long-range bombers compared to 60 of them at present. If neither went into battle, the annual cost of the 10 divisions would be about \$3,000,000,000, and that of such a segment of the air force less than \$1,000,000,000.

#### POLICY REVISIONS PROPOSED

I can most clearly state the points of foreign policies in which many of us believe at this time by summarizing a program. No program can be perfect—none without risk. For the present I suggest:

1. We should devote our overwhelming productive power to air and naval strength and supply of munitions.

2. If the Europeans are attacked, we should be prepared and use such overwhelming air and naval power to the limit and keep it up until they have had enough. The Kremlin knows that we are committed by the Congress to do so. I believe that reserve, if large enough, is Europe's real protection.

3. We should supply munitions to nations doing their utmost to defend themselves.

4. From the starkly realistic, economic, political and military reasons which I have given you, my personal conviction is that we should not create land armies for expeditions into the quicksands of either Europe or China. I do not want to even start on the road to another Korea.

5. There are those who think we should send more divisions to Europe for their encouragement even before there is an attack. To them, I urge watchful waiting until much more military strength has been developed

by Europe itself and there is more evidence they have resolved their disunities.

6. We must reduce our national expenditures to a level we can carry over a long term of years, and at the same time avoid economic disaster which can destroy freedom in America.

Senator BYRD estimates that \$8,600,000,000 of proposed nondefense expenditures in the budget could be reduced or postponed. We should spend all we can afford on air, navy, and munitions rather than large armies.

#### FOR BACKING CHIANG KAI-SHEK

7. We can and must defend Formosa, the Philippines, and Japan. We can do it by naval and air forces.

As to Korea, we should demand of the United Nations that they call for a stop of supplies to Communist China by the non-Communist nations.

Since Red China is making war on our American armies, we should free Chiang Kai-shek to do what he wishes in China and furnish him munitions.

8. I proposed 3 years ago that we should give full independence to Japan and Western Germany under representative governments. During 100 years these nations were the great dams against these Russian-controlled hordes.

In the last war we may have been engaged in a great crusade for freedom of mankind, but we certainly destroyed these two dams. The sooner they are given their independence the sooner, for their own security, they will resume their ancient role.

9. Recently I proposed that if the nations of Europe failed we should, as a prudent nation, have in mind a second line of air and naval defense based upon the foreign shores of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans both north and south, and I may add the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean.

10. Congress should recover its constitutional authority over starting wars. It could certainly do so through its powers over the purse.

#### PROGRAM FOR RESTRAINING FOES

I have proposed no retreat, no withdrawal. I have proposed no repudiation of treaties or obligations. Rather I have proposed that the pledges to the Congress and the American people be kept. I have proposed that we stop, look, and listen before we start on a road of land war that risks the loss of all civilization.

I propose no good to Stalin. His greatest hope is to get us into a land war.

Before we go off the deep end of steps toward another land war in Europe, let us remember that we fought two such wars hoping to bring peace and we have no peace.

We should be prepared to make heavy sacrifices to help. But we should do it with common sense, within our strength, with the long view of history in mind.

The essence of the program I have proposed is to effectively restrain our enemies from attack upon our allies or ourselves. It is the best chance of peace—even if it is an uneasy peace.

If we pursue the lines of our own genius and resources, we can meet this—the greatest menace of a century.

And being in the right the Almighty is on our side.

#### CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM AND THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a 3-minute statement preliminary to the introduction of some matters into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, one of the most important questions affecting the stability of the economy of the Nation today is that which has arisen as a result of the differences between the views of the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury. While these differences do not command the attention which has been given to the more dramatic debate on foreign policy, there are those of us who believe that their impact may be almost as telling on our ability to remain free.

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] received last week a copy of a statement prepared by Hon. James K. Vardaman, Jr., a member of the Federal Reserve Board, intended to set forth Governor Vardaman's position in the dispute. With his statement, Governor Vardaman enclosed a covering note, asking for the comment of the Senator receiving it. At the request of the Senator from Ohio I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the statement of Mr. Vardaman, together with the note accompanying it, the reply to Mr. Vardaman by the Senator from Ohio and five articles by respected columnists commenting on the matter. These articles are: Politics in Finance, by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post of February 7; McCabe Holds Power in Fight With Snyder; Dare He Use It?, by J. A. Livingston, from the Washington Post of February 8; Mr. Walter Lippmann's columns entitled "Today and Tomorrow," from the Washington Post of February 8 and February 12; and a column entitled "Fighting Fire With Gasoline," by Mr. Henry Hazlitt, from the February 5 edition of Newsweek magazine.

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

#### BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, February 5, 1951.

#### Memorandum to Senator BRICKER:

There is enclosed a statement which I issued to the press today giving my impressions of what happened at the meeting between the President of the United States and the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System at the White House at 4 p. m. on January 31; and also stating what I believe the Federal Reserve Board should say and do in connection with the financing program of the Government as officially promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I would sincerely appreciate it if you would read this statement in its entirety and give me the benefit of any comment you may care to make.

J. K. V.

#### STATEMENT BY GOV. JAMES K. VARDAMAN, JR., MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD, FEBRUARY 5, 1951

Never having regarded membership on the Federal Reserve Board as a speaking part, I have made only three short public talks and given about the same number of interviews in nearly 5 years' service on the Board. However, in the present situation where an apparent attempt is being made to question the veracity of the Presidency in its dealings with this Board I feel that it is only fair to give my impressions of what has happened and what the conduct of this Board should be.

After the meeting between the Federal Open Market Committee and the President at the

White House at 4 p. m. January 31, the Committee, consisting of all seven members of the Federal Reserve Board and the presidents of five Federal Reserve banks, returned to the Board's quarters and went into executive session. The suggestion was made that a written memorandum of what took place in the White House should be prepared, and Chairman McCabe requested Governor Evans to undertake that task. The preliminary draft of Governor Evans' memorandum which was released to the press by Governor Eccles without authorization of the Board or the Committee had not been approved by the Federal Reserve Board members nor all of the members of the Federal Open Market Committee. It was thought to be correct in all essential details but certain minor changes had been suggested. Governor Evans had prepared the memorandum from memory without notes. There were no notes taken at the meeting with the President so far as I know.

Governor Evans' memorandum was correct in essential details as to the words which were spoken during the meeting with the President, but the memorandum did not attempt to set forth the impressions and general atmosphere prevailing during the meeting. My own impression of the meeting was that the President of the United States had been allowed to leave the conference room with the definite impression in his heart and mind that the Federal Open Market Committee would support the Government financing and bond program as officially promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury on January 18. I said to the Committee that I thought it was tragic that the President had been allowed to leave the conference with such an impression when the majority of the Committee apparently knew at the time they were not going to carry out the President's wishes.

On January 29, 2 days before the meeting with the President, I submitted a written memorandum to the members of the Federal Reserve Board and on the 31st to the Open Market Committee suggesting that the Board make the following public statement:

"The Federal Reserve Board has made its recommendations to the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with the interest rate on short-term Government obligations and also with reference to the interest rate and maturities on funding and refunding bonds. In the exercise of his statutory authority and obligation, the Secretary has not thought it wise to follow all of the suggestions made by this Board in connection with these matters. Acting in his official capacity, as the spokesman for the Government, the Secretary has announced a financing program, and this Board has nothing further to say on the questions involved other than to state quite firmly and clearly that the Board will support to the fullest extent of its authority the program as officially promulgated by the United States Treasury.

"Whenever it is in line with its statutory authority to do so, the Board will advise with the Secretary on all matters relating to the management of the public debt or any other questions which he may desire to discuss. But it should be clearly understood that under our constitutional framework and present statutory laws, the management of the public debt is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury and this Board will support him to the utmost of its ability in his officially declared programs and actions.

"We believe the duty of this Board to be to make its ideas available and known in council, but not to make such ideas prevail and the Board will act in accordance with this belief in the present situation."

The Board and the committee refused to consider the issuance of any such statement in spite of the fact that it was generally thought that Chairman McCabe had given



President Truman every reason to believe that the Committee and Board would support the Government financing program.

As long as the questions involved were in the negotiation stage I felt it to be the duty of the Board to present and argue its ideas with the Secretary of the Treasury, and if necessary with the President. But once the Secretary of the Treasury, as the official spokesman for the Government on debt management, had promulgated the Government program I felt strongly that this Board should give such program its wholehearted support personally and officially. The question of statutory prerogatives and personal feelings should be subordinated to the all-important necessity of supporting the Government and the Presidency in this time of national emergency. For myself I unhesitatingly waive any theoretical statutory authority and prerogatives in order to support the Government and the Presidency at this time; and if there is any question in my mind as to the propriety of such a waiver I will try to appear before the proper congressional committee to ask for clarification of my statutory responsibilities as a member of the Board.

February 7, 1951.

The Honorable JAMES K. VARDAMAN, Jr.,  
Board of Governors,  
Federal Reserve System,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VARDAMAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your statement of February 5, 1951, and the attached memorandum requesting any comment that I might care to make.

The first part of your statement relates to your version of what took place at the January 31 conference between the President and the Federal Open Market Committee. Naturally, I cannot determine whether your report of that conference or the report of Governor Evans is correct. However, the aftermath of confusion which has followed a conference intended to clarify matters convinces me that the President has failed to grasp the basic issues of fiscal policy which are at the bottom of the dispute between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board.

Your statement makes it clear that you feel that the Board should support the financing and bond program advocated by Secretary Snyder. If this opinion is based on economic rather than legal considerations, I do not question your right to advance it. My own view is that the Treasury's fiscal policies will result in disastrous inflation. Since May 1950 the Board's holdings of Government securities have increased by \$3,500,000,000, which in turn has led to a sixfold expansion of credit. The proposal that the Board should continue to support the Treasury's cheap-money policies has been accurately described by Mr. Henry Hazlitt as "fighting fire with gasoline."

The concluding paragraph of your statement is one of the most amazing ever uttered by a public official in recent years. You say: "The question of statutory prerogatives \* \* \* should be subordinated to the all-important necessity of supporting the Government and the Presidency in this national emergency." The meaning of this euphemism is that the laws passed by Congress should be disregarded whenever the President feels that the national emergency so requires. I am unalterably opposed to that sort of totalitarian philosophy either in war or in peace.

You also say in the final paragraph of your statement that you "unhesitatingly waive any theoretical statutory authority and prerogatives in order to support the Government and the Presidency at this time." First, I would like to point out that the laws of the United States are not "theoretical" for 150,000,000 American people. They must obey them or go to jail. By what right

do you presume to waive statutory authority in violation of your oath of office?

Finally, I invite your attention to the fact that the Federal Reserve System is accountable to the Congress, and not to the Presidency as you suggest. Congress has not charged the Board with the duty of supporting the price of Government securities, but, rather, with the duty of supporting the value of the dollar.

Until such time as the duties of the Board may be changed by act of Congress, I trust that you will see the impropriety of your suggested waiver of statutory authority and prerogatives.

Sincerely yours,

[From the Washington Post of February 7, 1951]

POLITICS IN FINANCE  
(By Marquis Childs)

HOW NOT TO STOP INFLATION

As the roulette wheel of inflation continues to spin, checked somewhat but not stopped by the wage-price freeze, there are events in the news which have an ominous meaning. The following developments have a bearing on whether the wheel is to be stopped or whether the reckless gamble is to go on.

1. The response of Congress to the President's tax recommendations is confirmation of the fear that existed before the program came up for final action. Almost certainly final action will be delayed for several months. There is a widespread determination to cut deeply into the President's \$71,000,000,000 budget—which can be healthy if it is not indiscriminate on the defense side.

2. The report of a Senate subcommittee shows how political influence has operated to get loans out of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Professional fixers, in one or two instances former RFC employees, have taken large sums to get loan applications approved.

3. The controversy between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board over Government credit and the interest rate on Government bonds has created doubts as to fiscal policy. Congress, which granted the original powers to the Federal Reserve Board, will have to step in.

For several years reports have circulated about politics determining, in some instances, the loaning policy of the RFC. Details were first supplied in this column on how Merl Young, with his White House connections, stepped from a comparatively minor position in the RFC to a highly paid job as Washington representative of the Luston Corp., which got a \$37,000,000 loan. That loan is in default and the RFC has a doubtful chance to get something back from the assets of the company.

What has happened in the RFC shows the deterioration in standards of administration that has taken place during the past 3 or 4 years. There has been too much indifference toward ordinary integrity, or even the appearance of integrity, in the conduct of Government and the handling of the large sums of money entrusted to Government.

This points up sharply the contest between the Treasury and the White House on one hand and the Federal Reserve Board on the other. For most of us the argument over fiscal policy is in terms that are nearly impossible to understand since they are so far beyond our daily problems of grocery bills and the installment due on the car.

But one thing is perfectly easy to understand. That is President Truman's action in calling the members of the Board to the White House to discuss their policy on Government bonds. What makes this such an unusual act is that Congress specifically gave the Board powers independent of the Treasury to act as an instrument for maintaining the Government's credit relationship

with the Nation's banks. Never before has a President taken up directly with the Board the issue of the Board's policy.

After the meeting the White House issued a statement saying that the Board had pledged to maintain the Government's security market at existing levels both as to refunding and new issues. Board Member Marriner Eccles says that no such agreement was reached since, he adds, the President did not raise this point during the discussion.

Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder insists that to raise interest rates on Government securities by half of a percent would cost a billion and a half additional in interest charges. This, Snyder says, would be the next effect of Federal Reserve policy.

Eccles and others on the Board say that the extra interest cost would be nearer \$200,000,000 since the rate would be raised only on new issues and not on all Government securities. But even if the cost was considerably greater they argue that it is essential in order to check the flow of credit that is being released through the banks under the present policy.

The Federal Reserve Board has bought \$3,500,000,000 in Government bonds since May chiefly from insurance companies and savings banks. This figure should be multiplied by six, it is contended, to get the amount of credit inflation which such action means.

In April of 1948 the President replaced Eccles as Chairman of the Board and named in his place Thomas B. McCabe, a Philadelphia industrialist. Two years before he had made what was generally interpreted as a political appointment in naming his old friend from St. Louis, James K. Vardaman, Jr., to fill a vacancy on the Board. Vardaman had had only limited experience in the banking field.

To permit politics in this field is to invite an explosion that could do almost as much damage as an atomic bomb. With each day that passes it becomes increasingly obvious that the wage-price freeze cannot hold the line against inflation unless it is buttressed by other measures. There should be at this moment a willingness to consider the remedies that, however unpalatable they may be temporarily, have the backing of so many knowledgeable men.

[From the Washington Post of February 8, 1951]

McCABE HOLDS POWER IN FIGHT WITH SNYDER;  
DARE HE USE IT?  
(By J. A. Livingston)

In the fight between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury, the initiative rests with the Reserve Board if it cares to exercise it. This is true even though President Truman has publicly sided with Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder.

The Reserve Board's Open Market Committee has congressional authority to lower the prices it pays for Government securities. But to do so would run directly counter to Snyder's program of financing rearmament. Will Chairman Thomas B. McCabe risk that? Or will he feel he must resign?

Snyder has laid the groundwork for a knock-down, drag-out fight in Congress—if necessary. In a New York Times interview he berated those "who would have the Government make it possible for the banks to make even bigger profits at a time when industry, business, and labor are asked to forego part of the profits they would realize from defense mobilization." Shades of Andrew Jackson in his fight against the Bank of the United States.

In the row to date, members of the Reserve Board have been dominated by the thought that the country's great internal danger is inflation and that Snyder's policy aggravates it. Commercial banks own \$50,000,000,000 of Government securities. If the

Board is required, as Snyder demands, to buy these bonds at fixed prices, the banks can—at will—increase their reserves sufficient to expand credit by \$360,000,000,000, or seven times the outstanding volume of loans. All the banks have to do is sell their bonds. Thus the volume of credit would be determined by individual banks, and not as Congress intended, by the Reserve Board.

The Reserve Board is quite prepared to maintain a stable market for Government securities. But it wants to be free to let prices drop, so that if banks want to sell, they'll be penalized. Or, to put it the other way, it wants to create an incentive for holding.

As it is now, a bank or insurance company that has purchased a marketable 2½-percent long-term bond can get its money back at any time—from the Federal Reserve—without loss. No holder of American Telephone & Telegraph bonds can expect that. He always runs the risk of loss if he wants to sell. Presumably he buys to hold to maturity.

The Treasury's underlying fear is that once the Reserve Board started to lower the price of Government securities, holders would anticipate the decline and try to beat it. Panic might result. So Snyder would rather keep prices and interest rates fixed and the market settled. In that way, he always knows beforehand what future financing will cost him.

Thus, the real issue is this: Who's boss over the money supply, the Treasury or the Reserve System?

If Snyder prevails in the fight, then the Reserve Board would become an administrative arm of the Treasury. It would clear checks, supervise regulations W and X, examine banks. Some people say that it has already surrendered its independence, that whenever a central bank bucks the Government, it writes its own finish.

The Treasury, then, would be in the anomalous position of being the central bank and the country's biggest borrower at the same time. It would make its own terms on what it borrows and then use its central banking powers to make the loans good.

A face-saving device is conceivable. From time to time, the board has sought additional power to curb bank credit. One recent proposal would "sterilize" all reserves created by Reserve System purchases of Government securities. But Snyder had adhered to the institutional line of former Secretaries of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and Fred Vinson. They haven't liked to cramp the banks because that might depress the market for Government securities.

Perhaps now Snyder will back a Reserve Board legislative proposal for additional powers to curb bank reserves. The Board could then save face by agreeing to support Snyder's bond market in the manner to which Secretaries of the Treasury, ever since Morgenthau have become accustomed. And a knock-down, drag-out fight in Congress—to determine who's boss—would be avoided. But the conclusion would be plain: Snyder. He'd have the Reserve in Truman's hip pocket.

[From the Washington Post of February 8, 1951]

TODAY AND TOMORROW  
(By Walter Lippmann)

FOR MR. SNYDER TO EXPLAIN

The dispute between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board is not a tempest in a teapot. It is certainly not a personal feud. Nor are there any questions of veracity or honor involved. It is about a question of policy which is fundamental in our mobilization—what to do about the fact that a gigantic military program has been super-

imposed on the greatest civilian boom in our history.

The Federal Reserve System is appointed by law to see to it that the volume, the cost, and the availability of the total money supply of this country is such as to avoid either a deflation or an inflation. The view of the Federal Reserve Board is that the armament program can be carried out even allowing for an increase of productivity, only by a considerable deflation of the civilian boom. But it is impossible to reduce the civilian boom, indeed it is impossible not to pour oil on the fires of inflation in that boom, if the Federal Reserve System is going to be compelled, as it is now, by the President and the Treasury to buy unlimited amounts of Government bonds at essentially fixed prices—at a 2½-percent rate for long-term marketable bonds.

The view of the Treasury, as stated by Secretary Snyder in his carefully prepared speech of January 18, is that the public credit of the United States depends on keeping the price of Government securities at the 2½-percent level, and that this is of such enormous importance that the Federal Reserve System must manufacture the money to keep on buying the bonds in order to maintain them at that price.

I may say, however, that though the Secretary has stated his views, he has merely stated them dogmatically, without proof and without any serious attempt to reply to the great array of expert opinion which supports the Federal Reserve Board. There is not available at the Treasury as this is written any document which shows how the Treasury thinks the inflation of money, which its policy demands, is to be dealt with.

Perhaps Secretary Snyder can prove his case. But he will have to prove it, not merely to declare it. He will have to prove that policy of manufacturing money to keep the price of Government bonds at a 2½-percent rate does not, as Mr. Eccles says it does, set up "an engine of inflation" which raises all other prices and, therefore, because it devalues the dollar, makes even the apparent stability of Government securities a fiction.

In arguing the Treasury case Mr. Snyder will have to face up to the fact that the dispute is no longer theoretical. The record of the last 6 months of 1950 proves with a conclusiveness that is rare in matters of this sort how inflationary is the Treasury's policy. The record shows that the inflation we have suffered since the Korean war is due to this policy, that as a memorandum from the economists of Chicago University puts it, "the price rise of the last 6 months could almost certainly have been largely or wholly avoided . . . prices would probably be a little above their level in May if the Federal Reserve System had kept its holdings of Government securities unchanged, instead of adding to them by \$3,500,000,000." That is a serious and a definite charge made by responsible experts who speak with great authority, and their argument has the support of an overwhelming majority of bankers and theoretical economists.

The inflation since the Korean war began last June has been marked by a rise in personal incomes of about 10 percent, by a rise in wholesale prices of about 11 percent, by a rise in the cost of living of nearly 6 percent.

What caused this inflation? Was it the Government's expenditures for war and rearmament? It was not. During the last 6 months of 1950 the Government actually took in more money than it spent. It had in fact a surplus of nearly two billions in the cash budget. This surplus was due to the fact that the taxes Congress so wisely imposed had begun to yield revenues from the enormous prosperity of the boom before there was time to spend very much of the big appropriations for armaments.

Thus the inflation since Korea has not been caused by the military budget. The

budget in fact has been deflationary. What is more, during this same period the Federal Reserve System has lost \$1,500,000,000 in gold that went abroad. That also was a deflationary influence.

Nevertheless, despite the deflationary budget and despite the deflationary loss of gold abroad, we have had a lively and extremely disconcerting inflation. What caused it? It was caused by the compulsory manufacture of money in the Federal Reserve System in order to buy those Government securities which the Treasury insisted must be bought at a fixed price. That is what caused the inflation. From May 31 to the end of 1950 the demand deposits of the country—the money in which business is largely transacted—rose by over 8 percent. This increase in the volume of money corresponds very closely indeed to the increase in prices. "It is no accident," says the Chicago memorandum, "that these figures are so nearly of the same magnitude. This is about as clear a case of purely monetary inflation as one can find."

Mr. Snyder should tell the country how he proposes to finance effectively the military program if, in competition with it, he continues to insist on having inflationary manufactured money pumped into the civilian economy through private channels, through local governments, and through the agencies of the Federal Government, of which, according to Mr. Russell Leffingwell, there are now about 100 engaged in lending and giving and spending money.

And while Mr. Snyder is explaining all that it would be a good idea if the Director of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, considered the problem, and perhaps took a hand in the solution. He is vitally interested in the solution. For it is hard to see how he can fall to run into tremendous trouble if underneath the artificial price and wage structure he is trying to establish there is the destructive force of a repressed but swelling monetary inflation.

[From the Washington Post of February 12, 1951]

TODAY AND TOMORROW  
(By Walter Lippmann)  
OFF THE CUFF

Much is at stake in the argument between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System, and the complicated problem can only be confused and bedeviled if President Truman lets it become distorted into a political quarrel between his friends and his opponents. The controversy is not like an election or like a football game which can be settled and disposed of when one side has won and the other has lost. For the management of our huge Federal debt by the Treasury and the regulation of the supply of money and credit by the Federal Reserve will have to be carried on continuously and cooperatively.

The two agencies of Government are going to have to agree on a common policy. Neither can afford to win in the sense that it knocks out the other and then drags it along triumphantly behind it.

The crux of the present controversy is whether they are to work together with some flexibility, or whether the Treasury is to dominate the Federal Reserve System in order to maintain a rigid pattern of interest rates. My own inquiries have convinced me that if the issue of flexibility were left to those who best understand it in the two agencies, it would not be a fighting issue at all, and that the problem could be settled by practical operations in the money market, and without resounding declarations.

The rigid dogmatism which now appears to be the Treasury policy certainly does an injustice to its good sense and competence. And the impression which has got abroad is,

of course, absurd that the Federal Reserve System is not concerned about the Federal debt and is advocating a policy of let her rip. "We are suffering," says a very highly qualified observer who wrote to me the other day, "the consequences of having had three exceptionally stubborn Secretaries of the Treasury in succession during the past 10 years." Now that it is essential to put an end to the inflation of Federal Reserve credit, we have to deal not only with the problem itself, which is a delicate one, but with politicians who have become so addicted to inflation that they tremble at the idea of being deprived of it.

Before long Mr. Truman will find that the question is not so simple as he thought it was when he summoned the Federal Reserve Board and the presidents of five Federal Reserve banks to the White House. He will find that even if he were able to force the Federal Reserve to manufacture as much inflationary money as the Treasury's rigid interest rate required the controversy would break out again elsewhere.

It would break out because to control prices and wages and to obtain production uninterrupted by strikes will prove to be impossible if the pressure of inflationary credit is not reduced. It is a reasonable certainty that if the Federal Reserve Board were to knuckle under today, within a short time Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston would have to revise the argument.

When the order for a general price freeze was issued on January 26 Mr. DiSalle issued a statement which had been approved by Mr. Eric Johnston, the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency. It is the statement of men who find themselves forced to do something which they don't at all like to do. The statement says that though the general price control has become necessary as an emergency measure, Mr. Johnston and the men responsible with him have no illusions: "The effect of price control is not to eliminate inflation but to suppress it \* \* \* major reliance must be placed upon vigorous taxation and a strong credit policy. To the extent that we succeed in reducing the inflationary pressure by these means we make the task of price control that much easier."

As a matter of fact, this is almost certainly an understatement. Price control will not work at all if the inflationary pressure continues to accumulate. It will produce an orgy of corruption and black markets, of injustice and discontent. In order to make price control work well, that is to say with reasonable honesty and fairness, it would be necessary not only to stop adding to the inflation but to find ways of accomplishing a measure of disinflation.

We shall have to come to that. At least for the emergency period of the mobilization we shall have to resort to emergency methods to disinflate, measures beyond any contemplated by the Federal Reserve Board or really within the proper use of its powers. In one way or another the disinflation will have to be brought about by a considerable reduction in Federal, State, and local public expenditure of civilian uses, by greater private and corporate savings, and almost certainly also by scrutinizing more critically than it is now the fashion to do the content of some of the military programs. We should not naively assume that the survival of western civilization depends upon treating every order from the quartermaster, and every order for four-door sedans, as sacrosanct.

Perhaps the most important thing to be noted about the President's intervention in this business is that he thought he could settle it personally in a few minutes' talk. That is one of Mr. Truman's weaknesses. In this case he didn't settle the controversy but he aggravated it. Thus, though he was lining up the Federal Reserve System behind

the Treasury, he did not even take the precaution of having the Treasury represented at the meeting. This prevented him from hearing the issue argued by men competent to discuss it. It left him supposing that he himself could argue the Treasury's case. In fact he didn't argue it and he couldn't argue it. The Federal Reserve men listened to him and did not argue with him because they were too polite to argue with the President of the United States on a subject about which the President obviously was not understanding the question.

It would be ever so much better if Mr. Truman would recognize the difficulties and the complexities of a problem like this, and would realize that no one would think it a reflection on the President of the United States if he himself does not know the answers off the cuff. Then he would do what most Presidents before him would have done. He would bring together those most responsible and best informed—in this case the representatives of the Treasury, of the Federal Reserve System, and the civilian mobilizers, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Johnston, and Mr. DiSalle—and he would press them to work out agreements. He would reserve his own influence for use against anyone who in the discussion showed himself to be at once badly informed and highly opinionated.

[From Newsweek magazine of February 5, 1951]

#### FIGHTING FIRE WITH GASOLINE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

How preposterous can the situation get? The administration starts the inflationary fire, fights it by pouring on more gasoline, and then talks as if it were completely mysterious in origin. Or it hints that the fire was started by business, by the speculators, the hoarders, the profiteers, or by the buying public. And it acts on this assumption when it insists on the completely false remedy of price control, which puts the economy in a straitjacket of prohibitions, allocations, rationing, licenses, and subsidies, unbalances and disrupts production, creating artificial shortages. All this is called total mobilization.

Take the Secretary of the Treasury, John W. Snyder. He is personally a mild-mannered, quiet, unassuming, amiable, loyal, and honorable man who thinks of himself as a conservative. He would be shocked beyond measure to learn that he is more responsible than any other single man for the existing inflation in this country and the almost universal fear of further inflation. And he has earned this No. 1 position not only by his past record but by his extraordinary announcement on January 18 that the long-term rate for marketable Federal securities must be held at 2½ percent. He might just as well have announced outright that he is determined to have more inflation.

Mr. Snyder's attitude stems, of course, not from any desire for inflation, but from a tragic lack of understanding of economic cause and effect. Inflation, always and everywhere, has one basic cause—an increase in the supply of money and bank credit. At the end of 1939, demand deposits and currency outside of banks totaled \$36,000,000,000. At the end of May of 1950 this total had reached \$109,000,000,000. At the end of December of 1950 it had reached \$117,000,000,000. This is not merely the cause of inflation; this is the inflation. The increase in commodity prices is merely a consequence.

And the principal cause in turn of this increase in money and bank credit has been the artificially low interest rates maintained by the Treasury. This cheap money policy has not merely swollen the volume of private borrowing; it could be maintained—in

connection with the policy of pegging Government bonds above par—only by encouraging the member banks to load up with Government bonds and by forcing the Federal Reserve banks to buy as many of those bonds as is necessary to maintain the predetermined rate. They bought these bonds by creating deposits or printing money.

All this is now an old story among monetary economists and bankers. But Mr. Snyder has never understood it. He can see the problem only from the immediate short-run interest of the Treasury—to pay as low an interest rate as possible. "Any increase in the 2½-percent rate," he says "would seriously upset the existing security markets."

Any increase in prevailing interest rates would of course mean a lower price for present outstanding bonds. But Mr. Snyder refuses to see that the only alternative to accepting this comparatively mild consequence is an uncontrollable inflation. In the face of overwhelming economic opinion and evidence to the contrary, Mr. Snyder persists in declaring that a cheap money policy and inflation have nothing to do with each other.

If Mr. Snyder stood alone in this appalling blindness the situation would not be so grave. But he is supported in administration circles by a conspiracy of silence. Within the Federal Reserve System there is some real understanding of the situation; but—with a few honorable exceptions like Allan Sproul, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York—there is precious little courage. Mr. Snyder's statement clearly implies that Chairman McCabe of the Federal Reserve Board acquiesces in the policy of maintaining the inflationary 2½ percent interest rate. In lieu of any genuinely effective over-all action, the Board on January 16 announced the token gesture of increasing required stock margins from 50 to 75 percent. Meanwhile, an ominously growing bureau prepares to cure inflation with the colossal hoax of price control.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD from the letter by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], in order to stress the particular point involved, as well as some other points. The letter was addressed by the junior Senator from Ohio to Governor Vardaman. I read:

The concluding paragraph of your statement is one of the most amazing ever uttered by a public official in recent years. You say, "The question of statutory prerogatives \* \* \* should be subordinated to the all-important necessity of supporting the Government and the Presidency in this national emergency." The meaning of this euphemism is that the laws passed by Congress should be disregarded whenever the President feels that the national emergency so requires. I am unalterably opposed to that sort of totalitarian philosophy either in war or in peace.

You also say in the final paragraph of your statement that you "unhesitatingly waive any theoretical statutory authority and prerogatives in order to support the Government and the Presidency at this time." First, I would like to point out that the laws of the United States are not theoretical for 150,000,000 American people. They must obey them or go to jail. By what right do you presume to waive statutory authority in violation of your oath of office?

Finally, I invite your attention to the fact that the Federal Reserve System is accountable to the Congress and not to the Presidency as you suggest. Congress has not charged the Board with the duty of supporting the price of Government securities, but rather the duty of supporting the value of the dollar.

Until such time as the duties of the Board may be changed by act of Congress, I trust that you will see the impropriety of your suggested waiver of statutory authority and prerogatives.

REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT'S CHALLENGE  
TO CUT THE BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last Thursday the President of the United States held a press conference during the course of which a reporter noted that some Members of the Congress had expressed their determination to squeeze the water out of the budget. Newspaper reports quote Mr. Truman's reply to the effect that, "they said they were going to do that last year, and ended by adding a billion or so, and then asked the President to do the cutting." The President is further reported as saying he is not going to do it for them this year, that it is a good budget and a tight budget, and he dares the Congress to do anything about it.

Mr. President, I am not sure that it is my sole responsibility, as a minority Member of the Senate, to attempt to set the RECORD straight so far as Congress is concerned. The President's statement certainly is a challenge to the majority of this body, as well as to the minority, because in the handling of the budget last year we did function properly. I wish to state that the kindest thing the Senator from New Hampshire can say about the President's remarks—and the Senator from New Hampshire has a kindly and warm feeling for the President, personally—is that either Mr. Truman was misinformed, or he was attempting to be facetious. He has repeatedly advised the press and other groups that he is an expert on the budget—that he has been preparing budgets for years and knows all about them.

We can only hope, Mr. President, that President Truman knows more about the budget which he submitted on January 15 of this year than he knew about the budget he submitted last year.

Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear where I stand on this matter. I wish to take exception to the President's statement that the Congress added a billion or so and then asked the President to do the cutting. I have in my hand a copy of the appropriations estimates for 1950-51, with all the actual budget estimates which were requested by the President and by the Bureau of the Budget for consideration by the Congress.

I have the record here, in its official form. If it is available to me, certainly it is available to the President and to every other Senator, so what I am saying I am taking from the official record. Senators can examine it. There can be no question about it.

Let us discuss, first, the general appropriations bill for 1951. The estimates considered by the House were \$30,300,000,000. The House cut this figure to \$29,100,000,000. By the time the budget estimates reached the Senate, the figure had grown to \$35,500,000,000. As finally enacted, the appropriations bill had been reduced to \$33,900,000,000, a reduction of more than \$2,000,000,000.

I wish next to call attention, Mr. President, to some facts concerning the second supplemental appropriations bill. The estimates considered by the House totaled \$18,000,000,000. The House reduced this figure to \$17,800,000,000. By the time the estimates had reached the Senate the figure had grown, as a result of increased estimates from the President, to \$19,900,000,000, and the supplemental bill as finally passed by the Congress remained at that figure—\$19,900,000,000.

It can readily be seen from these facts that the statement which President Truman made the other day to the effect that Congress had added a billion or so simply does not make sense.

Taken together there are some interesting figures regarding the total appropriations for the fiscal year 1951. The estimates considered by the House were \$66,700,000,000. The House reduced this figure to \$65,000,000,000. By the time the estimates had reached the Senate, the President and the Bureau of the Budget had submitted additional estimates to bring the figure up to \$74,200,000,000. When passed by the Congress this figure had been reduced to \$72,300,000,000.

The Senate will recall that the so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment, which had the support of the overwhelming majority of this body, was adopted by a vote of 55 to 31. The over-all effect of that amendment was to reduce the appropriations bill by nearly a billion dollars and as amended by the Senate it provided for an additional cut of \$550,000, a very substantial amount. The Congress was perfectly clear at this point. It stated where the cuts were to be made and by whom they were to be made. However, when the appropriations bill was sent to conference, the administration leaders brought sufficient pressure to bear to change the intent of the Bridges-Byrd amendment and directed that the President and the Bureau of the Budget make these reductions, in the sum of \$550,000,000, wherever they see fit.

It is very interesting in view of these facts, Mr. President, that President Truman claims the Congress added a billion dollars or more, and he did the cutting. The fact of the matter is that he did the adding on and the Congress did the cutting. The facts are here. They speak for themselves. It was the Congress and not the President which reduced the final estimates submitted by the President and the Bureau of the Budget from \$74,000,000,000 to \$72,000,000,000.

The President, Members of Congress, and everyone else should examine the official record in this regard, which speaks for itself.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that the President sent to Congress supplementary estimates and budgets, so that he increased the budget, rather than the Congress increasing the budget over and beyond his estimate?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So, the Congress did not appropriate unbudgeted items over and above the amount of the budget estimates both as contained in the original and in supplemental budgets.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Michigan is absolutely correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that it is up to the whole Congress, representing the people as it does, to accept the challenge issued by the President, by looking into his budget and examining it and actually cutting down some of the unnecessary expenditures provided in it? Does not the Senator agree that it becomes the duty not only of the minority in the Senate, for whom I can speak in the Senate, but of the majority in the Senate, in fact of the whole Senate, to scrutinize every item and accept the challenge issued by the President in relation to the cutting of the budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that when I speak here today I am speaking not only as a minority Member of this body, but I feel I am speaking for this body. Someone should speak for the great numbers on the majority side who contributed to the writing of the record to which I have referred. It is a good record. It is not so good a record as I wish had been made, but it is a good record that was written. The duty certainly falls on the shoulders of someone to stand on the floor of the Senate and correct the President's statement issued to the country in which he said that the Congress had added a billion dollars to the appropriations, whereas the Congress had actually cut \$2,000,000,000 from the budget, plus the amount represented by the Bridges-Byrd amendment which, as proposed, would have cut nearly \$1,000,000,000 more, but which, when it finally went to conference, resulted in cutting \$550,000,000 more.

So the Congress, instead of adding a billion dollars, as the President said, cut directly \$2,000,000,000, plus the \$550,000,000 which was cut in conference. The Congress saved \$2,500,000,000, which, in the opinion of some individuals may not amount to much, but certainly it means a considerable amount to the heavily taxed people of the country.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not fair to say that the President, by his statement, has endeavored to lead the public to believe that the Congress is responsible for the appropriations and the size of the budget and, over and above the President's request, increased the budget by approximately \$1,000,000,000? The Senator from New Hampshire has now pointed out that that is not a fact. He has pointed out that the President actually demanded a certain amount of funds, and that the Congress gave him even less than he demanded, instead of more than he demanded.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; the Congress appropriated \$2,000,000,000 less than the

President demanded, and, in addition, as a result of the action taken in the final conference Congress wrote in a cut of \$550,000,000, in lieu of the amount of cut proposed by the Bridges-Byrd amendment, which resulted in a total reduction of more than \$2,500,000,000 which the Congress either made directly or provided for by law.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also a fact that, in spite of the reduction provided in the Bridges-Byrd amendment, an amendment which the Senator from Michigan joined in supporting, in spite of the specific provision of law passed by the Congress as a result of that amendment, as it was changed in the final conference, there have come back into the present budget items which were cut out by the provision of the law passed last year?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The last supplemental bill contained a very large number of such items. There is practically a continual story in that connection, as the Senator well knows.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to add that I shall join other Members of the Senate, in accepting the challenge of the President to cut the present budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, a great many taxpayers may raise the question as to why these estimates considered by the Senate are so much higher than those considered and passed by the House. That question has a very simple answer. Anyone who has worked on the Appropriations Committee as I have over a period of a decade and a half knows that there is an almost constant influx of additional requests for appropriations from the time the budget is submitted until it is finally passed. A classic example of this is to be found in last year's budget. The general appropriations estimates submitted to the House did not include any requests for a foreign-aid bill. Between the time the House was given the estimates and the time the Senate considered them, the President had submitted a foreign-aid bill calling for \$4,300,000,000.

Mr. President, using the same kind of logic the President used in his press conference on Thursday of last week he should, in order to have been consistent, have accused the Congress of adding the \$4,800,000,000 to the budget for foreign aid.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that these budget estimates are recommendations of the President and the Bureau of the Budget, which is under his direction, and a creature of the Executive.

The same thing is happening again this year. On January 15, the President submitted his budget to the Congress. Only last week the President sent to the Congress a request for a small item, for \$3,125,000 to be added to one item alone. It should be clearly understood that it is the President and not the

Congress who is asking for the increase in this item.

Mr. President, as the ranking Republican member on the Senate Appropriations Committee, I ask that the American people be given the facts. If the President insists upon constantly increasing his request after the original budget estimates are made, let him tell the American people that he is the one who is adding to their tax load and not the Congress.

Many of us want to accept the President's challenge to cut the budget this year. Most of the Republican Members of this body, with whom I have talked, feel as I do, and I know that some members of the President's own party, will join in an effort to reduce the cost of government.

It would be extremely helpful if the Congress could count on the President's cooperation in this effort. Of course, if we cannot have that cooperation then we will have to do it without his cooperation.

I want to serve notice of our intention to scrutinize very closely every request in this budget. We must reduce to a minimum every nondefense expenditure. We must likewise examine carefully every request for money for the Defense Establishment, to see that a dollar's worth of defense is received for every dollar spent. I think that is a very logical thing for us to do.

Mr. President, I believe that in these days of sacrifices by the American people, we will have the character, the determination, and the courage to accept the President's challenge. The people elected us to watch out for their interests, and it is up to us to meet our responsibilities.

The Senator from New Hampshire, for one, is convinced that if we are to draft American boys, if American boys are to die on the foreign battlefields, if we are to tax American families more than they have ever been taxed before, if we are to call for sacrifices and for the acceptance of a lower standard of living, then we have the right and the duty to demand that the administration likewise make some sacrifices.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator tell the Senate what proportion of the budget is not related to military expenses? By "military expenses" I mean, of course, expenses for preparation for the national defense now and the cost of the veterans' care and the interest on the national debt. What percentage of the total budget is involved in military expenditures?

Mr. BRIDGES. Something over two-thirds.

Mr. McMAHON. As a matter of fact, it is approximately 74 percent, is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Let us bear in mind that the Senator from Connecticut may not be aware of the fact that when the President submitted his budget estimates the other day, and when they came to the Congress in January, for the first time the President failed to accompany them with justifications, except for a small part of the total amount

he requested. So, thus far, the Congress—as the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], could tell the Senator as well as I could—is not able to state the details; we have only the broad figures.

However, as the Senator is aware, roughly speaking, we are talking about an expenditures budget, on the one hand, and an appropriations budget, on the other. The expenditures budget will approximate the size I have stated, and percentage-wise may be less than the appropriations budget to which the Senator from Connecticut is referring. The difference is a small percentage figure, which I would not attempt to give from memory. However, the figure stated by the Senator from Connecticut is in the general field of being correct.

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad to know that, because when we approach the budget question, I think all of us realize that the opportunity to achieve economy in Government is somewhat limited to us by the nature of the expenditures we have had to make and those we shall have to make for the national defense and security. I think that point cannot be emphasized too strongly.

I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that during the last session I voted consistently for what I thought were reasonable cuts in the appropriations for the executive departments. I refused to vote to apply for a conservator and to ask the President to do something the Senate refused to do. I voted against that, and I shall continue to vote against it, because if I cannot discharge my own responsibility, I am not going to ask the President to discharge it for me. So I intend to pursue the policy which I followed during the last session.

On the other hand, let us not deceive the American people about the scope within which we can operate in connection with the budget. When some talk about cutting \$6,000,000,000 from the civilian expenditures budget, it simply cannot be done, and it is merely a piece of fakery to say that it can be done.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for yielding to me.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to make a statement?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I have said that this budget could be cut by from \$5,000,000,000 to \$6,000,000,000. I think it is an absurdity to assert that the budget cannot be cut by 10 percent straight through, without doing any serious harm or injury to the national defense program.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I would not have the Senator from Georgia misunderstand me at all. As I understand, the Senator contemplates a cut right straight through the budget on the military expenditures.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not say that. I said that the budget could be cut by 10 percent, and even then we would not get

the waste out of the military side of the budget.

However, I rose to point out that I am not guilty of any fakery, nor am I guilty of any attempt to deceive the American people, when I say that the budget can be cut by between \$5,000,000,000 and \$6,000,000,000, without injury to the national defense.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me, so that I may answer the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I did not mean to imply that the Senator from Georgia was guilty of fakery. What I said was that we could not take \$6,000,000,000 from the civilian expenditures, as opposed to the military expenditures, of our Government; and an attempt to say that that could be done in my opinion is fakery.

Now the Senator from Georgia says that the \$6,000,000,000 cut can be achieved over the entire range of the budget. That is a subject upon which I would not comment at this time because I have not made a study of the military expenditures and I am not prepared to say that that cannot be done. My impression is that before the end of this year we shall end up by appropriating more money for military defense than is requested in the budget.

I would not want the Senator from Georgia to think I applied the statement of "fakery" to him, because he is talking about an over-all cut, a cut out of the entire budget, which he thinks is possible, whereas I am talking about a cut of \$6,000,000,000, which I have seen advertised, although not by the Senator from Georgia, as being possible to be taken from the civilian side of the budget, as opposed to the military side.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Connecticut, because he has talked about a division of the budget as between the expenditures for military purposes and those for civilian purposes, that, of course, the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and all other Members of Congress wish to appropriate sufficient money so that the security of the United States may be assured. However, when anyone says or attempts to say that the military budget is un-touchable, that simply is not so.

Let me give an example, in order to illustrate why I make that statement: When we were sent the last supplemental appropriation bill, requesting additional appropriations for military purposes, naturally the Appropriations Committee wished to move, and move rapidly, in handling that bill. In that connection we did some things which I did not approve of doing. We actually included in that bill some items which were not authorized by law, for the over-all construction program had not then been authorized. Nevertheless, in the interest of the national defense and the national security, the committee deemed it wise to do those things, and the Senate concurred in that action. I am not quarreling as to that.

On the other hand, in connection with the brief examination we made of the military items, one item alone

which stood out was for \$100,000,000 for relief in Korea. For whom was that relief to be provided? It was in substantial part for the relief of the North Koreans, whom we were fighting, and who were killing American boys day by day; and included in that amount were items for such things as rebuilding municipal electric-light systems or rebuilding various building projects in North Korea. We even found included in that total an item for the purchase of diapers for North Korean Communist children. Those were actual items in that budget request.

So, Mr. President, when we find such items as that included in a military budget, I say it is not an untouchable budget; and therefore we can well survey the entire situation. I have cited that case only as an example. I believe, therefore, that the budget this year should have the personal attention of every Senator.

Recently I noted an item in the press showing that executive departments which, by the greatest stretch of the imagination, have nothing to do with national defense, were asking for increased personnel, in commission after commission, department after department. That certainly is not moving in the right direction, but in the wrong direction. I note also that many agencies of Government are coming forward saying, "We must do certain things because of the war effort," when as a matter of fact their proposals were not for the war effort at all. Those are matters which must be scrutinized.

No one is perfect; I realize that; but the Senate this year is faced with the likelihood that taxes will go to their highest level, at a time when American boys are being killed, and when other American boys are being drafted. With the situation throughout the world what it is, and when we are trying to help our friends in other countries build up and provide for collective security, I think it is up to us to perform a real job in keeping down appropriations.

I realize what the President has said about this being a tight budget. I have not studied it as fully as I should like to do, though I feel confident that I have given it as much study as anyone else in the Congress, and perhaps as much as anyone in the country, aside from the Bureau of the Budget. I contend that the budget is demonstrably as full of water as a field of melting snow. I think we can squeeze a great deal out of the budget. But, Mr. President, there must be a will to do it. The facts must be known to the American people, and there must be a will on the part of this body to do it. We cannot merely stand by and scoff at every attempt and at every serious-minded effort to cut the budget.

To cut some of the nondefense items of the budget is not going to harm anyone. Certainly anyone who gives more than a casual glance at the defense items knows we can cut some of the fat from the unnecessary things, such as Korean relief, and from certain of the military items which have been submitted. I hope that when the record of this Congress is written, it will demonstrate that we have done our work well—that sev-

eral billions should be cut from the budget—and at least that we equal or better our last year's record, when we cut something over \$2,000,000,000 from the budget by direct action on the part of the Congress, and at the same time included a directive to the extent of an additional reduction of \$550,000,000.

#### GOVERNOR DRISCOLL AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the Newark News of yesterday, Sunday, February 11, 1951, there appeared an article written by William R. Clark, one of the leading news writers in the State of New Jersey. The article is captioned Political Foreground and in it Mr. Clark emphasizes the fact that Governor Driscoll, fresh from the State budget triumph we have just had in New Jersey, now is ready, along with the Governors of the other States, to take on another great fight, namely, to try to find a solution of the excessive Federal budget. This article is most apropos, in view of the remarks made earlier today by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection?

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

#### POLITICAL FOREGROUND—FRESH FROM STATE BUDGET TRIUMPH, DRISCOLL WOULD TRY HAND AT FEDERAL FIGURES

(By William R. Clark)

Having won his bout with a middleweight budget, Governor Driscoll is tempted to accept a challenge for a go with a real heavyweight. He has been reading about the Federal budget, which weighed in at \$71,000,000,000, and of President Truman's open invitation to cut it down to size, if possible.

While Mr. Truman's defi was addressed specifically to the Congress, Mr. Driscoll thinks maybe this shouldn't be a private fight. He is confident that if the Congress couldn't bring the President's budget down his brother Governors could. For one thing, he thinks they've had more training and, of necessity, stiffer budget work-outs than either Congress or the administration. Even though they operate on a limited scale relatively, Governors have faced no such fiscal set-ups as Washington. Their revenues come harder and all have been victims of inflation and Federal tax encroachments.

From a wealth of experience, Mr. Driscoll is ready to concede that a Governor's recommendations don't mean any more in Washington, say, than a price freeze that isn't. He knows about the impact of rearmament on Federal costs, and on State costs, too, for that matter; and that everything, especially taxes, is on a bigger scale nationally. But he also knows that budgets and champions grow fat on soft living, and he's convinced that financially the country could do much worse than give a Governors' committee a crack at trimming Federal overhead.

#### INFLATIONARY DRIFT

Since most Governors have completed or are in process of completing State budgets, they are acutely aware at this time of the fiscal soft spots of the Federal Government and what the inflationary drift has done to State resources. Mr. Driscoll's prize exhibit

in this direction is the State turnpike. By the time this project completes its 118-mile journey next November from the George Washington Bridge to Deepwater it will have picked up en route \$30,000,000 in increased costs. Original estimates, it seems, did not take into account the spectacular flight of materials and allied construction costs.

In the 1949 election, the voters ratified a bond issue of \$25,000,000 for a State hospital construction program. At the then market, the Governor and department of institutions and agencies expected the \$25,000,000 to provide buildings and facilities sufficient to care adequately for the State's 25,000 patients and to meet reasonable increases in institutional population. Today's prices will sheer off one whole wing of the new South Jersey Hospital.

Within a few months, and due to unchecked and nonscheduled price flights, Mr. Driscoll finds \$500,000 added to the fuel and grocery bills of these same 21 mental, correctional and specialized institutions. The Governor is getting figures from the State government council on what fuel and food increases, for one thing, have done to budgets in other States.

Mr. Driscoll hopes Eric Johnston, the ESA optimist, knows what he is talking about when he estimates that, under the thawing price freeze, costs will level off by midsummer. That, he thinks, will be fine, provided State budgets don't melt first.

#### UNWILLING TO WAIT

But the Governor notes that pressure is already being exerted at vulnerable spots for a cost-of-living increase for State employees. For some strange reason, they seem unwilling to wait, with Mr. Johnston's easy equableness, for the promised price altitude to be reached.

The State's payroll already runs to \$49,550,000 a year. That's an increase of \$2,130,000 over 1950, and provides only for normal salary increments due employees under civil service ratings. This upgrading, for which Mr. Driscoll already has set aside sufficient funds, is not to be confused with cost-of-living raises. When you get into that department you're in the heavy money zone—somewhere between \$10,000,000 and \$16,000,000, depending upon which of several estimates are consulted.

Not all of Mr. Driscoll's inflationary exhibits are as aggravated as the turnpike and institutions items, or as the salary problem could be. They are the largest, and the ones over which he has no control.

In other controllable categories, the Governor's recommendations are in the bare bones class. He believes that, in spite of Mr. Truman's confidence, some of the same hard economics could be introduced into the Federal budget. Anyhow, Mr. Driscoll thinks it would be fun to try.

#### THE FOOD CRISIS IN INDIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 56)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For the President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, pp. 1243-1244.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and also on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I desire to express our gratification that the President has supported our proposal for emergency aid to India and has sent a message to Congress urging prompt consideration of a bill to im-

plement it. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on next Thursday we plan to introduce a bill providing for emergency aid to alleviate the famine situation in India and we hope that there will be many Senators on both sides of the aisle who will join us on this bill. A similar bill will be introduced in the House at the same time by a bipartisan group of Representatives.

We have attempted to get the best information obtainable on the exact situation in India, to ascertain what foods are available, and how much India must have in order to avert the very critical famine. We hope to have our measure ready to circulate among interested Senators tomorrow and to introduce in the Senate next Thursday.

I may say that the proposal for aid to India originated in the Congress as a bipartisan movement. We have been in touch with the State Department, which has given us valuable assistance in providing us with information on the situation in India, but we feel it is best for this proposal to come from the Congress as an indication of the wishes of the people of the United States who, from the information we are getting by way of letters, telegrams, and so forth, are eager that something be done to provide relief. We have therefore tried to apply ourselves to all the problems involved, and to obtain the assistance of the representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, ECA, and other interested departments and agencies, to ascertain exactly what can be done. A very careful study has been made, and of course, in the hearings, testimony will be forthcoming to show what has been discovered.

For the information of the Senate, I might add that on January 30, a bipartisan group in both the Senate and the House addressed a communication to the President on this subject. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it, but I ask unanimous consent that, at this point in my remarks, the communication to the President, together with the names of the signers from both the Senate and the House, be inserted in the RECORD.

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

#### THE CAPITOL,

Washington, D. C., January 30, 1951.

#### THE PRESIDENT,

White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Over 3 years ago the people of India entered a new era as a free and independent member of the family of nations. We, as Members of Congress, have been aware of the common devotion of the American people and the people of India to the ideals of human liberty.

This year India is faced with an emergency food shortage and has asked the United States for help. We have been discussing this situation among ourselves and with interested citizen groups, and have come to the conclusion that a favorable response by the United States to this Indian request would be in harmony with the interests and traditional policy of the United States and would furnish a concrete demonstration of the friendship and good will existing between our people and theirs.

A series of misfortunes including earthquakes, floods, droughts, and locusts has cut India's grain production this year 6,000,000

tons below her minimum requirements. It is our understanding that, in an effort to make up this shortage, the Indian Government has arranged to purchase some 4,000,000 tons from Canada, Australia, Argentina, and the United States. These emergency purchases have drastically reduced India's foreign exchange reserves, so that she is reported to be unable to purchase the remaining 2,000,000 tons needed to prevent widespread famine. For this remaining deficit India has appealed to the United States for emergency aid, and we understand the United States is in a position to meet that request.

To that end we are considering the introduction of legislation under which Congress would authorize the necessary emergency assistance. Unless we act promptly, many hundreds of thousands of people in India face starvation.

It is our hope that we may have an early opportunity to discuss this question with you in detail. In our view, the need to prevent starvation is entirely separate from all political considerations. It is our further view that a response to that need should not imply any commitment on the part of the United States beyond the present emergency food situation. We do not want our desire to help the suffering people of India within the reasonable limits of our capacities to be regarded as in any sense lessening our opposition to the apparent views of the Government of India with respect to the Chinese Communist aggression in Korea. On the other hand, our firm opposition to this apparent position of the Government of India on that issue does not lessen in the least our desire to help relieve the acute food shortage in India.

As a bipartisan group, therefore, we hope we may have your support for our proposal and that we may coordinate our efforts with those of the executive branch. We look forward to hearing from you at your early convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, RALPH E. FLANDERS, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, IRVING M. IVES, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, WAYNE L. MORSE, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, JAMES E. MURRAY, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, CHARLES W. TOBEY, United States Senators; FRANCES P. BOLTON, THURMOND CHATHAM, JAMES G. FULTON, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, JACOB K. JAVITS, WALTER H. JUDD, EDNA F. KELLY, MIKE MANSFIELD, THOMAS E. MORGAN, ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Members of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Subsequent to the sending of that letter, the President of the United States invited representatives of the signers to confer with him. We had a very extended conference with the President and certain of his advisers as to the practicability of our proposal. The President subsequently took the matter up, as we know from the press, with former President Hoover, who came to Washington specifically for the purpose of discussing the question with the President. Mr. Hoover, on leaving, expressed his approval of an emergency assistance program and called attention to certain problems concerning it which will be covered by our hearings. The President subsequently met with ranking leaders of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to discuss the proposal.

It is my purpose, as I said in my opening remarks, on behalf of myself and of the Senators whom I have named, and on behalf also of any other Senators who

may wish to joint with us in this effort to introduce an appropriate bill on Thursday next. We are inviting all who desire to cooperate to join with us in sponsoring that bill, which will be promptly referred to the respective committees of the House and Senate for hearings. I believe that the program can be developed in a prompt and orderly manner, in accordance with this procedure.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Mr. Hoover Intervenes," published in the New York Times of February 9, and an editorial entitled "Wheat for India," published in the New York Herald Tribune of the same date. These editorials indicate the popular support that has been developed on this important subject.

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

[From the New York Times of February 9, 1951]

**MR. HOOVER INTERVENES**

Former President Herbert Hoover's timely intervention seems to have quieted some Members of Congress who held that starving people whose governments differ with our Government should be permitted to go on starving. As a result some 120,000,000 persons in India who have been living on a grain allowance of 9 ounces a day, perhaps 40 percent of what they need, can hope to benefit by 2,000,000 tons of American wheat. We don't believe anybody on Capitol Hill wanted those people to starve or to die of the diseases malnutrition brings. But some did seem to hold that it was up to Mr. Nehru to prevent this catastrophe by chiming in on the United States policy toward Communist China. There is no connection between the two facts: Mr. Nehru is, we believe, wrong; his people need the grain we can easily send and should have it.

Mr. Hoover is, as everybody knows, a humanitarian with a practical bent. He has had long and honorable experience in relief work; he is well aware that grain moves by rail and by water and that no amount of good will can offset a shortage of planning. He did not mention bushels or dollars after seeing the President on Wednesday. He did not, however, seem to see insurmountable difficulties in finding 1,800,000 to 2,000,000 bushels of wheat India must have or the ships to carry something like 220 shiploads that the amount asked will make.

India asked for this food on December 16, offering to assume a long-term debt to pay for it. At best 2 months from that date will have gone by before the shipment is authorized, and this is too bad. Perhaps it will help a little if we give this grain free—and give it in the spirit of a remark made by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota: "This is people to people, not government to government."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1951]

**WHEAT FOR INDIA**

President Truman has done well in securing Mr. Hoover's help in planning aid for the starving peoples of India; Mr. Hoover, in turn, has responded with the alacrity and magnanimity that was to be expected of him. "This is not in the category of politics but in the category of Christianity," he said; and the view will be echoed, we believe, by the overwhelming majority of Americans. It is an impressive thing that this wise and

experienced public servant, having contributed to his country and to the world more than is asked of many men in a generation, should take up this fresh assignment with an unrelaxing sense of duty and with something close to youthful enthusiasm. A democracy is rich in proportion as it contains proven men ready to respond to any call; and Mr. Hoover, throughout his long career, has been one of those who have never failed where service was asked of them.

The case for sending grain to India is clear. A series of natural catastrophes has struck at the food supplies of the new-born nation. Floods, droughts, earthquakes, and visitations of locusts have conspired to render life uncertain for millions. Some 6,000,000 tons of grains will have to be imported this year if a minimum standard of diet is to be maintained; of these two-thirds have already been provided for, and a request to the United States has been solemnly made for the additional 2,000,000. Our Government possesses the grain; transportation can be arranged; the terms on which it will be sent—whether as a grant or as a long-term loan—can be worked out. The important thing is that the human cause not be lost sight of, and that action be taken before it is too late.

There has, unfortunately, been a disposition to delay, partly as a result of the divergences on international policy between India and ourselves. It is inconceivable, however, that such considerations should weigh significantly in America's decision. The humane tradition of our country is one of its glories; and it is not now, when we step forth to take our full role on the world stage, that narrow motives or unworthy second thoughts should control us. Mr. Hoover has in the past been credited with saving millions of lives through the administration of relief regardless of political affiliation; will he find that some petty calculations or pressures stand even temporarily in the way of saving life in a nation that, despite superficial differences, is one with us in its love of freedom? In the Congress a bipartisan movement to assure relief for India is on foot; and this, combined with effective Executive leadership, will certainly carry the day. Let us only hope that this good victory will be assured while the day is yet young.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for not more than 1 minute?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Vermont may yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have listened to the message of the President with great interest and sympathy. I wish to say that I fully approve and shall strongly support the program which is outlined in the message. I shall deem it a great pleasure and a source of pride to join with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and I hope, with many other Senators, in introducing the necessary bill to implement the recommendations of the President. I very sincerely hope that such proposed legislation will receive early and favorable consideration by the Members of the Senate.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to say that I fully associate myself with the statements which were made a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a very brief statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation, my gratitude, and congratulations to the President of the United States for his message to the Congress urging legislative action in support of the request of the Government of India for 2,000,000 tons of grain. The Members of the Congress know this has been a concern of mine ever since I became a Member of the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress. It was my belief then and remains my belief today that the future of Asia will depend to a large extent on the destiny of India and its people.

The people of India are a freedom-loving people who achieved independence in a manner similar to the way the United States achieved independence 175 years ago. They are imbued with the concept of human dignity. Their leaders and their scholars have been weaned on the inspiration of Thomas Payne, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. There is a common bond which unites the people of India and the people of the United States. The future of world peace and the future of our democratic civilization depends on the strengthening of that bond and of that feeling of unity.

The people of India are today in need; they face famine, starvation, and disease. The people of the United States, in the spirit of generosity, humanitarianism, and the Judaic-Christian teachings, are eager and willing to respond to that need.

Mr. President, I am proud and happy to be able to join the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from New York in urging the enactment of legislation on this important subject. I am proud of the fact that the issue of food for India unites the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, as it has united the distinguished former President and leader of the Republican Party, Mr. Hoover, and the leader of the Democratic Party President Truman.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the enactment of such legislation as that proposed would be another demonstration of the warm heart, the warm hand, and the kindly spirit of the American people. If there ever was a time when the people of the world needed to know that our minds are filled with something else besides rearmament and the terrible threat of war, it is at this hour. I am convinced that such a demonstration of the simple, basic, and fundamental goodness, love, and affection would do more to win us friends in the world, and to gladden our own hearts than any other one thing that has been accomplished in a long time by Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial en-



titled "Starvation in India and American Grain," published in the Minneapolis Star of January 29, 1951, and an article entitled "Have You a Dollar To Help India?" written by Paul W. Ward, and published in the Minneapolis Star of the same date.

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

#### STARVATION IN INDIA AND AMERICAN GRAIN

Reports from Washington and New Delhi are that India is going to ask America for an extra 2,000,000 tons of food grain as an outright gift, and that if the gift isn't forthcoming 20,000,000 Indians are going to starve during 1951.

The 2,000,000 tons that will be asked are in addition to between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 tons that India is buying with all the exchange it can get its hands on from its own resources or from loans.

About half of the 2,000,000 tons would be wheat, and the balance kafir corn and milo—grains that aren't regarded as foodstuff here, but as feed. That's roughly 33,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 50,000,000 bushels of coarse grain.

The United States will have about 450,000,000 bushels of wheat still on hand when the new crop starts coming in, and the wheat crop prospects look fairly good. So, from a supply standpoint, the country could easily stand shipping 33,000,000 bushels to India.

Last year's crop of grain sorghums was the largest on record, and the country is generally in good shape on stock feed. It can ship the kafir and milo without much interference with the need for increased livestock production.

Giving India this extra 2,000,000 tons won't solve India's long-run problem. There shouldn't be any illusions about that either here or in India. Neither should India be misled into thinking that America could stand repeating such a gift year after year.

But the gift undoubtedly would extend millions of lives another year, and that is not a small thing. The gloomy rule that while there is life there is hope applies.

With all this in view, the Star thinks the gift should be offered. And we hope that current political differences with India won't cause Congress to balk at the necessary appropriations.

#### HAVE YOU A DOLLAR TO HELP INDIA?—2,000,000 TONS OF UNITED STATES GRAIN SOUGHT AS GIFT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—How much is 2,000,000 tons of food grain? Roughly, it is 1 3/4 percent of America's annual grain crop. It would fill about three-quarters of Minneapolis' elevators, which have a greater capacity than those of any city in the world.)

(By Paul W. Ward)

American altruism is about to be put to an even stiffer test in India's behalf than the one it passed successfully last month in Yugoslavia's case.

The test will come when officials get up sufficient courage to pass on to Congress India's request to the United States for 2,000,000 tons of food grains.

It is equivalent to asking each of this country's 150,000,000 residents to put up \$1 in aid to India at a time when—largely to pay for an anti-Communist defense program that India shuns—they are being prepared to fork up nearly \$500 apiece in Federal taxes.

Executive-branch officials already have satisfied themselves that the grain is available; that India cannot possibly pay cash for it or even acquire it on a loan or credit basis; and that, if anything, it will have to be an outright gift from American taxpayers to the Indian people.

They have not yet satisfied themselves, however, that Congress is in any mood to consider such an outlay, and their doubts on that score have mounted as—

1. Some of the key Democratic as well as Republican Members of Congress continue to lambaste as "complete appeasement" and "abject surrender" the Truman administration's recent apparent acquiescence in an Indian-led move by the UN toward a peace-at-any-price deal with Communist China.

2. Jawaharlal Nehru, India's Prime Minister, reasserted his "new China" thesis at the London Commonwealth conference while continuing to balk at applying to settlement of India's 3-year-old dispute with Pakistan over his homeland of Kashmir the simultaneous-troop-withdrawal formula he prescribes for Korea.

Despite the resulting uncertainties within primarily the State Department, it is virtually certain that inside a month the administration will submit India's request to Congress with an urgent recommendation for its approval on wholly humanitarian grounds.

Considerations pressing them to urge favorable action on Congress are chiefly these:

1. If the aid sought from America is not promptly granted, between 10,000,000 and 20,000,000 Indians will be condemned to death by starvation in the months immediately ahead.

2. If the United States balks at extending aid to a non-Communist government because of its different attitude toward Communist China and related issues, America's foes in Europe as well as Asia will use the fact as proof the Kremlin is right in contending that American humanitarianism is hypocritical and that all aid from this country is given with political strings attached.

3. If Nehru's government should topple under the strains of a starvation economy, its successor would certainly be one reflecting in larger degree the antiforeignism and anti-Americanism of the Indian masses than Nehru's does and thus even more helpful to the Kremlin's Asiatic designs than Nehru's presently may seem to be.

#### THE TERMS OF AN HONEST PEACE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on January 17 last I offered suggestions to the Senate as to how the world conflict in which we are engaged could be more economically and effectively prosecuted, so that it might be brought to an end at a date short of the time of complete prostration for our allies and ourselves. Toward the end of that talk I made brief reference to the possibility of peace by disarmament. I wish now to discuss in more detail a concrete proposal to that end.

Mr. President, we have found ourselves in a very serious position as a result of our foreign problems and the military preparations we are making to meet them. In domestic matters we are facing severe economic strains. Dependence on the military arm to solve our problems requires that we arm to the limit and train soldiers, sailors, and airmen to the limit. While our military budget has been set by the President at nearly \$50,000,000,000, no one with mature judgment and experience believes that even that enormous sum is the limit. There is no limit to military demands. By its very nature Armed Force demands of us everything we have. Its desires are as insatiable as in the case of the two daughters of the horse leech to whom Solomon refers in Proverbs. They cry, "Give, give"—and we are giving.

To strain our economy to the utmost is the set purpose of the Politburo. This purpose was foreshadowed by Lenin and is being ably carried out by Stalin. We are dancing to their tune.

It is not only that we are sacrificing to defend our standard of living and the free independence of our economic life. We are sacrificing our freedom itself. We are being forced to shift the American way of life into the pattern of the garrison state. Not only are we shifting we are there now. Yet it is only as the months go by that we will begin to realize all that has happened to us.

It is clear enough that the future of the young men and of many of the young women of this country no longer lies in their own hands. That future is at the command of the military. Schooling will be interrupted, opportunities for beginning employment in life work will be denied. The whole future of the youth of America is clouded with uncertainty as to everything except that the Armed Forces hold their lives and prospects in their hands.

But this power of the garrison state extends beyond persons to institutions. The Armed Forces can determine which ones of the colleges in our country shall survive and which shall perish. With this tremendous drain on the youth of our land only that college which is granted an ROTC contract can continue to perform its functions. Our wealth, our standard of living, the lives of our young people, and our institutions are under the control of the military. We are no longer a free people.

We are doing no better on the foreign than on the domestic front. Our position with relation to Korea is clearly understood by us. It has been clearly expressed in resolutions passed by the House and Senate and has the overwhelming support of the American people. But it is folly for us to ignore the weakening of our position with relation to those who should be our allies.

In very large part the weakening of our allies is due to an unwillingness to face facts. It is due to a strongly ingrained attraction toward appeasement in spite of the fatal results of appeasement hitherto.

But there is more to it than this. To the outsider our position, our policies, and our actions are difficult to distinguish from an old-style contest for power as between ourselves and the Soviet Government. The surface appearances all point this way to those who do not have access to the inner thoughts, desires, and aspirations of the citizens of America. We really are sheep in wolves' clothing. Our neighbors see the wolf's skin but cannot believe there is a sheep in it. Our most plaintive bleating seems to them the sound of a snarling growl. These are the facts of life, and we must face them.

That we are not doing too well in the United Nations goes without saying. Our first impulse is to write that organization off as a failure if its members do not understand our position or sympathize in our attempts to maintain its integrity. Aside from this insistence in maintaining the integrity of purpose of

the United Nations which is vital and on which we cannot compromise, the foreign observer must conclude that our attitude and activity are largely summed up in the endeavor to outshout the Soviet delegates. To give our respected Ambassador to the United Nations that thankless task is to weaken our cause and nullify our representation.

Mr. President, it is my conviction that we can move from the negative to the positive in the United Nations. It is my conviction that we can present proposals for peace which will be so simple, so practical, and lead so evidently toward the desired result, that we can appear before the United Nations and before the world as honest, honorable, and practical peace seekers instead of being considered as one of two parties to a contest for world domination. Let us not write off the United Nations. Let us use it.

The proposal is a simple one. It is based on the Baruch plan for the control of atomic energy which was rejected by the Soviet government. It differs fundamentally from the Stockholm Peace Proposals which were aimed at the destruction of the armament in which we are strongest while reserving a full strength to the Soviet government the elements of military power in which that nation is strongest. In essence, the proposal would be to disarm completely in every weapon and to any degree above the few small arms required for maintenance of civil order. The essential, of course, is that the carrying out of this disarmament must be progressive and must be done under the direction and under the inspection of the United Nations itself.

The Baruch plan provided for international control and inspection of a particular form of armament—the atomic bomb. We would propose to extend this to all armament. It requires a treaty signed by all members of the United Nations. This would have to be extended to cover all nations of any importance, whether at present members or not.

As in the Baruch proposals, the treaty would set up a control agency, would provide for complete access by that agency to every nation, would prohibit the manufacture of prohibited arms, would provide for the disposal of those now existing, and would provide sanctions for violations. The peace proposal we would offer would contain these provisions. Most importantly, as will be stated later, the right of access would be the first step in the progressive application of a peace agreement.

In the words of the Baruch report, "In consideration of the problem of violation of the terms of the treaty or convention it should also be borne in mind that a violation might be of so grave a character as to give rise to the inherent right of self-defense recognized in article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations."

This total disarmament plan should likewise provide a schedule for the completion of the transitional process over a period of time step by step in an orderly and agreed sequence leading to the full and effective establishment of international control of armament.

This is the American plan extended to cover all major armament instead of one single element of it.

The first of the series of steps by which disarmament and peace are to be reached will be that of freedom of communication. We must set as the goal the same freedom of communication behind, through, and in front of the iron curtain as existed in Western Europe and the Americas prior to the Second World War. This is not complete freedom, for now, as then, we would require visas the duration of which would be determined so that travelers would not be allowed to become residents. But the whole freedom of travel and likewise the whole freedom of uncensored communication—by air, by wire, by cable, by the post—would be reestablished.

It would be well for us to start even with the Soviet government in this matter of communication. While we have placed restraints on the freedom of satellite representatives, we have consistently maintained the decencies of international relationships with the Soviet government, while its satellites have cut themselves off from friendly relations with the rest of the world. This situation has extended over years through both war and peace. The example of the nations of the Western World persistently maintained against great provocation has had no effect whatever on the Soviet powers. They still persist in shutting us off from friendly and normal relationships and communications. In making the comprehensive peace proposals such as have been outlined, we should start by announcing that we will apply exactly the same restrictions on the travel of citizens and on the movements of accredited representatives that they apply against us. The power of example has failed. We will start even on this question of decency in international relationships.

Mr. President, while this proposal for peace and disarmament can be stated comprehensively in these very few paragraphs, it is necessary that we realize the serious implication of the proposal for us. It means throwing America open to travelers whom we suspect of having subversive purposes. We will let in Communists. Let us not blink that fact. But let us also remember that Russia will let in capitalists, as they will call any visitor from a capitalist country. This is going to be at least as unpalatable for them as for us. It is, in fact, going to be more dangerous for them than it is for us, for the institutions they have set up cannot be so easily maintained in the light of knowledge and free intercourse. The Politburo knows this, and this is the reason for the iron curtain.

We are not endangering our institutions to the same degree. While we have scared ourselves stiff, it is because we have faced subversive activities in a society which is already weakened by the necessities of military preparation, and which, in consequence, cannot devote itself wholeheartedly to the well-being of its citizens. When we can reverse our direction and purpose, nothing that Communists can say or do will divert the American people from the attainment of

the economically high and the spiritually satisfying way of life which we are able to work for and attain.

Mr. President, our principal need in this respect is a revival of our faith in our institutions. Polluted rivers are purged of infection as they flow for miles under the bright sunshine. Communist infiltration will wither and die under the bright sunlight of knowledge and the fresh winds of freedom. Let us not lose our faith.

Can the Soviet government refuse such a proposal as this? It will indeed be hard for it to swallow, but will it not be harder yet to be put on record before the eyes of the world as refusing peace when it is offered completely and unequivocally? How can that government sell to the world the idea that the western nations, and particularly our own country, are warmongers seeking world domination? In the face of such an offer the proposition is absurd. No really peaceloving nation will entertain it for an instant. World sentiment will again turn our way. It cannot fail to do so. The Soviet government, branded as seeking conquest rather than peace, will either have to retire within its boundaries defeated and bare to internal disension, or will have to join the ranks of the really peaceloving nations.

Mr. President, in making this proposal we cannot lose. If it is accepted we and the whole world win a disarmed peace. If it is rejected, the Soviet government stands convicted before the eyes of the world without a single excuse for its rejection of peace.

If it chooses to rejoin the peace-loving nations, the way to its aspirations held for generations and centuries, will be open. In a United Nations having united support of the nations and which has been successful in establishing a disarmed peace, many things are possible that are now impossible. For instance, the rulers of Russia have long fretted at their confinement. They have not had free and easy access to the great oceans of the world. From access to these oceans it has felt itself barred by more advantageously placed nations, by narrow seas subject to hostile military control, and by the icy barrier of the Arctic. This can be changed with such a peace agreement as has been described. It would be possible—nay advisable—to put the narrow seas in charge of the United Nations with a suitable police force for patrolling and safeguarding in a peaceful world. The narrow passages of Scandinavia, the Dardenelles, Gibraltar, the Suez Canal—yes, and the Panama Canal—can and should be under international control under those conditions. The age-old complaint of Russia would lose its justification.

Another complaint of the Soviet is that it has inadequate supplies of oil. So long as that government seeks to set the world in turmoil to add to its enormous conquests and to its millions of enslaved peoples, we must see to it that its supplies remain inadequate, that there be no doubt that this is our purpose; but in a disarmed and peace-seeking world we can change all that. Plans can be arrived at whereby Russian commercial

access to the oil supplies of the world are enjoyed by that nation on the same terms as the rest of the world enjoys.

Aside from these two complaints, access to the oceans and to adequate oil supplies, the Soviet Government can make no just demands that the rest of the world is not ready and willing to meet.

There are many powerful and judicious voices which have been raised in support of some of the ideas which I have been setting forth. Among them I would call attention especially to Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union of the CIO, to our own fellow Senator, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and to ex-Senator Tydings who, in spite of the fact that he was chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, made a bold and outright plea for disarmament. Both the Senator from Connecticut and Mr. Reuther have proposed that any plea for peace and disarmament should offer proposals on our part for a wide expansion in amount and application of the point 4 program to nations now groaning under the burden of armament. Mr. President, I agree with the desirability of this but I do not like to see the proposals used as a means of buying peace. The value of peace is without price. It must be sought as a precious jewel—not purchased in the open market.

However, the possibility of expanding point 4 has a great and necessary interest to us. Our rearming has painfully modified our economy and our way of life. It will affect them harmfully to a still greater degree as we get deeper and deeper into the policies and practices of the garrison state. But we must not dodge the fact that a sudden return to peacetime activities would likewise be disturbing. It might, in fact, have almost the effect of an atomic bomb on an economy and a way of life which have been geared to war. We have to face not merely the moral equivalent of war but the economic equivalent as well, which we must develop and build up rapidly for the period of transition if the necessity for war preparation disappears.

Point 4 is one of the transition policies to which we may have recourse. As rapidly as may be we can redirect productive, managerial, and engineering ability now concentrated on war to the development of the undeveloped parts of the world. Even should we do this as a free gift, it would still be better than the free and destructive expenditure of our blood and treasure in preparation for and carrying out of warfare. We will need this moral and economic equivalent of war if we are to shift our purposes and our direction.

But it is not only in the foreign field that we must find these equivalents. We have to redirect our energies to similar undertakings on the domestic front. We are, for instance, far behind in school building. We must see to it that our equipment of educational facilities are renewed, rebuilt, enlarged, and improved. There are innumerable other things we can do as the moral and economic equivalent of discarded warfare. All the streams of America should run

fresh and pure to the sea. No sewage should taint their waters. No industrial refuse should pollute them. Billions upon billions upon billions we devote purposefully toward destruction. A part of these funds for an extended period must be directed toward the health, education, and higher satisfactions of the American citizen. The period of liquidation of the garrison state may become a period of constructive rebuilding of American life.

During this period of diminishing expenditures, we can expect diminishing taxation. This means increasing freedom. One of the means by which the garrison state destroys our freedom, is by that excess of taxation which destroys our ability to do for ourselves and makes us dependent on the Federal Government. The garrison state is the consort and breeder of the Socialist state.

Now, Mr. President, just a few words of recapitulation. We must look closely enough at our present position and course to recognize that we have lost the battle for the American way of life. Instead we are beginning our experience with the garrison state. On the domestic front the Soviet has already won. Military victory will be barren in the face of this grim fact.

We must also face the fact that we are losing the sympathy and support of other nations in the world, large and small, and that through the clever propaganda of the Soviet Government we are being made to appear as one of two contenders for supreme power in the affairs of the globe. We know this is not so. But it is not so clear to the outsider. We are losing on this field of battle as well.

If, as is true, we are seeking peace, we must make that so evident that no one can misunderstand it. We can make it evident by such a peace proposal as I have described. In the face of the clear evidence of such a proposal the Soviet Government will either have to accept or be branded before the world as seeking power over the world, as it has already sought and obtained power over so many hundreds of thousands of square miles and so many hundreds of millions of helpless captives.

This opportunity for peace must not be presented as an ultimatum to be accepted in a given number of days and then withdrawn. Our willingness to join in a disarmed peace must be set before the nations of the world as a permanent exhibit. We must proclaim it monthly, weekly, daily, hourly. It is always valid. The world's warmongers must never be allowed to forget it.

Our position before the world is that of holding a sword in one hand and a Bible in the other. The sword means that there can be no truce with violence, injustice, and tyrannical conquests. The Bible means that we hold to the doctrine of the brotherhood of all men with Christ under the Fatherhood of God and that we are prepared to incorporate that belief in a practical proposal for peace for the nations of the earth.

Our road is clear and the chance is here.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONNOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have asked the distinguished Senator to yield for a moment, in order that I may express my warm commendation of the splendid presentation he has made and the addition he has made to the so-called great debate with regard to where we go from here, in the great peace offensive which I agree with him we must undertake at once. I thank the Senator very much for his remarks.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I, too, should like to make a comment on the splendid presentation the Senator from Vermont has just made. I wish to say that I think his speech is a very fine follow-up of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont when, a few months ago he made a speech entitled "Let Us Try God."

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to associate myself with the remarks just made by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in regard to the very eloquent address just made in the Senate by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### THOMAS ALVA EDISON

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, yesterday was the birthday of one of our Nation's greatest men, Thomas Alva Edison. Nowhere in the world was he more widely respected and more greatly honored than in New Jersey, where he lived and worked for the greater part of his lifetime. The people of New Jersey revere his memory, as do the people of the entire country. At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a tribute to Thomas Alva Edison, as presented by Ted Mack on the Ted

Mack Family Hour on Sunday, February 11, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—let me say that when I was a student at Columbia University, from 1906 to 1910, several times I had the great privilege and opportunity of meeting Thomas Edison at his home, and there I met his family. Not only was he a great engineering genius, but he was a great American, and particularly a great family man. Therefore, I join with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Jersey, in saying that among all the outstanding Americans of his time and of his age, and particularly in association with John Burroughs, Harvey Firestone, and Henry Ford, Thomas A. Edison set one of the greatest examples of true progressivism of any American of his time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey?

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

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS ALVA EDISON AS PRESENTED BY TED MACK ON THE TED MACK FAMILY HOUR ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1951

Once more we hear the strains of America, the Beautiful, and turn to our album of great Americans. Today is February 11, and more important, it is the birthday of one of the greatest minds that ever was produced in America—Thomas Alva Edison.

You know it's more than possible that I wouldn't be talking to you—there'd be no brilliant signs on Broadway, you'd have no radio, television or phonograph, and not even movies—oh, we'd be missing a great many things we take for granted today—if a boy hadn't been born in a simple little home at Milan, Ohio, in 1847.

Young Edison, from the stories we have at hand, seems to have been a typical American boy who tried to hatch chickens by sitting on them, set fire to his father's barn, ran a chemical laboratory in the cellar, and had a job of sorts as a candy butcher on the Grand Trunk Railroad. If any of you at home are wondering what's going to happen to your young hopefuls—after reading the midyear report cards—you may take comfort in knowing that Edison's school teachers expelled him as not worth teaching at all.

Tom Edison was taught from that time on by his mother, by a railroad telegrapher and by the "university of hard knocks." When he was 30 years old, he invented a tin-foil phonograph—and if you're interested, the very first words to come out of this wonderful machine were "Mary had a little lamb."

Of course, he hadn't been idle before that, you know. He had invented a stock ticker, helped make the first successful typewriter and automatic telegraph machine, and electric rheostat, the electric pen which made possible the mimeograph machine and the carbon transmitters for telephones. I'm sure the recording stars of today would get a real kick out of visiting Edison's first recording studio in West Orange, N. J. Singers and musicians sang or played into megaphones instead of out of them in those days.

There were other scientific discoveries, but the most important one to come up next was

the invention of the electric light in 1879, when Tom Edison was only 37 years old.

What happened in the years since the first light bulb glowed in his laboratory is apparent in your own home every time you push a button, and it's certainly evident on the main street of every town in America.

In 1891 he applied for patents on the motion-picture camera—actually it was developed 2 years before that, 1889, but Edison was a little ambitious. He was trying to tie up his phonograph with the camera to make talking movies. That, friends, was 60 years ago.

Then he went on to develop electric semaphore signals for railroads; he invented the fluoroscope; and at one phase of his life, he worked on metal ore refining. Out of this work came iron, copper, and zinc miracles, and even a new cement.

You must realize that we're just skipping across the top of his many contributions to mankind. In among the familiar inventions, the name of Tom Edison touches safety lamps for miners, dictating machines, coal tar derivatives that provide many flavors and perfumes today.

For all his contributions to mankind, they've struck off medals in his honor, they've issued stamps in commemoration of his great works, but every time we turn on a light, ride in an automobile, a train, or a plane, every time we take part in the pleasures of radio, television, the movie, the theater—in fact, whenever we enjoy life in America today, we are walking around among the monuments a great man erected to the eternal American ideal that a country boy from Ohio has the opportunity of asserting his genius.

It can be done again because it's been done before. For that we thank Tom Edison and for that we're glad we're Americans.

#### ADVISABILITY AND EXTENT OF UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, in the all-important discussion regarding the advisability and extent of our participation in the defense of Western Europe, it is gratifying to note the wholehearted determination of outstanding citizens of both parties to present their well-considered views on this vital matter.

The people of the United States have already had the opportunity to weigh the various arguments and recommendations voiced both in the Halls of Congress and elsewhere. But too much cannot be said in relation to a decision which must be made in the near future. The lives and possessions of many Americans are involved; the future course of our Nation's history is at stake. Under these circumstances each one of us has a duty to submit his best judgment, whatever it may be worth.

I believe the President of the United States should consult Congress regarding the important phases of our troop assignments to Western Europe. I have in mind the definition of "consult," as given in a leading dictionary, as follows: "to ask the advice of, to take counsel with, etc." Such a proceeding negatives the idea of simply allowing the Congress to express itself, after which the President would do as he pleased.

Nor do I think any great difficulty will be encountered if the President takes Congress into consultation, in the true sense of that word. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are possessed of the same high degree of pa-

triotism as is to be found in the executive branch—no greater, but no less. There will be found in the Senate and House of Representatives earnest and devoted public servants who are as zealous in safeguarding our Nation's interest as any other representatives of this democracy.

When these true Americans in the Congress are consulted by the President as to the components of any United States expeditionary force they will respond patriotically. Any proposed plan must, of course, be based upon practical considerations, and be definitely required for the security of our country and for the containment of communism, which is a menacing threat to liberty and freedom.

Congress should be consulted as to troops for Europe, not only because it is in keeping with the understanding at the time of approval of the North Atlantic Pact, but because such joint action of the Congress and executive branch will be the surest guarantee of national unity. The Members of the Congress are truly representative of the will of the American people. They reflect the attitude and determination of the citizenry. This is an all-important consideration in the creation and perpetuation of support for the vital decisions upon which the lives and possessions of our people will depend.

I say this as one who has consistently supported foreign-aid programs. Since that epoch-making message of March 1947, antedating the anti-Communist program for Greece and Turkey, and continuing through the successive steps which were designed to rehabilitate the democracies of Western Europe, I have voted for the different outlays. Furthermore, I am convinced that without these programs, to which we gave unstinted support, the iron curtain would long ago have enveloped other nations, just as Poland and Czechoslovakia and other peoples are now subjected to Communist domination.

But in casting those various votes for European aid in huge amounts, I did so with the understanding that Congress would have voice in the determination of policy involving the sending of men, just as we were implored to give support to plans for the sending of dollars to Europe.

The instinct of self-preservation impels us to maintain our position of world leadership. It is not that America has any aggressive intentions. Rather, it is that our Communist foe represents a global menace, and that, the further his ideology is spread, the more imminent is the danger to our security.

It is incumbent upon this Nation to reaffirm allegiance to the doctrine of collective security. We must not abandon Europe. Not only would such a course mean the repudiation of our pledges and the loss of the great military and economic investment already made but it would represent an open invitation to Moscow to strike whenever the time appears propitious.

Furthermore it is not sufficient to conclude that we can fulfill our objectives alone by air and sea power. History and

experience, not only of past decades but contemporaneously have demonstrated that in addition to these two mighty forces there is a third essential, namely, ground troops of infantry and artillery.

Reinforcements must be available to our fellow members of the Atlantic Pact. To hold that we will not give assistance in this matter until and unless the foe has already inflicted his damage would be to defeat the very purpose of the program long since adopted.

Not to be ignored also is the fact that we already have troops in Germany who must not be abandoned. Obviously we cannot allow these Americans to be the victims of a ruthless enemy.

But a policy to commit ground troops to Europe should have qualifications attached. There is a limit to what the United States can do, as Korea has shown. Our European allies should understand in advance that they cannot expect too sizable a portion of our limited infantry and artillery. Possibly, if they had been warned when hostilities opened in Korea of this fact, they would not have thrust so great a burden upon the United States as was done. We must not repeat our all-out assumption of defense, as has occurred in the Korean crisis, where the United States has suffered tremendously and disproportionately.

An inflexible mathematical formula cannot be decided in advance of an emergency. It is no more possible in advance to say that 16 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent is all that we will commit any more than it would be reassuring to know that while 10 planes might be needed to cover a given target, only 9 can be allowed under the technical blueprint. Britain could never have determined in advance that after Dunkerque so many troops and supplies would go to Egypt, to France, to Africa, to Malta—and when. The determination of "adequacy" must take into account the needs of the hour and the availability of other forces. We must leave such tactical and strategic decisions to the military strategists who are the better informed as to what is required, lest perhaps, through shortsighted policy, we jeopardize the lives of American boys already dispatched to foreign lands.

But all this is not to say that limitations should not be placed. I do not believe in giving a blank check to anybody, whether it be the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States or to anyone else. We would never countenance the giving of a blank check for the expenditure of United States Treasury moneys for domestic purposes. Much more serious would it be to consider giving such unlimited authority over lives of American boys upon whom the future of our Nation and of the world will depend. How best to accomplish the objective of commitment without jeopardizing the entire program is obviously the difficult question. Consideration should be given to imposing a requirement that the President must receive the approval of Congress at stated intervals as to the commitments made in the intervening time. If such approval could not be secured from the

people's representatives, then no additional troops could be sent.

In addition, consideration should be given to the establishment of a joint bipartisan emergency policy committee of possibly 12 Members of the Congress, who would be consulted regularly as to developing needs in the European defense area and who would be called upon continuously for consultation by the President of the United States. Such a committee should include representatives of the Foreign Relations, the Armed Services, and the Policy Committees of both parties of the Senate and of the House. If additional appointments to the group are necessary, the presiding officers should take this action. Members of this emergency committee should meet at stated intervals, throughout the critical period, with the President, the Secretary of State, and military officials, so that they would continue to be informed of the latest reports as to changing conditions. More important, they should be consulted in the formulation of policy and in connection with further decisions.

More and more it would seem necessary that Russia, and all the nations of the world, be kept informed of basic United States reactions and intentions with regard to the matter of preserving the peace and security of the world. Had Russia, Communist China, and North Korea been fully convinced of the determination of the United States not to permit violation of the independence of Southern Korea, I am sure that they would have been less ready to face the opposition which the free nations have offered in that area.

Undoubtedly, if the United States forces and armaments are to be poured into any and every area where Communist Russia directs one of her satellites to strike; if they are to be dissipated in attacks upon those subservient forces, we can well wear ourselves out fighting a windmill, like Don Quixote of fiction, while Russia sits by and awaits the day when she can send her own forces into action against a United States which has been so weakened by successive incidents that our ability to defend our freedom may be sorely impaired.

It must be clearly made known to the Kremlin that further Communist aggression anywhere in the world is tantamount to an attack upon the United States. Let it be made clearly evident that efforts to counteract such incidents will be directed at the oppression center from which they stem, namely, Moscow and Russia's points of military production, as well as against the satellites who are actually prodded into the attack.

With every new area gained through aggression, Russia strengthens herself by manpower and natural resources, and by so much weakens the power of the free nations of the world for final resistance.

To permit absorption by the Communists of the resources of Western Europe, for instance, or of Southeastern Asia, could well be to produce the final increment to Communist strength and productive facilities which would make the difference between victory and pos-

sible defeat for the United States and the nations allied with her. Every hour we delay in making such a position known, every additional square mile of territory yielded by such delay, adds by so much to the task that ultimately and surely will confront us.

Mr. President, there is one point about which I agree entirely with former President Herbert Hoover. Our allies in Western Europe must not undermine our efforts by continuing to supply our Communist—and common—enemies the products and raw materials of a strategic nature or that serve to bolster the behind-the-line economy of those enemy countries, to which Mr. Hoover referred in his speech of last Friday.

Certainly nothing could be more open to condemnation than is a policy on the part of any of these nations whom we propose to help, of continuing to benefit financially and otherwise by trade with nations who are seeking to destroy both them and us and who will make use of all supplies thus sent them, in one way or another, toward our defeat and destruction.

This particular point needs stressing at this time because of the information possessed by the subcommittee investigating shipments to Communist areas regarding the vast amounts of highly strategic items—copper, steel, and their products; electric machinery, machine tools, transportation items, and so forth, which have been flowing to the satellite countries and to China, and to bordering nations which have been transshipping those items to the very areas which now are in open or at least actual hostilities against us.

To summarize, it is earnestly suggested that—

First. To refuse any troops to Western Europe would let that whole area go by default should Russia attack; much of that area has been overrun twice or more since 1914. The people's "will to fight" depends understandably to a large extent on the belief in the possibility of successful defense.

Second. Our planning should not make it possible for Russia to walk in almost unopposed, and then have opportunity to attack this country from Atlantic bases when she has consolidated her hold upon Europe. Rather we must assist our European allies with troops and armament to defend their countries, to hold and delay the foe, to fight our battle and theirs, while we carry out our major task of destroying the enemy's home, military, and productive centers by air attack to prevent reinforcements.

Third. If Korea has shown anything at all, it is that air and sea power alone cannot repulse and destroy masses of foot soldiers.

Fourth. Troops furnished Europe must be according to an all-over program that allows for adequate home defense; but any rigid proportional allotment of such troops to troops of other nations obviously must depend upon conditions as they develop.

Fifth. Congress much be consulted—not on the basis of a fait accompli, a decision already made, but as to whether

troops should be sent, when, and how many.

Sixth. Realizing the unwieldiness of a policy of Presidential consultation with large congressional committees, I suggest a bipartisan consultation group, from both Houses of Congress, consisting of Members of each party from the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services and Policy Committees, who would be delegated by the Congress to represent them and to consult on necessary decisions with the President in matter of troops dispatched in an emergency.

Seventh. United States must demand that all anti-Communist nations be included in the defense set-up. To exclude Spain, Turkey, or Greece would be to weaken a system of defense which, at its strongest, will be subjected to all-out strain in case of Russian aggression against Western Europe.

Eighth. Insistence that United Nations allied with us stop supplying enemies with needed supplies and material.

Ninth. Concentration upon defense to exclusion of all nonvital spending for construction or for expansion or initiation of Government social services.

It is heartening, when one considers the vast differences of opinion which naturally follow the free thought of the American people and their leaders on vital aspects of foreign policy in the past, to realize how much basic unity of thought now prevails with respect to United States European commitments, despite all the apparent sound and fury.

All the vehement arguments for ceilings on the amounts of troops to be sent, or for proportionate allocations of American troops to those of other countries involved, serve but to emphasize the very important general agreement on the necessity of aid from this country to the nations of Western Europe, particularly in the form of armaments.

Happily there is a resurgence of determination that the cause of liberty and freedom shall not be defeated. Further, there is general realization among our people that, within the Atlantic coalition, there lies the best hope for resistance to the enemy.

To the undying credit of the American people let it be said that they approve of the outlay from our Treasury of whatever is necessary for the fulfillment of the extensive rearmament program which will supply not only our own troops but will assist Western Europe in building its defenses against possible Communist aggression.

Also, as a dire warning to Moscow is the determination of our country to meet force with force and to carry the fight to the homeland of the enemy, if the Soviets launch an attack upon Western Europe.

In the light of recent developments and fortified by the definite state of unity among the American people which has been noted, particularly since General Eisenhower's survey and report, the United States can be depended upon to do its part to prevent the overthrow of democratic institutions and to frustrate the onrush of Communist aggression.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very much delighted to find a Democrat

among my friends on the other side of the aisle hitting the sawdust trail. Not only do we find a Democrat who agrees on at least two points with former President Herbert Hoover's program but, if I may do so, I most respectfully suggest to my distinguished friend from Maryland that within the next few months I think he will probably agree with Mr. Hoover's program in its entirety.

Do not let us forget, Mr. President, that it was a Democratic President who first recognized Russia, after Herbert Hoover had declined to do so. Let us not forget that it was during a Democratic administration that this Nation engaged in World War I and World War II.

Well do I remember early in World War II Winston Churchill saying over the radio:

We don't want American boys over here. We don't need them. Just give us the tools. Give us the guns.

Mr. President, the Connally resolution which was adopted by the Senate provided for a second front. What did we find within a few days after we adopted the resolution? Only a few weeks after Mr. Churchill had said over the radio that the British had all the manpower they needed out of 116,000 casualties in the Normandy invasion 86,000 were American boys.

A few days ago President Truman appointed a new commission. He said the purpose of appointing the Commission was to find out why American people did not go to the polls and vote. It is particularly appropriate today, since it is the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth, to call the attention of the Senate to the great fact that Abraham Lincoln found that the political parties of his day were not doing a good job. Therefore he organized the Republican Party. We tried very hard a short time ago to have a new constitutional amendment adopted. Did we get the support of the Democrats? We did not. In the elections of 1940, 1944, and 1948 we could as well have had one party. People who were opposed, as some of us were, to sending American boys all over the world, sending our treasure to every country on the globe, spending \$200,000,000 for tobacco for citizens of foreign lands, buying \$200,000 worth of Coca-Cola for foreigners, purchasing and sending to them dummies, and all of that sort of thing, had no place to go. The Republican bipartisan policy, for which my friend made his plea only a moment ago, stopped us. We heard Mr. Dewey, the Republican candidate, asking for more help for Western Europe than had been asked for even by President Truman. He asked for more men and larger contingents of boys to be sent to foreign countries than had been asked for even by Mr. Truman. A few nights ago Mr. Dewey again renewed his plea over the radio.

Mr. President, why does Mr. Truman want to appoint a commission now to find out why the American people do not go to the polls? Why is it that nearly 50,000,000 Americans stayed home at the last election? They stayed home be-

cause there was no candidate and there could be no candidate under the Constitution after the Republican and Democratic national conventions had met and made nominations, to represent the rank and file of the American people, who were opposed to sending American troops abroad, and who were opposed to continuing to send billions and billions of dollars abroad. Mr. President, I suggest to my distinguished friend that some day, when he is at liberty and he has nothing else to do, he look up some of the old CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, and read some of the speeches which were made by Members of the Senate after World War I. My distinguished friend could find no more instructive reading. Senator after Senator, some of whom are still Members of this body, rose on the floor and said that we had made a mistake, that we had no business getting into World War I. I refer him to the RECORD.

Mr. President, in Europe, before World War I, there existed the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It was over a thousand years old. It was made up of 19 different nations. The house of Hapsburg was older than the royal house of England. After World War I a Democratic President took a trip to Europe. Woodrow Wilson said, "We are going to have self-determination of nations over here." The nations of Europe had been working together. They almost had a common currency. It was possible to travel from one country to another without any difficulty. They almost had a real United States of Europe. All that was torn to pieces. Let us take the case of poor Poland. England guaranteed the sovereignty of Poland. England said, "We are going to war to preserve Poland." The record shows how England preserved Poland. It does not take the senior Senator from North Dakota to show the lamentable job which England did on that project.

Mr. President, everyone knows how national conventions are rigged. President Truman does not need to appoint a new commission to find out why nearly 50,000,000 American people did not vote at the last election. Let him pick up a newspaper and read the accounts that were written at the time the national conventions were held. Well do I remember that the Republican convention at Kansas City was delayed 25 hours until Andrew Mellon from Pennsylvania could appear before it to tell whom to nominate for President. Well do I remember that twice the lawyer for the House of Morgan had them nominate the candidate for President of the United States.

Every one of us is familiar with what took place at the Democratic convention at Chicago when a loud-speaker microphone was installed in the basement of the convention hall, through which a fellow yelled in a loud voice, "We want Roosevelt. We want Roosevelt." A few weeks later, in Philadelphia, we find the Republicans nominating a man who in the primary had not carried even one State. They nominated Wendell Willkie. He had not carried one primary election. A few

days before the convention we found the London Times saying, "There is a great demand for the nomination of Wendell Willkie." They said that only a few days before the nomination took place. Then we find the House of Morgan sending its representative to Philadelphia. Fake tickets were issued to men and women, who, after being paid a certain amount, went into the balcony and shouted, "We want Willkie. We want Willkie." They shouted "We want Willkie" from morning until night.

Mr. President, we tried to secure the adoption of a constitutional amendment. My distinguished friend the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] tried to help us the last time it was brought before the Senate. It was an amendment under which all the people could go into a primary election and cast their vote for their candidate for President, in the same way that they can now nominate a candidate for governor, Representative, and Senator.

Mr. President, I well recall the great fight put up by the late George Norris for the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of President of the United States. Senator Norris was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and he worked, not weeks, not months, but years, in an endeavor to get that constitutional amendment adopted. But in spite of his great prestige, in spite of the fact that he was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, in spite of the fact that he finally got the joint resolution reported from the committee and upon the floor of the Senate, it was emasculated until he himself could not recognize his own proposal. Then, finally, it was defeated by an overwhelming majority.

I congratulate the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for his assistance some months ago when we finally got one-third of the membership of this body to vote for the submission of an amendment providing for the direct election of President of the United States, and providing in the same amendment for a primary election.

Ah, Mr. President, I well remember when in my own State a citizen could not vote directly for a United States Senator, and no citizen had that right until a constitutional amendment making provision for it was ratified. Today no one can vote directly for a President of the United States, and I submit that one reason why 50,000,000 remained at home at the last election was because they were so disgusted at what took place at the Republican convention and the Democratic convention that they did not care to vote at all.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not blame the people. So far as the foreign policy was concerned, what difference was there between the parties? There was not any difference. Yet only a short time before that Burton K. Wheeler, then a Member of this body, a distinguished Senator from the State of Montana, speaking in Los Angeles just before we entered into World War II had an audience of 108,000

people. Did those 108,000 people have a chance to express themselves?

So today, on Abraham Lincoln's Birthday, I call attention to the fact that Mr. Lincoln, not liking the parties which were then in existence, organized the Republican Party. I only wish that today the Republican Party was still enunciating the principles of Abraham Lincoln as he announced them at the time the party was established.

My distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], earlier this afternoon mentioned George Washington and George Washington's Farewell Address. He referred particularly to the part in which Washington said that we should avoid entangling alliances with other countries. It would have been a pretty good thing if we had followed the advice of Gen. George Washington.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which was published by the North Dakota Taxpayers Association which says that North Dakota's share of the Federal debt is greater than the total taxable value of all real and personal property in the State of North Dakota.

Time and time again upon this floor I stated the amount of the debt which would be borne by every county in Wisconsin, in Minnesota, in North and South Dakota, and the same information was available as to every other State. I showed, for example, that the total debt of a small county such as Cass County, N. Dak., just for the Marshall plan, would amount to more than \$16,000,000.

To show how little the rank and file of the people know about it, I may state that one day I went into the gallery of the Senate, where three of the leading bankers of Fargo, N. Dak., were sitting, when the Marshall plan was being discussed. All three of these bankers were for the Marshall plan, and I said to the first of them, "How much will the share of Cass County be?" He said, "About \$250,000." I asked the next one and he said, "about \$350,000." The next thought it might be half a million dollars. These bankers are supposed to know all about fiscal matters, but not one of them knew that the share of Cass County, N. Dak., would be \$16,000,000.

Mr. President, I agree with nearly every word of what Herbert Hoover has said in his last two speeches. He is a man who has spent the major portion of his adult life in foreign countries. He has taken trips all over the world since he was President. I say frankly that I was shocked when I picked up the New York Post yesterday and saw on the front page a statement to the effect that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, was not even going to call Mr. Hoover before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Who are the men who know so much, the men who do not want to hear a former President of this country even testify? I was delighted to find in the same article a statement to the effect that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], although he said he did not agree entirely with what former

President Hoover had said, nevertheless was going to ask that Mr. Hoover be requested to appear and testify.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.  
Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he read the report of the former President about the reorganization of the Post Office Department, and how many hundreds of thousands of dollars he thought he could save. Does the Senator believe he could save that money in the Post Office?

Mr. LANGER. Let me preface my answer to the question by saying that when I received that report, I wrote a letter to Mr. Johnson, chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Among those who served on the Hoover Commission there were prominent labor leaders, and such men as our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and men high in business and in industry. I wrote to Mr. Johnson and said, "I want to know who wrote this report. Did Mr. Hoover write it? How many meetings have you had of all the directors of the Hoover Commission?"

Would not my distinguished colleague be anxious to get the answer which I received from Mr. Johnson? They meet once a year, and many of them are not present when the committee meets. So we find that this report is not a report of President Hoover at all. It is a report of Mr. Johnson and his staff.

But answering the Senator's question directly, I say that I believe a great deal of money can be saved in the Post Office Department. I believe the suggestions made were good.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did the Senator speak of "Johnson" or "Johnston"? I should like to have him clear that up. I was not the one to whom he wrote.

Mr. LANGER. "Johnson" is not the Senator. I gladly clear that up. The name of my distinguished colleague from South Carolina is "JOHNSTON." The chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report is a man by the name of "Johnson." The names are very much alike, but there is a "t" in one and not in the other.

As I said, I was very much delighted when I found that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] announced he intended to invite Mr. Herbert Hoover before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed again in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the table prepared by the North Dakota Taxpayers Association, showing that North Dakota's share of the national debt is much greater than the total taxable value of all real and personal property in the State of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

*North Dakota's share of Federal debt is much greater than total taxable value of all real and personal property in State*

[Each individual's share of the \$256,598,297,426 Federal debt amounts to \$1,708]

| County        | Population, 1950 | County's share Federal debt | Net taxable valuation, 1950 |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Adams         | 4,801            | \$8,353,828                 | \$4,659,425                 |
| Barnes        | 16,822           | 28,731,976                  | 16,134,965                  |
| Benson        | 10,618           | 18,021,544                  | 10,685,428                  |
| Billings      | 1,769            | 3,651,452                   | 2,552,297                   |
| Bottineau     | 12,091           | 20,828,428                  | 12,236,154                  |
| Bowman        | 3,998            | 6,267,674                   | 4,260,661                   |
| Burke         | 6,597            | 11,130,676                  | 7,319,443                   |
| Burleigh      | 25,252           | 43,898,416                  | 17,826,697                  |
| Cass          | 57,903           | 98,971,324                  | 52,551,326                  |
| Cavalier      | 11,693           | 19,484,644                  | 12,794,204                  |
| Dickey        | 9,066            | 15,484,728                  | 10,428,079                  |
| Divide        | 5,977            | 10,318,716                  | 6,450,961                   |
| Dunn          | 7,212            | 12,318,096                  | 6,611,827                   |
| Eddy          | 5,361            | 9,557,588                   | 6,244,652                   |
| Emmons        | 9,694            | 16,005,352                  | 7,879,929                   |
| Foster        | 5,301            | 9,954,108                   | 6,855,722                   |
| Golden Valley | 3,487            | 5,935,796                   | 4,153,396                   |
| Grand Forks   | 39,190           | 66,336,520                  | 30,777,633                  |
| Grant         | 7,109            | 12,022,172                  | 6,003,366                   |
| Griggs        | 5,414            | 9,147,112                   | 6,936,639                   |
| Hettinger     | 7,086            | 12,502,888                  | 5,611,526                   |
| Kidder        | 6,154            | 10,011,032                  | 6,661,298                   |
| LaMoure       | 9,471            | 16,176,468                  | 10,224,453                  |
| Logan         | 6,345            | 10,837,260                  | 5,387,407                   |
| McHenry       | 12,556           | 21,445,648                  | 11,970,079                  |
| McIntosh      | 7,591            | 12,965,428                  | 5,724,150                   |
| McKenzie      | 6,840            | 11,682,720                  | 6,401,960                   |
| McLean        | 18,770           | 32,059,160                  | 11,641,182                  |
| Mercer        | 8,676            | 14,818,608                  | 6,814,786                   |
| Morton        | 19,242           | 32,865,336                  | 13,739,567                  |
| Mountrail     | 9,399            | 16,053,492                  | 9,001,109                   |
| Nelson        | 8,055            | 13,757,940                  | 9,538,100                   |
| Oliver        | 3,077            | 5,255,516                   | 3,252,447                   |
| Pembina       | 13,944           | 23,816,352                  | 13,080,697                  |
| Pierce        | 8,259            | 14,106,372                  | 8,888,549                   |
| Ramsey        | 14,334           | 24,482,472                  | 15,820,950                  |
| Ransom        | 8,838            | 15,095,304                  | 8,052,989                   |
| Renville      | 5,388            | 9,202,704                   | 5,616,626                   |
| Richland      | 19,738           | 33,712,504                  | 19,017,396                  |
| Rolette       | 11,094           | 18,948,552                  | 5,346,531                   |
| Sargent       | 7,568            | 12,926,144                  | 8,080,145                   |
| Sheridan      | 5,226            | 8,926,008                   | 4,870,378                   |
| Sioux         | 3,709            | 6,334,972                   | 1,616,010                   |
| Slope         | 2,308            | 3,942,064                   | 2,647,915                   |
| Stark         | 16,121           | 27,534,668                  | 11,677,794                  |
| Steele        | 5,131            | 8,763,748                   | 6,837,939                   |
| Stutsman      | 24,039           | 41,058,612                  | 20,241,619                  |
| Towner        | 6,329            | 10,809,932                  | 8,844,535                   |
| Trails        | 11,330           | 19,351,640                  | 12,588,027                  |
| Walsh         | 20,485           | 34,988,380                  | 15,545,378                  |
| Ward          | 34,631           | 59,149,748                  | 25,014,286                  |
| Wells         | 10,384           | 17,735,872                  | 10,992,828                  |
| Williams      | 16,402           | 28,014,616                  | 15,555,793                  |
| Total         | 617,965          | 1,055,484,220               | 559,647,225                 |

Sources: Valuation, State tax commissioner; Federal debt, U. S. Treasurer's Report, November 1950; population, Bureau of Census.

Mr. LANGER. I might add that the record shows that the share of each individual in North Dakota—and I am not now talking about a family, Mr. President, for if a man has a wife and eight children the total family share would be ten times as much—the share of each individual in North Dakota of the \$256,598,297,426 of Federal debt amounts to \$1,708. That is what every North Dakotan, not every family, but every individual in North Dakota, owes.

I have here the list which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of every county in the State, showing the population of each county and each county's share of the Federal debt, as well as the net taxable valuation of each county in 1950. If my distinguished friend from South Carolina is interested in the details, I shall be glad to secure them for him. The total population of North Dakota in 1950 was 617,965. The share of the Federal debt of the counties of North Dakota is \$1,055,484,220. The taxable valuation in 1950 was \$559,647,225.

That, Mr. President, shows where the Democratic Party has led us. That is the result of permitting the party to remain in power since 1932.

In all honesty and humility, Mr. President, I wish to say that the Republican Party, under the bipartisan program, is partly to blame. I notice that my distinguished friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is smiling at what I am now saying. When he was running for the Senate in the State of Minnesota I heard him say over the radio that he blamed the Republicans just as much as he did the Democrats because of the so-called bipartisan policy. Well do I remember how the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota rolled those words under his tongue. I also remember the great impression his statement made upon the rank and file of the people of the State of North Dakota. I can understand why my distinguished friend from Minnesota defeated by nearly 300,000 votes his opponent, who had voted for the giving of all the vast sums of foreign aid money, who had voted that the United States should take care of a great portion of Europe. Since that time Asia has been added. As one Senator stated today, we are now going to take care of Asia also.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I only want to help the Senator from North Dakota make the RECORD accurate. I must remind my good friend, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, that my charges made in the last campaign were not that we were doing too much internationally. My charges were that we were not doing enough or doing it well enough. I believe possibly it is well at this point to say, in view of the fine eulogy by the Senator from North Dakota, that the people who heard me applauded my remarks, and liked what I said. They liked what I said because they believed it to be the responsibility of the United States to do this job internationally. It so happens that the junior Senator from Minnesota was taking issue with his opponent on the basis that we were not following through on the bipartisan foreign policy.

I merely wanted to clarify the RECORD, because I know the Senator from North Dakota and the junior Senator from Minnesota do not see eye to eye on our foreign policy. In fact we see, let me put it in this way, rather back to back instead of eye to eye.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that he flatters himself. He did not receive those votes because the people of Minnesota thought he was going to do more for the people of Europe and Asia than the man against whom he was running. They voted against Mr. Ball because they did not like his record. They said "We do not know what he, the man running against him, will do, but he cannot do any worse so far as aid to foreign countries is concerned and we are going to take a chance on him."

I call to the attention of my distinguished friend that his distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. THYE],

speaking over the radio when he was running against former Senator Shipstead, said, "I would not have voted for the loan to England." Both former Senator Ball and former Senator Shipstead are from his own State of Minnesota. When my colleague [Mr. Young] ran for Senator the last time he stressed the fact that he also would not have voted for the loan to England.

In closing I want to make a prophecy, Mr. President. I prophesy that in a few years, it may not be long, some of the very Senators who are now upon the floor of the Senate will do what Senators did after World War I, rise on the floor and apologize to the American people for having participated in the present foreign policy, for having sent billions and billions and billions of dollars to foreign countries, when at this very moment there are 10,000,000 families in America trying to live on \$2,000 a year.

My distinguished friend from Minnesota is a member of the board of directors of an organization known as the Institute of National Affairs. That organization has in its employ as executive secretary a man named Dewey Anderson. A short time ago I placed in the RECORD a report made by Dewey Anderson, who, I assume, was chosen to the position he now holds, by my distinguished colleague from the State of Minnesota. In that report Mr. Dewey Anderson gave figures to show that there are some families in the United States trying to live on a thousand dollars a year. Those are not my figures. They are the figures of Mr. Dewey Anderson, a leading economist, selected by my distinguished colleague from the State of Minnesota himself.

So, Mr. President, I today venture the assertion that if hard times come, if, for example, we should have a drought such as we experienced some years ago in the Northwest, if conditions become bad, some of the Senators who are so anxious to vote billions upon billions of dollars to almost every other country on the face of the globe and some of them who are now saying, "We are going to send our boys all over the world," will change their position.

I remember that the former Senator from South Dakota, Mr. Gurney, during the Eightieth Congress introduced the selective-service draft bill. I then asked him, "To what countries on the globe are you going to send American boys?" Former Senator Gurney said, "To every single country in the world to which the President of the United States may care to send them."

Mr. President, although I may be in a hopeless minority, I wish to say that I do not propose to send American boys all over the earth. I voted against the appropriation of every dollar of money which is going to any foreign country, with the exception of the appropriations for UNRRA, representing \$2,000,000,000 to feed the naked and the hungry. What a mess was made with the UNRRA program before it was finished. Russia handed out our money, or the food purchased with our money to other countries of Europe. Under that program England handed out our money in South



America. The United States received no credit.

Today what do we find? We find the bipartisan crowd made up of Democrats and Republicans alike again saying they are going to vote to send more and more American boys across to Europe. On the other hand, we find the President of the United States saying we are not at war. Mr. President, if we are not at war, I suggest that some Senators who are so anxious to send American boys across the sea, go to Walter Reed Hospital and talk to some of the boys there who have no arms, who have no legs, and some of those who are unable to feed themselves, and have to have nurses to take care of them morning, noon, and night. Let Senators talk with those boys and find out whether or not we are at war. They can tell us, Mr. President.

#### KOREA AND THE THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me, to permit me to make an insertion in the RECORD and to make a few comments thereon, with the understanding that I shall not take more than 2 minutes to do so?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a dispatch from London concerning a statement by His Majesty's Government, made by Prime Minister Attlee, to the effect that the British Government opposes another crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel.

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

LONDON.—Prime Minister Attlee announced that the British Government opposes another crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea until after full consultation in the United Nations.

Attlee said in Commons it was especially important to get the views of the nations fighting in Korea.

Attlee said that while Britain loyally supports the United Nations and considers China the aggressor, "the question of sanctions is not one which we can support until there is no hope of settlement."

He said the thirty-eighth parallel is not a military line but just an imaginary line on the map, and that therefore there might be unintentional crossings here and there at times.

But, referring to any planned intention to cross the parallel, Attlee said:

"In our view the thirty-eighth parallel ought not to be crossed again until there has been full consultation with the United Nations and, in particular, with those member states who are contributing forces to Korea."

Attlee criticized those who insist that the issue in the Far East is solely between the United States and China.

"The issue is between the United Nations and Korea," he said. "It is just stupid to suggest that China has done nothing in this. It is equally stupid to suggest that His Majesty's Government have no policy of their own."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to comment briefly on the dispatch, within the time allowed me.

On February 1, by a vote of 44 to 7, and with 8 absent, the General Assembly of the United Nations determined that the Chinese Communists were aggressors in Korea. Twelve days have passed since that action was taken by the United Nations. I think the Senate of the United States and the American people are entitled to know what sanctions, if any, have been proposed by the United Nations, whether they be economic or military.

I also believe that both General MacArthur and General Ridgway are entitled to have a clear understanding as to just what the policy on the part of the United Nations is in regard to the Korean situation. Those generals have had their hands tied behind them up to this time by the limitation which prohibits the United Nations forces from attacking military targets north of the Yalu River, whether they be supply depots, air bases, arsenals, or troop concentration points from which reinforcements are being sent to attempt to destroy the United Nations forces in Korea.

Mr. President, it is bad enough to ask men to fight and to risk their lives when they are placed under those very severe handicaps which are recognized as such by every responsible American commander in Korea and by every soldier, sailor, and airman fighting in Korea. If His Majesty's Government is going to propose that the United Nations forces not go north of the thirty-eighth parallel, it is time that information was very clearly outlined in specific detail. What, in effect, this will mean, Mr. President, is that the Communists of North Korea will be assured that they will have the opportunity to build up a Korean government north of the thirty-eighth parallel, and it will make military operations very difficult if this limitation is placed upon General MacArthur and General Ridgway.

However, more important than that, Mr. President it is time that we have a clear understanding as to what the Prime Minister of Great Britain proposes to do in the event the forces of the Republic of Korea are going to go north of the thirty-eighth parallel. I was in Korea last November. I am convinced that the Republic of Korea will never be satisfied with having that country divided at the thirty-eighth parallel. The fact of the matter is that Korea cannot exist economically or politically if divided at the thirty-eighth parallel.

I predict that Mr. Attlee will have some difficulties with the government of the Republic of Korea and with the 38,000,000 free people of South Korea if he attempts once again to establish a Communist regime north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

#### CONFIRMATION OF ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE NOMINATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield briefly to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that I may report, from the Committee on Armed Services, various and sundry routine nominations and promotions in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. These nominations have been before the committee for some 2 or 3 weeks, and they are reported unanimously by the committee. In the interest of economy, and to avoid the expense of having to print the nominations in the RECORD on a subsequent occasion, I also ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nominations may be confirmed en bloc forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that, as in executive session, he be permitted to report the nominations from the Committee on Armed Services? The Chair hears none, and the report of the nominations is received.

Is there now objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the nominations be considered at this time?

Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### UNITED STATES MILITARY AND CIVILIAN POLICY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I believe that there is a fear among the people of the United States that we are facing another war. It is my belief that that is exactly what Russia wants us to believe. I am convinced that at the present time Russia wishes our people to become so frightened and so stirred up that the United States will rush headlong into full armament and at the same time cripple the domestic economy. Russia wishes the United States to do that, not only to make our country spend money, but also in order to keep the Russian people in fear that America will attack Russia.

Today the Russian leaders are telling their people that the United States intends to attack them. Mr. President, the people of America know that is not true. On the other hand, the American people are saying that Russia is going to attack us. I do not believe that is true as of now. On the other hand, I do not want anyone to think that in time of peace we should not prepare for war. We must do so. At the same time we must keep our feet on the ground, so to speak; we must keep our economy sound, in order to pay off the enormous debt we owe and keep our people employed, in order that the Russians will not have a fertile field in which the Communists can stir up strife and discontent and form their own fifth columns in America.

For that reason I have prepared some remarks on this subject, to let the people of the United States know that we do not fear Russia, that we can take

care of Russia, and that we want Russia to know that we can take care of her if a war is forced upon us. We want Russia to know, also, that we have allies, who will assist us in case of a war. We should let Russia know those things.

Mr. President, in the events of the past month, I sense a heartening development in the return to the national scene of the fine perspective and moral judgments that have always served America so well in periods of trial and conflict.

I feel and see, as you must, Mr. President, a growing measure of real unity that comes from a true understanding of the issues in world affairs and from their full and honest discussion to which we here and all our citizens have been treated by the Members of this Congress.

We may well take comfort from the fact that in this hour of great challenge, we have proved again that we have leaders who, by their scholarship, patriotism, and statesmanship, have demonstrated their ability to deal with the complex and numerous problems whose constructive solutions are so tied in with our national well-being and the future security and prosperity of the democratic world.

As this debate has gone forward, all of us have been made increasingly aware of the fact that we are engaged in a struggle for the continuance of our American way of life. The values we hold dear are daily under contest in many parts of the world. We cannot take anything for granted; but, rather, we must make a positive and constant effort to secure and expand the rights which we as Americans consider priceless.

In the recent past I believe we have been prone to bring an emotional rather than a factual and objective appraisal to the global situation. Once we enthroned fear as the basis of our plans and programs and are confronted with its extensions at every turn, then we are subject to gross and costly error. That is why I am particularly glad to note at the present hour a return to sanity and realism. Once we fully consult our own resources and project them into global strategy in relation to the assets of our allies of the free world, we find that our position is promising, not dismaying; we have the task of making the most of what we have, speedily and with intelligence.

As to the current differences on use of American military manpower abroad, I am glad to note that they appear to be receding to the point of what would be reasonable under the circumstances for the protection of world peace.

The Russians are generally credited with having available for action in Western Europe a striking force of about 175 divisions. To this force it may be expected naturally that they could muster up substantial additional reserves. This standing army, augmented by the vast armament which the Soviet Union possesses and by the standing troops in the satellite countries, we know is far beyond what Stalin and his Kremlin masters require in order to protect the national interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The physical powers and the foreign policy of the Soviets clearly constitute a threat to

world peace. Of this we must never lose sight, no matter how greatly we may be tempted to shy away from this distasteful situation.

In the face of this threat, we have the job of rallying the resources of the democratic world to meet the situation, and of developing such strength that our would-be enemies will realize the futility of contesting our strength.

Before we get on with the development of the factors of strength in America, I believe we should proceed cautiously and not write off Europe at one stroke, as so many of our self-styled experts are inclined to do. There are substantial anti-Russian forces in Europe, and they constitute elements which need to be reckoned with. At the moment I am making particular reference to nations which are not technically associated with the Atlantic Treaty powers. Thought needs to be given to advancing their availability and increasing their effectiveness. I feel that we may be certain General Eisenhower is giving due attention to these forces in his calculations and over-all plans.

Yugoslavia, for instance, has an army of 32 divisions, or 400,000 men; Greece, 8 divisions, or 130,000 men; Turkey, 30 divisions, or 550,000 men, and Spain, 30 divisions, or 450,000 men.

Let us examine all this aspect for a moment. We know that Tito's men would have their work cut out for them, since Stalin has approximately three-quarters of a million satellite soldiers in arms around the borders of Yugoslavia. Nevertheless Tito stands as a serious obstacle to any Soviet walk-over of Europe. While the Grecian Army probably would be occupied mainly at home, it is well trained, and even though small, it would act as a road block to a Soviet blitz.

Any way we look at it Turkey and Spain have forces that could play an important part in the western defense. Judged by professional standards, Spain is said to have one of the best armies in Europe, and we all know the battle strength of the Turks. If the military forces of the nations I have just enumerated were to be added to the military strength now being developed for General Eisenhower's command, there would be a solid basis for hope that the Soviets could be withstood until the full powers of the free nations could make themselves totally felt.

What are the prospects of such an all-Europe front against Soviet expansionism? Turkey has clearly lined up with the west against Russia, and the Turkish force would appear to be clearly available. American money and equipment have been made available to the Turks to bolster their military strength. Turkish soldiers are in the thick of the fight in Korea. Staff liaison would appear to be the principal need, and this could be arranged. In my opinion, too, the quicker we arm Western Germany the better it will be for the allies; for if war should start now, it would start at the Rhine, but if we had Western Germany, then it would not begin at the Rhine, but would begin on the other side of Western Germany, which would be to our advantage. I think the military

leaders of the allies should train a German Army. I am not now speaking of Germany's coming back and being built up immediately, but we need them, and we had just as well be sensible about it and handle them to our advantage.

When we come to the western fringe of Europe the situation is different. Only within recent weeks has the United States restored full diplomatic recognition to the Franco government. With the appointment of an Ambassador to Spain, America gave signal recognition to the realities of the day. The world picture made our new policy advisable. Too long did we harken to the promptings of voices which contended that the rightist leanings of the Franco government could be modified by the application of political and economic pressures. Our military authorities have long urged the resumption of diplomatic relations with Spain. Although General Eisenhower did not find it convenient to confer with Franco on his recent tour, it would be well to hear what he has to say about linking up the assets of Spain with those of other European nations banding in defense against Communist aggression.

While we are on this aspect of the general question of husbanding our global strengths, it will not be amiss to say a few words regarding Japan. The Chinese Communist invasion of Korea clearly points up the need for a peace treaty with Japan, concluded at the earliest possible reasonable date. Japan, alone among the states of the Far East, presently holds the potential of offsetting and frustrating the Communist drive to dominate Asia. Japan's industrial capacity and her military potentials loom large as assets to withstand the aggressive onslaughts of Communist China.

As in the case of an Austrian peace treaty, Russia with her legalistic bickerings is playing the part of an obstructionist. Russia does not want any Japanese treaty; she does not want any revival of an economically and militarily potent Japanese Nation fostered by democratic principles.

There are many who perhaps have emotional blocs against the United States pushing for the revival and restoration of a recent enemy belligerent. But it would be foolhardy for us to work against our own best interests and the best interests of a stabilized world condition for such a reason.

Because of the predominant role we played in the Pacific War, we have the right to call the turn on the Japanese Peace Treaty; and if Russia wants to play dog in the manger, that is her privilege. Everything we can do should be done to hasten the day when Japan is a sovereign democratic nation so that her strength may be joined in the fight of the free world to turn back communism.

If these things were accomplished in Europe and in Asia the complexion of the world picture would be altered materially. We would come to look differently at our own manpower requirements and needs if all our efforts were exerted to get everybody on our team that wants to be there, and should be there.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am wondering whether the Senator from South Carolina has given any consideration to the possibility of a few allies behind the iron curtain. It seems to me that we are locking horns with a very unorthodox type of attack. The Communist imperialism has used with great success fear propaganda warfare, economic warfare, political warfare, and actual military warfare. It has used with some success in some parts of the world saboteurs and agents within our country and in many of the other countries of the world. The people of Poland have a great passion for national independence. The history of Poland is that of a great people desiring with fervor and emotion their independence. There are also the people of Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I would also include that former great democracy, Czechoslovakia. It appears to me that we should be practicing at this stage of world history what we practiced during World War II when we had the OSS and when we had our agents going behind enemy lines. They were in Yugoslavia and in Czechoslovakia, stirring up the people against the Nazi oppressor.

Is there any reason in the world why we should not be able to bring into our fold untold millions of people who would be anxious to work for the cause of human freedom if we but had contact with them? Possibly we do have such contact with them; I do not know. There are some things which we are not privileged to know. But it appears sensible not only to think in terms of Western Europe and of the friends we have in the Philippine Islands, but let us think of the peoples who over the centuries have fought for freedom—the Poles, the Czechoslovakians, the Bulgarians—who are ruled by a handful of Communist political leaders.

I think it is safe to say that in Czechoslovakia 90 percent of the people are anti-Communist. We should not lose touch with them.

I wanted to bring this thought to the Senator's attention because I pretty much agree with what he is saying, but I want us not only to have our own strength for combating Soviet imperialism, but I should like to remind the Senator, in all friendliness, that there are forces within the Communist Empire who are ready to fight for freedom.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I sincerely thank the Senator for Minnesota for his contribution. There are, it is true, millions of persons back of the iron curtain and in the satellite nations who are only waiting to be given an opportunity to shake off their shackles. There is no question in my mind about that. I think America could spend more in the field of propaganda, as we may call it for want of a better term, to sell the truth as to what is taking place in America and letting those people know what a democratic nation stands for and what privileges we have here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Today, February 12, marks the birthday of a great American who has gone down in history for many brilliant accomplishments, one of which was his emancipation proclamation. Does it not appear to be a wise and prudent policy on the part of our Government that we make to the world not only an expression of friendship, as was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] recently in a resolution, in which I joined, expressing friendship for the Russian people, a friendship which I am sure we have for them, but would it not seem a wise and prudent policy to announce through the Congress of the United States, the people's representatives in this country, a sort of emancipation proclamation for all enslaved peoples?

I think the people of Poland are a little bit worried about our containing policy. They think we are going to let them go by the board. I am against the containment idea, and I want the Senator to know that that is my position. I think containment is essentially a negative program. I believe we should be thinking about ways in which we may liberate people.

I can think of no better day than February 12, 1951, to say to people who have been enslaved by Communist hypocrisy and defeat that they are not forgotten souls; that, actually, they are very precious on the agenda of human liberty, and that we are interested in their salvation and in helping them in the process of liberation. Just as we need the armies of France—and the Senator has mentioned the armies of Spain and Greece, and I concede we need those armies in our military program—so do we need to breathe continuous hope into the hearts and minds of all peoples behind the iron curtain to let them know that we are just as much concerned about their liberty and freedom as we are concerned about the liberty and freedom of France, England, and Western Germany. The only difference is that Poland has already been assaulted; she has been partially consumed by the Communist fire. We should remind those good souls—and they are our friends—that they are not forgotten, that they may temporarily be enslaved, but they are going to have their hour of emancipation, and that this Nation, dedicated to emancipation, is going to try to help them in every possible way.

I wish the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the great leaders of the Senate and of the House would say again and again, every day in the week, to the peoples of the world that we are not only interested in saving what we have but we are interested in the welfare of all peoples and desire to help them liberate themselves from the masters who would grind them into the dirt and into deprivation and misery.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senator from Minnesota that I shall touch on that point as I proceed with my speech. I believe we should let the countries which are satellites of Russia know that we are interested in them and that the reason we are not helping them

at this time is because we cannot reach them in our efforts to help them. That is our problem in spreading the gospel to them and letting them know about our American way of life.

Although much of the world is tired, disillusioned, and cynical, yet freedom still remains the greatest attraction to man, and with our leadership and support much can be made of situations which, as I said before, all too many people are too ready to write off as liabilities.

We have good reason to believe, for instance, that despite the apparent iron-clad Soviet rule of the satellite states there are strong underground movements which await only the day when the signal is given for them to throw off their wraps and enter the fight for freedom. And the same thing applies inside Russia where a small Communist elite impose their regime of organized inequality on the millions of exploited Russians.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from South Carolina on his observations. I did not know that he would bring out that point. He has surely thought far beyond what I have thought on this issue. I wish only to add one idea. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina will have something further to say about it.

According to newspaper reports, some of the Communist leaders in European countries were trained in Moscow in the principles of communism. Years ago they attended special training courses in Moscow. That is particularly true of such leaders as Togliatti, in Italy, and Gottwald, in Czechoslovakia, as well as of many other Communist leaders. They were trained at Moscow in the techniques of communism. It appears to me, Mr. President, that it would make good sense and that it would border on reasonableness, for the Government of the United States to try to smuggle from behind the iron curtain some of the key democratic leaders and to train them in all the lines they need training for reestablishing free rule in countries behind the iron curtain as well as to feed to them supplies, money, and every conceivable instrument that would be useful to their liberation.

Instead of our always worrying about what the Communists are trying to do to us, I should like to have the Communists behind the iron curtain, in Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, worrying about what we are trying to do to them. I should like to have them wonder whether we could launch counterespionage and counterattacks which would be successful. I think we have been a little weak in that respect. I do not know why. I do not think we have put sufficient emphasis on the philosophy of a counter-attack, of trying to get behind the iron curtain and engaging in guerrilla warfare, whether it be political, economic, or diplomatic. We have not done enough along that line. I hope the Senator will touch on the point further along in his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Probably not the least deterrent to the Politburo's go-ahead for an all-out war is the grim prospect of policing Europe to the English Channel, in the event Soviet arms were initially successful. This they know might well be the wheel on which the Soviet rule would be broken as their far-flung occupation faced the terrors of not one, but many underground armies.

Let us not fall into the error that Western Europe's potentialities are spent. There on the continent which nurtured western civilization and gave to the world its brightest periods in man's history are vast physical resources, great reservoirs of human skill, fires of human spirit. All can be made to serve the cause of liberty once again.

We can and must understand, however, that Europe's people have been through one agony after another. Communities have been pounded into rubble, economies wrecked, human weariness grown to the point of despondency. There is dullness and despair to be found in some places, cynicism and wretchedness, but beneath all this is the spring of hope and aspiration that can never be choked off while life remains.

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

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

Mr. LANGER. The Senator spoke of despair and rubble. Has the Senator been in Europe recently?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have been there, but not recently.

Mr. LANGER. How long ago was the Senator in Europe?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Not since immediately after the First World War.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator speaks of rubble and despair. There is not much of it today. Some of the countries of Western Europe are in better shape than the United States. I was there only a few months ago. Denmark and other countries are in better shape than the United States. We have 10,000,000 families who are living on \$2,000 a year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator will remember that Germany has been laid low.

Mr. LANGER. Germany has been laid low. I visited Germany. Did the Senator from South Carolina read the report which was made recently by the distinguished Representative from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are building back fast. There is no question about it.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wondered how much of the despair which the Senator has mentioned he knows to exist from his own experience.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At the outset I referred to the number of divisions the Russians have. It would be well, I believe, before we lead ourselves into miscalculations to understand that a Soviet division is not so large as an American division. The Russian division has approximately 10,000 men, whereas ours run from about 17,000 to 18,000. It can be seen at once that speaking purely in terms of divisions, comparatively, we may ascribe to the Soviets more armed

and trained manpower than they actually possess.

Again for sake of guidance, and not in any way to minimize the threat that confronts the West from the Soviets, we may be generally safe in asserting that the Soviet soldiery may be counted upon to be more effective in defending the homeland than in purely offensive action. All of this should figure in our reckonings.

By the same token we cannot ignore the comparative strength of Communist and democratic forces in the air and on the sea. In strategic air power we have the decided edge, and this, of course, would be the instrumentality through which either side would deliver the A-bomb. On the other hand, in numbers, if not in quality of aircraft, the Soviets have the advantage in tactical air power, although we can do much to whittle down the disparity if we push along quickly in our plane-procurement program. On the seas, we are very much out front, especially in surface craft; our advantage is encouragingly marked when we consider the total naval strength of the free world powers. We are adding to this, too, and emphasis is being put upon improved undersea craft.

What I am saying is that there is no need or sense for us to be intimidated into adopting any course which runs contrary to our national conscience or our national interest.

We have what it takes to prevent any power from winning a modern war, and if we proceed with our mobilization program without any undue delays we should shortly be at a point of actualized power where it would be foolhardy for any nation or combine of nations to launch a war.

I feel that one of the chief dangers we must avoid is that of falling into rigid and unimaginative planning on the international scene. Some of our people, with the very best of intentions, have brought themselves around to a mental attitude of "It's all this way, or else." I am of the conviction that no one has a corner on just what is best for the world. Frequently when I am about to cast my vote in the Senate I honestly do not know whether I am voting correctly. In such cases I only ask God to guide and direct me in my vote. As a matter of fact, the whole international situation is in a condition of fluidity and change. We have the task, through our intelligence, of keeping alert to every possible alteration of fact and attitude in the world, and playing it accordingly. No arm is more important than accurate intelligence. We must insist on adequate, competent intelligence service. Only through such media can we steer the right, safe course.

It is of vital and primary importance that we know at the earliest possible date of any weak spots that may be developing within the Soviet orbit of power. How about conditions inside the iron curtain? What about the reports that the Ukraine may be a source of internal trouble for Stalin? We must find out.

In the same way, we must take every step to insure putting our story across to the Soviet world. We know that in the open, the Communist way, with its

phony doctrines of equalization, with its special privileges for the elite, with its organized techniques to prevent a free press and free assembly, with its terror apparatus and secret police, cannot stand the competition of a free society. The more we can let the captive peoples of the world know about the real America the faster we can crack the barriers which are maliciously maintained to keep the whole world divided.

Words are weapons, and propaganda with us must be a major instrument of national policy, just as it is with the Soviets.

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

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

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in what the Senator had to say about Saigon and Burma and some of the other countries. Does not the Senator think it is more important to clean up the slums in the city of Washington within two or three or four blocks of the Capitol than to send money over to Saigon or Burma?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not believe the Senator heard me say anything about Burma or Saigon.

Mr. LANGER. I think the Senator mentioned Saigon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am sure the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. LANGER. What country was it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was speaking of other countries. The Senator knows my position as to spending American money abroad. I have never been in favor of spending too much money under the Marshall plan.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator agrees with me that it is more important to remedy slum conditions in Washington, does he not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am in favor of dealing with the slums at home. I am in favor of taking care of the home front. I think we should take care of that at the same time when we are looking after the world situation.

In recent months we have been showing considerable improvement in our informational effort, and there are present signs that in the days ahead even more fruitful results will be forthcoming from this source. For too long a time we have been too modest, backward, and subjective about telling the American story to the world. We have a moral arsenal in the saga of this great Republic, and it behooves us to make the most of it.

Certainly we come before the world with clean hands. Our performance during the Berlin airlift was a lesson in humaneness and heroic endeavor that ranks high in the history of the world. True to our promise, we gave the Philippines their independence. The MacArthur stewardship of Japan is something without precedent in history. I wonder how many of us have paused to ponder that Japan, only recently our bitter enemy has been so won to our side that when the Korean invasion by Communist aggressors was launched last June, General MacArthur could virtually strip Japan of all our military forces, dispatch them to the Korean front, and be

secure in the knowledge that the Japanese would make no overt move to profit by the situation. Yes, we have a moving story to tell through the Voice of America.

My approach to this whole question of what is best for America and the democratic world in this troublesome period is one of critical constructiveness. I believe I have thrown some light on several areas in which we may have greater sources of strength.

Now one of the things which have caused me a great deal of concern is manpower policy. I know there are many horns to this dilemma. As we proceed in this mobilization it behooves us to keep before us the fact that there are limits to our manpower, just as we should not forget that the battlefield is only the extension of the home front. While providing for adequate armed forces, we also must not disrupt the national work force to the point where production goals will not be met; again it is important to our Nation's future that we take steps to assure our educational institutions that they will not be depleted, and the country thus denuded of that leadership so essential to our national progress.

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

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

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator mind repeating what he said about Berlin? I did not quite catch his statement. Did he say we did a good job in Berlin?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I said we did a good job with the airlift in Berlin.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator certainly would not say we did a good job when we gave all the territory around Berlin to the Russians, and have to ask the Russians, "Won't you please let us bring some foodstuff into the city?"

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the Senator was out of the Chamber when I was speaking a few moments ago. I think there should be some peace terms arranged for Western Germany as soon as possible.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator see the poll taken by John McCloy, as published in the Wall Street Journal, which indicated that only 5 percent of the Germans would volunteer and only 10 percent would fight if they were drafted. That appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 19.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Such a condition will exist until they are giving more privileges at home. I think we should give the people in Western Germany greater privileges.

Mr. LANGER. What privileges would the Senator give the people of Western Germany?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would not have done what was done to the people of Western Germany or Eastern Germany. I would not have taken the machinery from their factories and used it somewhere else.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know who is to blame? Is it not a fact that Russia so completely controls Berlin and Vienna that the Americans who

helped capture those places cannot enter them?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As the Senator knows that is a long story. He knows it would take me several hours to go into the details, and explain what took place and what did not take place in regard to why the Russians are where they are today.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield that I may ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota?

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

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from North Dakota studied the history of the fighting around Berlin; has he counted the American losses which would have been sustained had we gone ahead ourselves and attempted to capture Berlin; and has he studied the situation as it developed afterward, when we permitted the Russians to capture Berlin in order to save the lives and prevent the suffering of American boys?

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator addressing the question to me?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

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

Mr. LANGER. I made a complete study of it. Not only that, but I went to Germany to investigate. I found there that the German population took off their white shirts, got on the roofs, and waved their shirts, and wanted the Americans to come in because America was a much better friend of the German people than were the Russians. What did we find the condition finally to be? We found an agreement under which the Russians completely surrounded the area of Berlin and the area of Vienna. My understanding is that the Ambassador, the man who committed suicide, John Winant, was not blamed, that it was a matter of carelessness that a corridor was not left so that the Americans could go into the city of Vienna and into the city of Berlin.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota was in that area as soon as was the present speaker, and realized that the Russians would overrun Berlin before VE-day. I agree with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the Germans would have welcomed the Americans, and would have welcomed an American occupation of East Germany. I talked with East Germans, with Lithuanians, with Letts, and with others about it. But, unfortunately, a situation had arisen in which armies had advanced to definite lines. It would have meant an immediate joining of hostilities between Russia and the United States at that time.

I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I hesitate to blame anything on John Winant. To my mind he was one of the best ambassadors I met in all the European theater. At this time I want to pay tribute to him because, when I talked to him in London in 1945, he appeared to be the only one who fully

realized the Russian menace. I now think his unfortunate suicide was based upon his realization of the menace we faced from Russia. I say that because, as it seemed to me, he was the only American diplomat in the European area who knew what was going on inside Russia. He knew the Russian system as operated by the Politburo. I believe his realization of that menace was the reason why he took his own life. He was in England at the time, and I do not think he could have resolved the situation. I think the matter was probably settled—and I hate to blame anybody for it—in the United States. I want to protect the memory of John Winant because I had the highest respect for him, I regarded him as a great American, a great diplomat, and a great patriot, and I still do. I wished to make that statement for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota. Incidentally, Mr. Winant was not a constituent of mine and never had been.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the distinguished Senator from West Virginia tell us who was to blame for the fact that Russia completely surrounded Berlin and Vienna so that Americans could not see and visit the countries they helped to liberate? I may say that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] was one of the men who fought over in Europe in World War II. The Russians took for themselves all the country around Vienna, including Salzburg and Linz. The Senator from New Jersey was High Commissioner there. One day he received an order that, in spite of the fact that many of our boys had been killed in conquering that territory, the American Army must march back some 200 miles, and it did so. Does the Senator know who is to blame for that?

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from North Dakota is now jumping from the Berlin area to the Austrian area. I was talking about the Berlin area. I think the Senator from North Dakota will find that the Russian troops had completely overrun and surrounded the Berlin area, and that we had to accept what we could in the Berlin area.

As to the Austrian area, let me say this: A man by the name of Eli Perkins, a very fine Baptist preacher of the city of New York, once said—and I think the people of the United States of America would do well to heed the statement Eli Perkins made—"If our foresight was even one-fourth as good as our hindsight we would all be rich." A certain situation existed. In the face of that situation the men on the ground had to decide what to do. Whether that decision had to be made by our State Department or generals in our Army, I do not know. I do not want to place the blame on a man who, through, let us say, a complete lack of foresight, failed to understand what the result of the decision would be. We, with our much better hindsight, can understand what should have been done. I hesitate to place the blame.

The Senator from North Dakota sometimes defends lost causes, and I know that predecessors in the Senate of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] defended lost causes. I know that our foresight sometimes is not so good as the hindsight of our grandchildren or even of our children. So let us not make general condemnation because of something which was done based on lack of foresight. That, I should say, it water over the dam. Let us see what can be done to get around the situation which has come about, and let us, with our good hindsight, correct the mistakes which may have been due to lack of foresight. Let us not, however, jump on a man of the greatness of John Winant and blame him for all that took place.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for an observation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New York for an observation.

Mr. LEHMAN. A few days ago I made substantially the same statement the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has made today, that our hindsight is likely to be much clearer than our foresight. But there are two things aside from that which seem very plain to me. In the first place John Winant was an intimate friend of mine. I saw him constantly during the war, because, as the Senator from North Dakota knows, during the period I was head of UNRRA I visited England and other areas of Europe frequently. He never made a statement to me such as has been ascribed to him. As a matter of fact I saw and spoke to him in New York the day before he killed himself. There was no indication of the correctness of the statement which has been ascribed to him.

Furthermore, let me say that we hear a great deal about the wisdom of what was done at Yalta; about a sick President being fooled. I maintain that the decisions made at Yalta were as sound, in view of the circumstances existing at that time, as they could possibly have been made. We were at that time preparing to invade Japan. We had great numbers of men in the Philippines poised to invade Japan. We knew that without Russian help the loss of lives of our fighting men would be staggering. We were not sure of Russia at that time. We were not sure that they were not going to make a separate peace with Germany. We felt it necessary to keep them as our allies ready to join us and fight our battles with us side by side as comrades.

As the Senator from West Virginia says, it is very easy now to be critical, 6 years afterward, in the light of developments which nobody could have foreseen. I am tired of that sort of talk, and I say that not in derogation of my esteemed friend from North Dakota, for he is not the only one who is indulging in it. Some persons less sincere than he, are making statements of that kind, I believe for political purposes, to tear down the memory and the record of the greatest American in my time, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I say that the judgments made at that time were sound in

the light of what was known and what was believed at that time. It ill behooves any one now to seek to destroy the memory and the deeds and the acts of a great man.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a brief statement.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may suggest to my distinguished friend from New York that sometime when he has the opportunity—I know he is a busy man—he read a book entitled "The Mistakes of the War," written by Hanson Baldwin, the military expert of the New York Times, a man who is not in politics. No one who reads in that book the record of the mistakes of the war, as set forth by this distinguished military expert, can possibly believe as does my friend the Senator from New York.

Returning to the question of Berlin and Vienna, not even the most uneducated farmer, whether he lives in Missouri, New York, West Virginia, or North Dakota, would buy a piece of land, 40 acres completely surrounded and inside of a section of land, and fail to reserve the right of the use of a road to get to his piece of surrounded land. Yet we did that with respect to Berlin. We did it again with respect to Vienna. When an American wants to go to Berlin or to Vienna he must ask of the Russians, "Will you please let me go to Berlin or to Vienna."

Perhaps hindsight is better than foresight. But when one mistake after another is made, I submit that criticism is justified. I think the only way one can learn is from studying mistakes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a brief statement?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, but this is the last time I shall yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to say to the Senator from New York that I hope I do not misquote Ambassador Winant. I know, however, that Ambassador Winant was troubled and worried about the future. I know that he knew the inside of Russia.

Let me say, further, that when reference is made to a case in which allies suddenly declare war upon allies—which is exactly what the Senator from North Dakota said—we should recall that at that time we were in the middle of a war in Europe, and we had a war going on in Asia, and VJ-day had not then occurred. I happen to know something about the conditions which existed at that time, for I was in Europe before VJ-day, and spent some time there when some of these things were occurring. Possibly we did allow the Russians to overrun a part of Germany, but they did so at the cost of a tremendous loss of life to themselves, and that meant a tremendous saving of life to our forces.

So, Mr. President, although I believe in criticism, if it is constructive, particularly when it occurs after the act, yet, of course, it does no good to advise a man

that he made a mistake in getting married, for example, although it is really worth while to give him advice on that subject before he is married. Possibly the same is true, as applied to women, in more cases than as applied to men.

However, in this case the United States was "married" to an alliance, without which the war could not have been won. All of us must realize that.

Mr. President, all too often we forget that fact when we indulge in criticism. At that time we had an alliance. At that time we had to work as allies. At that time representations were being made even by the great Eric Johnston and by many others who had returned to this country from visits abroad, in offering all sorts of trading propositions with Russia. I am familiar with some of them, because I attended a number of meetings, and heard those propositions stated. Many of those gentlemen had far more trading experience, I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota than had the present speaker, and I think they had a little better trading experience than has the senior Senator from North Dakota. Many of those gentlemen were somewhat inclined to recommend that we accept those trading propositions, as the Senator will recall if he happens to remember the speeches made by Eric Johnston. Of course, I think he is a very honorable gentleman. In this connection let me also refer to the head of the War Production Board, another very honorable gentleman. I think all of them were "taken in."

Mr. President, those are some of the things we must consider in contemplating this entire matter. We must not condemn a man like John Winant, and certainly we must not condemn the man who carried us from the abyss of despair, where we were at that time, to the brink of victory. They should not be condemned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if my distinguished friend from West Virginia will remain in the Chamber until the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has concluded his remarks, I shall answer him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, when the distinguished Senators began their colloquy a few moments ago, and referred to the mistakes which were made and why they were made, I had been discussing the manpower problem now facing us. I intend to point out some of the mistakes which probably were made.

I hope that our foresight this time will be a little better than our foresight was before, and I hope we shall profit by our mistakes. Our highest officials make mistakes, of course; but sometimes they make mistakes under circumstances and conditions which are just a little different from those existing at the present time. For that reason we cannot always criticize those officials for making such mistakes, for probably they did what they thought best under the circumstances then existing. If my memory serves me correctly, I did not hear many Senators criticize what was occurring when the United States Army stopped its fighting and let the Russians continue

fighting. I did not receive many letters from my constituents at home expressing opposition to what America was doing at that time. Neither did I hear any Senator speak in this Chamber or any Member of the House speak in the House of Representatives in condemnation of what was occurring then.

However, now, after many years have passed, and when conditions have changed, our hindsight is better than our foresight was on those occasions. Then it is that I hear the prophets of today begin to criticize and tell what we should have done many years ago. That is what is occurring in America today.

Mr. President, we should study our history, realize the mistakes we made in the past, and try to learn how to meet the situations which will arise in the days to come.

A few minutes ago I was speaking of the manpower situation now existing, and of its seriousness. One of the things I would like to see would be an efficient integration, at the very top level, of all the various policies relating to manpower for the Armed Forces, for the needs of the civilian population, and for the industrial-production program. I have in mind the lessons of the last war when only too often bickering and contradictory courses marked the home front, as the various agencies concerned with advancing the war effort created conflicts which were wasteful and costly in the end.

All of us know that in the last war, due to placement of war-production facilities, many communities were literally choked because they did not have sufficient houses, transportation, or community facilities to handle the load which was placed upon them. At the same time there were many other communities which fought in vain for war plants. As a result, in one place after another official bottlenecks of congestion were created, producing adverse economic, social, and moral results. What did it avail a father to make a high wage if he had to live in a distant city, pay wartime living scales, be separated from his family, and in the end have scant send-home pay? Homes divided and homes broken were too often the result. Anyone versed in industrial production will tell us that labor is vastly more efficient when employed at home than when it is compelled to become migratory.

One of the first ways in which we can meet the increasing demands upon our national manpower resources is to insist upon the adoption and execution of production policies which will make the utmost use of the available manpower pools of the country. This factor should be a guiding principle in the designation of new industrial facilities, and should be a prime consideration in the placement of war contracts. When all such surplus-manpower regions have been utilized to their capacity, it will be time to get on with the job of consulting the possibilities of using male and female workers in the upper age brackets.

On the educational front we have a serious situation. All of us have been disturbed, I know, by the pictures and news stories of the long lines of college

students who in recent days have been visiting recruiting centers, endeavoring to sign up in the armed services. Our patriotic youth has been rather hard put to know what to do. It is mightily encouraging to find them ready in such large numbers to volunteer. On the other hand, what of the future of our Nation if we are not to have educated leaders for the professions and the sciences and in other walks of life?

All of us, I know, welcomed the announcement, as I did, by Defense Secretary Marshall, the other day, of a basic new policy for enlistment in the Armed Forces by college students. According to Secretary Marshall, the policy is intended to prevent the waste to the Nation and the damage to the educational system that is involved in having young men leave school in mid-term because they desire to enlist in the service of their choice before they are called for preinduction physical examination by their local draft boards. As we know, under the old rule, no branch of the armed services would accept a voluntary enlistment after a man had received notice to report for his preinduction physical examination.

Under provisions of the new policy, it is provided that students enrolled in colleges or universities, and thus automatically entitled to deferment for the school year in which they receive their induction notice, shall, to the extent of available openings in each service, be allowed to enlist in the service of their choice at any time in the 2 months immediately preceding the final month of their school year. As in the past, each service would accept enlistments only to the extent that places were open for those who desired to enlist. The new policy provides that a young man called by selective service during the academic year would continue his studies and still retain the right to designate his choice of service. Services accepting enlistments during this 2-month period would not call the students to duty until they had finished their school year.

In the opinion of General Marshall, the new rules will prove of benefit to the students, the colleges, and the national defense effort. In making the announcement, he put emphasis on the importance of the Nation's maintaining a vigorous educational system and on eliminating the unsettled conditions which have developed throughout the country in college circles as a result of enlistments by men who wanted to enlist before they received their selective-service calls.

I was very much pleased, too, to see General Marshall at the same time urging college students enrolled in the Army, Navy, or Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps to make every effort to complete their courses as a patriotic duty. As General Marshall stated, ROTC is a fundamental element in all Departments of Defense planning for expansion and maintenance of the Armed Forces. Because of this, the Selective Service Act defers from induction under its provisions during all their college years selected ROTC students who sign agreements to accept commissions and to serve a minimum of 2 years

on active duty in the military service for which they are being trained. All ROTC students who successfully fulfill the training and physical requirements are assured of commissions in the Regular or Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

All this is very important to America's security. Our whole policy is one for the maintenance of peace. If, however, we are forced into a global war, it probably will be one of long duration, and will place a continuing emphasis on the need of trained military leadership. On the other hand, if we are to go on through a long period of tension, in a twilight zone, it becomes doubly important that we get on with the education of our young people, and at the same time give as large a number of them as possible military training. To this end, the ROTC programs rank high on our list of national requirements. I should like to see every educational institution in the country which is capable of maintaining an ROTC program in any or several of the armed services be assigned such programs to their capacity. Money spent in this way, I believe, would be a very sound national investment.

Sound over-all strategy—that is the need of the hour; strategy in all aspects and elements of our democratic life. We know that the enemies of democracy are strong, but they are not invincible. In a contest between a materialistic Godless atheism, which seeks to enslave the world, and a democratic order, founded on man's belief in God, democratic man will emerge the victor. The United States has never flinched in the face of a threat or a challenge, and we have no intention of abdicating before our responsibilities and opportunities now.

So I say, let us bring a calm and resolute frame of mind to the problems which need our attention, ever cognizant of the fact that each of us, as a Member of the Congress, has the right to his own views; being mindful of the fact that, although we may differ, none has a monopoly on patriotism, virtue, or wisdom. What needs to be done, we can do with good spirit, through constructive compromise, and in ways that will unite all our people, as America, a strong champion of freedom and justice, goes forward in confidence to achieve its destiny.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNING in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in the concluding remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, stressing the right of every individual to his own views, and so forth. Will the Senator not say that the Republican Party has kept this country out of war whenever it was in power, and that every time we have become involved in a war a Democratic administration has been in power.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In reply, I should like to ask the Senator

from North Dakota how any administration could have kept us out of World War II, after the attack upon Pearl Harbor? Would the Republican Party, which is the Senator's party, have kept us out of war, following that attack? Will the Senator from North Dakota answer that question?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I will answer it. Let me tell my good friend that, if there had been a Republican administration, there would never have been a Pearl Harbor attack. Let me tell the Senator further—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has asked me a question, and I want to answer it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Go ahead. I tell the Senator further that if—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, he yielded to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yielded for a question.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator asked me a question, and I should like to answer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has yielded for a question only.

Mr. LANGER. I may say further that we would never have had World War I, if we had followed the advice of that great Democratic Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, who resigned rather than become a party to it. He was a great Democrat who came from the Middle Northwest.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Can the Senator from North Dakota tell us how many Members of Congress voted against World War I?

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend that former Senator Gronna, of North Dakota, was one of the so-called "willful 12", who stood here and fought with former Senator La Follette to keep us out of war. He fought until he almost dropped. Let me say further—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. May I inquire of the Senator whether former Senator La Follette was at that time a Republican, a Democrat, or a Progressive? What was he?

Mr. LANGER. He was a Republican, I am happy to say. I may say further that Woodrow Wilson, as a candidate, carried the United States on the slogan, "I will keep you out of war." He carried my State on that slogan, although it was a Republican State. Woodrow Wilson carried it because he promised absolutely to keep us out of war. That was during the campaign in the fall of 1916, and within a few months, and on April 6, 1917, we were in the war.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota recalls the slogan "Remember the Maine," which occurred during the administration of William McKinley, as I well remember it, and also the slogan "Remember Pearl Harbor."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### FARM PRICES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE PRICE-CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Brannan, made a statement concerning farm prices and their relationship to the price-control program. It appears to me that the Secretary of Agriculture has brought to the attention of the people some very significant facts concerning farm income, farm prices, and their relationship to the price, wage, and profit picture. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Brannan be printed in the body of the RECORD, and I wish to invite particular attention to his concluding remarks, as follows:

Parity is the fairest available measure of equitable prices for agricultural products.

Parity never increases until after prices of goods bought by farmers have increased, and then only by enough to balance the increases in prices and cost rates paid by farmers. When prices paid by farmers go down, parity goes down.

So, Mr. President, I might say that if there is a desire for lower prices, that desire can be met by adjusting what is called parity; in other words, the relationship of things sold to the relationship of things purchased.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement by the Secretary of Agriculture be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

#### FARM PRICES IN THE PRICE-CONTROL PICTURE

A number of recent public statements have created the impression that agricultural commodity prices are unreasonably or disproportionately high in relation to prices of other consumer goods or to wages or to the farmer's costs. This impression is not warranted by the facts.

Other statements indicate that food prices are exempted from price control. This also is not true. On the contrary, food products now included in the freeze order represent about 40 percent of the total food cost in the BLS consumers' price index.

Still other statements seek to show that farmers have been given special or privileged treatment in the laws and regulations providing for inflation control. Again, this is not true.

The purpose of this statement is not to deny that prices of some foods and farm commodities have substantially increased but rather to show where they really stand in our economy of general prosperity and full employment.

#### 1. HOW HIGH ARE FARM PRICES?

It is true, of course, that prices received by farmers for many commodities have risen in recent months and are now high in relation to their own history. But the same is true of most other raw and finished goods. For example, since the Korean outbreak, tin has gone up more than 138 percent, aluminum over 78 percent, lead nearly 50 percent, chemicals about 27 percent, and textiles 32 percent. In the same period prices received by farmers have advanced 21 percent.

Prices received by farmers have still not reached their previous record level, while farmers' costs have gone on up to new record heights. On the other hand, corporate profits, wages, and average personal incomes are setting new records.

Here are major facts about farm commodity prices and farm income which should be considered in the present situation:

(A) Most prices of farm commodities to the producer are below parity—the statutory measure of fair relationship between prices received by farmers and prices paid by farmers. Some are above parity—meats in particular—but these are now under the same type of control that applies to all other prices.

Much has been made of the fact that the farm commodities selling below parity are free to rise and thus increase the cost of living before becoming subject to control. But if all farm commodities now below parity should reach the parity level, consumer food costs would rise less than 5 percent, and this would mean less than a 2-percent rise in the over-all cost of living.

Moreover, it is extremely unlikely that such a rise will occur. Prices of potatoes and oranges represent about a third of that 5-percent difference; those prices have been about 50 percent of parity and there are no current indications of substantial rises; also, canned fruits and vegetables now in the warehouses and grocery stores are from last year's crop, already sold by the farmer; thus, there is no farm price of those commodities to be increased.

(B) Food prices have risen less than prices of some other commodity groups in the BLS consumer price index. From June to December food went up 5.3 percent, while clothing rose 6.2 percent and house furnishings rose 10.6 percent.

Consumers' price index: Cost of goods purchased by wage earners and low-salaried workers in large cities, United States (1939=100)<sup>1</sup>

|                        | June 1950 | December 1950 | Percentage change from June 1950 to December 1950 |
|------------------------|-----------|---------------|---|
| All items.....         | 170.2     | 178.4         | +4.8  |
| Food.....              | 204.6     | 215.4         | +5.3  |
| Apparel.....           | 185.0     | 196.4         | +6.2  |
| Rent.....              | 123.9     | 125.8         | +1.5  |
| Fuel, etc.....         | 138.9     | 144.1         | +3.7  |
| House furnishings..... | 185.2     | 204.8         | +10.6   |
| Miscellaneous.....     | 155.3     | 162.0         | +4.3  |

<sup>1</sup> Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Compiled from Retail Price, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

As shown by the table above, rents were relatively stable. Exclude rents from the computation and it will be seen that the other items of the index rose approximately the same as food.

(C) The average of all farm commodity prices is just now overcoming the drop it took in 1948 and 1949. The drop in farm prices averaged 24 percent, while nonfarm prices and wages were either dropping very little or continuing upward.

As of January 15, prices received by farmers were still 2 percent below the January 1948 peak. While receiving lower prices, farmers had to continue paying high prices, with the result that their net realized income went down 3 years in a row.

Net income realized by farm operators dropped from almost \$18,000,000,000 in 1947 to about \$16,500,000,000 in 1948, about \$14,000,000,000 in 1949, and about \$13,000,000,000 in 1950. If prices had not risen substantially in the latter part of 1950, farmers' net income for that year would have been further appreciably reduced.

(D) No other major segment of our economy went through such a severe economic setback. In fact, corporate profits after taxes, following a small decline, have gone on up to new records and are now running about 32 percent above the 1947 rate. For 1950 as a whole they were 18 percent above 1947. Wages have gradually risen, and hourly earn-



ings of factory workers in 1950 were 18 percent above the 1947 level.

Corporate profits after taxes amounted to \$18,500,000,000 in 1947, went up to \$20,900,000,000 in 1948, were at \$17,000,000,000 in 1949, and reached a new record peak of \$21,900,000,000 in 1950. In the last quarter of 1950, they were running at an annual rate of about \$24,500,000,000. Factory wages were \$1.24 per hour in 1947, \$1.46 in 1950, and for December were \$1.54.

(See chart for these and other comparisons.)

It is sometimes said that it is unfair to compare recent trends with levels reached in 1947, the all-time high year for agricultural income. Other comparisons can be made. For example, for the last quarter of 1950 as compared with the prewar period 1935-39, food prices had slightly more than doubled, but consumers' disposable income per capita was more than 2½ times the prewar level. Also, in 1950 income from agriculture was running 2½ times the 1935-39 average, while nonagricultural income was almost 3½ times and corporate profits more than six times 1935-39.

It should also be remembered that until the early part of the recent war, agriculture had not fully recovered from its long depression of the 1920's and early 1930's. Comparisons based upon depression conditions are completely unfair. Comparisons with postwar benchmarks at least measure how the various segments of the economy have been doing recently.

(E) Food is a better bargain for the average person today than in the prewar period. Those people whose incomes have kept up with the average can buy with 19 percent of their disposable income the same diet that required 23 percent of their disposable income in 1935-39. It is true, of course, that persons whose incomes have substantially lagged behind the general rise are at a disadvantage—some seriously. They have a real problem which requires the sympathetic attention of the whole public. However, agricultural commodity prices in general cannot be geared to the needs of the disadvantaged group as long as other prices are left at high levels. The result would be to drive farmers out of business and disrupt production at the time we most need a strong, highly productive agriculture.

(F) Prices of many farm commodities have very little relationship to consumer prices. Several examples give this picture clearly:

The cotton in a shirt now selling for \$3.50 to \$4 probably did not bring the farmer more than 30 cents.

A 16-cent can of tomatoes represents about 3 cents of gross income to the farmer.

The corn in a can retailing at 19 cents brought less than 2½ cents to the producer.

Onions which were selling in stores in November for 5.7 cents a pound had been sold by the farmers for a little over 1 cent.

When milk leaves the farm, it immediately goes into a distribution and processing system that almost doubles its price in a few hours.

The wheat in a loaf of bread that sells for 15 to 16 cents brings the farmer only about 2½ cents. It is interesting to note that the retail price of bread has gone up 1.7 cents a loaf since June. If this were due entirely to a rise in the price of wheat, it would mean that wheat had gone up \$1.12 a bushel. Actually, the farm price of wheat in January was only 16 cents a bushel higher than it was before the Korean outbreak.

Although the farmer is getting a larger share of the consumer's food dollar than a year ago (now about 51 percent) this is still considerably smaller than the share received by the farmer in several recent years. In 1945 and 1946 the farmer's share averaged 54 and 53 percent, respectively. From January of 1943 through September 1948, the

farmer's share did not go below 50 percent in any month.

(G) Causes of price rises in agricultural commodities are somewhat different from the causes of price rises in nonfarm commodities generally. Prices of many manufactured items tend to rise because market supplies are being lowered in order to permit increased production of military goods. Most agricultural commodities, on the other hand, are available in record and near-record amounts, but demand is increasing as consumer incomes increase.

These considerations emphasize the importance of abundant production in the job of keeping prices of agricultural commodities at reasonable levels. On the other hand, it should not be taken for granted that agricultural production can be increased enough to meet all of the rising demands.

(H) The public does not ask manufacturers to produce military goods at less than fair returns. On new defense plants, rapid depreciation is permitted in order to reduce tax liability. Under the Defense Production Act, Government agencies encourage financial institutions to lend money to defense producers by guaranteeing the lenders against loss. The Government itself may lend money for the expansion of productive capacity, the development of technological processes, explorations and mining. The Government often makes advance commitments to buy what is produced.

Many agricultural commodities are of such importance that, if necessary for expansion of production, the public (through Government) would undoubtedly make to farmers some of the same concessions and guarantees that it makes to manufacturers and other producers of defense goods. Some such devices might become necessary if agricultural prices were depressed in relation to other prices.

## 2. ARE FARM PRODUCTS EXEMPTED BY LAW FROM PRICE CONTROL?

No. Prices of all farm commodities are subject to control as soon as they reach a legally specified level.

Important farm commodities were put under price control in the price-wage freeze order issued by the Economic Stabilization Agency, January 26. Among them were the meat animals, wool, cotton, cottonseed, rice, and flue-cured tobacco.

## 3. HOW DOES THE LAW DEFINE THE LEVEL AT WHICH A CEILING MAY BE PLACED ON AN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY?

No ceiling may be established below the parity price or the highest price received by producers during the period from May 24 to June 24, 1950. Both levels are subject to adjustment for grade, location, and seasonal differentials. Except in a few unusual situations, those provisions apply generally.

## 4. UNDER THE LAW, MUST CEILINGS BE HIGH ENOUGH TO PERMIT FAIR MARGINS FOR PROCESSORS?

Yes. The law says, "That in establishing and maintaining ceilings on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing."

## 5. DOES THE LAW SPECIFY THE LOWEST LEVEL AT WHICH CEILINGS MAY BE APPLIED TO WAGES AND TO PRICES OTHER THAN FARM COMMODITY PRICES?

Yes. The standard for both is the May 24-June 24 level, but exceptions are permitted. Prices found to be abnormal in that period can be adjusted to a representative level. Provision is also made for adjustment of hardships and inequities. Controls on wages, salaries, and other compensation must not be "inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, or any other law of the United States, or of

any State, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession of the United States."

## 6. IS THE PROHIBITION AGAINST BELOW-PARITY CEILINGS FOR FARM PRODUCTS INCONSISTENT WITH OTHER PRICE AND WAGE PROVISIONS OF THE LAW OR WITH ACCEPTED GOVERNMENTAL PRINCIPLES?

No. The law seeks to achieve certain purposes, including the control of inflation, by means which are fair and equitable. In consequence, its provisions are based upon certain standards contained in previous legislation—minimum standards for wages and working conditions in the field of labor and the parity or fair price measurement for farm products—as well as a general provision for normal or representative prices.

If the old standards of equity were to be abandoned, new legal standards would have to take their place or be improvised by administrators from day to day.

Neither agriculture nor business nor labor nor any other segment can properly be asked to bear controls first, alone, or inequitably. Such action would be neither effective nor fair. All must bear the responsibility together.

Parity is the fairest available measure of equitable prices for agricultural products.

Parity never increases until after prices of goods bought by farmers have increased, and then only by enough to balance the increases in prices and cost rates paid by farmers. When prices paid by farmers go down, parity goes down.

OPA officials, reviewing price-control experience during World War II, concluded in a publication issued in 1947 that "it does not seem possible that anything other than parity could have been adopted by OPA as an administrative method of measuring generally fair and equitable prices for agricultural commodities."

## REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF KEOKUK LOCKS ON THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, KEOKUK, IOWA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the President's budget for the coming fiscal year makes no provision for repair or replacement of Keokuk Locks on the Mississippi River, at Keokuk, Iowa. The dam at Keokuk and the locks are in a bad state of repair. A break-down in these facilities would impair or wreck river transportation on the upper Mississippi River. I have urged the Bureau of the Budget to reconsider its decision to delete funds for adequate repair or replacement. I have written to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations pointing out the importance to the national economy and defense of these vital river facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of my letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and an editorial from the Minneapolis Star of January 26, 1951, entitled "River Transport Faces Bright Future, Unless—"

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

FEBRUARY 1, 1951.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have on a number of occasions directed the attention of your committee to the matter of the rehabilitation of the Keokuk Dam, at Keokuk, Iowa.

I have recently been informed that although the Army Corps of Engineers included a one-million-dollar item in their

report to the Bureau of the Budget for the Keokuk Dam, the Bureau of the Budget saw fit to delete that item.

At this time, I would like to bring to your attention some data which I think is pertinent and should certainly receive the full consideration of your committee.

Nine-foot depth for navigation on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., a distance of 660 miles, has been available since 1939, but a serious bottleneck still exists at Keokuk, Iowa, about 170 miles above St. Louis, Mo., where the existing lock, built in 1913, is entirely inadequate for needs of present-day traffic. The existing lock is 358 feet by 110 feet, compared to 600-foot by 110-foot locks at other sites, and the 1,200- by 100-foot lock being provided at Chain of Rocks and proposed for new lock No. 19.

After 35 years of service, the old lock shows the effect of age and wear, and many of its mechanical features are nearing or have reached the end of their economic life. Major overhaul of the structure is urgently needed and should be undertaken at once if the new lock is not constructed in the immediate future. Unless such action is taken, the old lock, to a much greater extent than at present, will cause prolonged delays and interruptions to upper Mississippi River traffic. Even with complete overhaul, which could be accomplished only with intolerable interference with traffic for several years, the structure would remain an outmoded lock of short length with slow-operating characteristics, in a system of larger and faster operating locks.

Failure to rebuild the Keokuk lock would very seriously affect the security and economy of the territory adjacent to the Mississippi River, north of St. Louis. In substantiation of this statement, I quote Lt. Col. G. A. Finley, Corps of Engineers, of Rock Island:

"In answer to your request of October 26, 1950, for lock No. 19 traffic data for the 1949 navigation season, the following figures, for commercial tows only, are furnished:

|                                      | 1948 <sup>1</sup> | 1949      | 1950 <sup>2</sup> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Total tonnage.....                   | 1,573,410         | 3,514,072 | 3,080,920         |
| Average tons per tow.....            | 3,140             | 3,085     | 3,349             |
| Total number of tows.....            | 501               | 1,139     | 905               |
| Total number of lockages.....        | 1,007             | 2,195     | 1,810             |
| Time spent in lockages.....          | hours.. 1,004     | 1,872     | 1,582             |
| Time of delays to tows.....          | hours.. 537       | 1,000     | 1,000             |
| Average lockage time, per tow.....   | hours.. 2.00      | 1.64      | 1.75              |
| Average delay per tow.....           | hours.. 1.07      | .88       | 1.10              |
| Average time to transit lock 19..... | hours.. 3.07      | 2.52      | 2.85              |
| Average time per lockage.....        | hours.. 1.00      | .85       | .87               |

<sup>1</sup> 1948 figures are for June, July, October, and November only, as those were the only months when delays records were maintained. Total tonnage for 1948 season was 3,125,156 tons.

<sup>2</sup> 1950 records for March through September only are included.

The tonnage figures are preliminary, but it is considered that they would be in substantial agreement with the final official figure.

"In explanation of the apparently excessive average lockage time for 1948 season, it is pointed out that work on the discharge valves was carried out during the navigation season, and that the emptying time of the lock is increased about 25 percent when one of the valves is out of operation, as was the case for a considerable part of the 1948 season.

"On the basis of the 1948 season figures, had the proposed new lock been in operation, the 1,139 tows could have been passed in 1,139 lockages, and delays would have been practically eliminated. Since the filling and emptying time for the new lock, including gate operation time, will be about 10 minutes, and if 5 minutes each is allowed for

entering and leaving the lock, which will have much better approaches than the existing lock, the lockage time should be approximately 20 minutes if upstream and downstream tows alternate, and 30 minutes if all are from the same direction. For use in estimating time savings, 25 minutes is considered a fair average lockage time. Lockage of 1,139 tows would require 475 hours, a saving of 1,397 hours; these hours, taken with the 1,000 hours of delay time eliminated, make an estimated possible saving of 2,397 towboat hours. Similar figures for the 7 months of the 1950 season extended to a full season indicate possible savings of 1,549 hours in lockage time, plus 1,283 hours of delay, or a total possible saving of 2,832 hours.

"The value of savings in time, estimated (perhaps too conservatively) to be \$37.50 per hour for 1948 statistics, must be considerably greater by now, considering the steady increase in horsepower in new towboats and the increased construction, maintenance, and operating costs. We have no detailed information with which to revise our annual charge figures for the boat and barge fleets, but on the basis of a few figures on lay time charges and construction costs of tows now in the petroleum trade, we consider that \$60 per hour is not unreasonable. Using \$60 per hour for delays in 1949 and 1950, the annual value of delays and cost per ton moved through the Keokuk Lock are shown in the following tabulation:

|                               | 1948       | 1949      | 1950      |
|-------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Tons.....                     | 3,125,156  | 3,514,072 | 3,080,920 |
| Possible savings..... hours.. | 2,790      | 2,397     | 2,832     |
| Savings value.....            | \$2103,500 | \$143,820 | \$169,920 |
| Value per ton.....            | \$0.633    | \$0.041   | \$0.046   |

<sup>1</sup> 7 months' figures extended to 9 months.

<sup>2</sup> 4 months' savings figures extended to 9 months at \$37.50 an hour.

"Repair maintenance and improvement costs for the Keokuk lock for fiscal years 1949 and 1950 were \$94,993.25 and \$38,796.26, respectively. Figures for 1949 include \$45,560 spent on gate repairs and \$15,800 spent on discharge-valve repairs."

When you realize the amount of fuel which comes up the Mississippi River north of Keokuk, Iowa, should it be cut off, we would have difficulty in supplying an area that is further removed from the source of either solid or liquid fuel, and might cause extreme hardships to industries, communities, and the farming area.

I most sincerely urge the Committee on Appropriations to give adequate reconsideration to this vitally important matter.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

[From the Minneapolis Star of January 26, 1951]

#### RIVER TRANSPORT FACES BRIGHT FUTURE, UNLESS—

Nearly 3,000,000 tons of freight moved on the Mississippi River above Guttenberg, Iowa, in 1950. Most of it was shipped into or out of the Twin Cities. The tonnage is a gain of almost 20 percent over 1949, a gain of 2,000 percent since 1937.

These figures are cited in the annual report of the Upper Mississippi and St. Croix River Improvement Commission, an unpaid official agency of the State of Minnesota, manned by five public-spirited citizens.

River transportation of coal and petroleum products has become much more important to this State than most Minnesotans probably realize. The commission's report says:

"Except for the river, the State would be experiencing fuel and power costs which would definitely injure our economy. Electric rates here are competitive with those

near coal mines and power sites largely through low-cost barge transportation. When a serious fuel-oil shortage prevailed three winters ago, it was due to an early closing of water transportation and was relieved when navigation again opened."

Water traffic was particularly valuable to this part of the country during the war, when railroads were overloaded and freight cars wore out faster than new ones were built. With another defense emergency, the same threat of a fuel shortage must be faced.

Based on increases in river traffic in recent years, the time is not far off when 5,000,000 tons will be carried. But Army engineers warn that the river system is only as strong as its weakest link, and the weak link is the Keokuk, Iowa, lock.

When the 9-foot channel on the upper Mississippi was authorized in 1930, locks of 110 feet by 600 feet were agreed upon. A dam at Keokuk, built in 1913, already had a lock 110 feet wide and 365 feet long. Congress said that would have to do.

Keokuk has a lift of 38 feet, much higher than the usual lock on the river. This lift, plus the fact that barge tows must be broken up to get through the lock, slows up traffic at Keokuk. Delays of 6 to 10 hours are frequent.

Plans have been prepared for a 1,200-foot lock. The cost would be about \$8,000,000. That's a lot of money and in these times no unnecessary civilian expenditures should be undertaken. But the big role played by upper river traffic indicates that it is necessary to replace an antiquated lock that is near the limit of its capacity.

The Government now has an investment of \$170,000,000 in the 9-foot channel. Private industry has invested a quarter of a billion dollars to use the river. More industries are in prospect, unless the Keokuk bottleneck holds traffic near present tonnages.

Even an economy-minded Congress should consider how much a new lock would mean to improving the whole transportation system for a vital part of the Nation.

#### HISTORY AND SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 6 the Fraternal Order of Eagles observed its fifty-third anniversary. It is a pleasure for me to bring this fact to the attention of the Senate and to commend that organization and its 1,200,000 American members for its splendid community services. I am proud to be a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. It is a humanitarian organization; it is a patriotic organization. Dedicated to the four cardinal virtues of liberty, truth, justice, and equality, it has directed its energies in behalf of workmen's compensation, old-age pensions, social security, assistance to the Armed Forces, among many other great services. Its emblem is the national emblem of the United States, the white-crested American eagle, symbol of courage, strength, and hardihood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement setting forth the history of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and a summary of its accomplishments.

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

#### THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES AND ITS SOCIAL VISION

When the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, a life member of Buffalo (N. Y.) Aerie, signed the Social Security Act on August 14,

1935, he expressed his appreciation for what the Eagles had done.

"I have long observed with satisfaction the sponsorship by the FOE of social justice legislation both in the States and in the Nation. The records for more than a quarter of a century bear witness to the campaigns of education conducted, the literature distributed, and the addresses delivered by your socially minded order. These efforts have borne, and are bearing gratifying results. Our countrymen owe the Eagles much good will for their unselfish services.

"The pen I am presenting to the order is a symbol of my approval of the fraternity's vision and courage. May its possession inspire your 600,000 members to rededicate their own efforts and those of the fraternity to the insuring of such economic and political conditions as will bring a greater degree of happiness to our people."

A summary of the social legislation sponsored by the Fraternal Order of Eagles follows:

Eagles sponsored and led the fight for the enactment of the first mothers' pension law in the history of America, the Missouri law. An Eagle drafted and Eagles supported the first workmen's compensation act passed in any State in the Union, the Wisconsin law.

Eagles led the crusade for State old-age pension laws and the first State pension system, that of Montana, was introduced by an Eagle member legislator and signed by an Eagle governor.

Eagles spent 14 years campaigning for a national social security law and the President who signed the Social Security Act, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, gave the pen with which he signed the measure to the FOE in recognition of its pioneering leadership.

An Eagle made the first known public plea for the observance of a national Mother's Day and the order adopted the idea as a fraternal observance, long before Mother's Day became a national holiday.

Eagles played an important role in starting America's first Citizenship or I Am an American Day, with Manitowoc, Wis., as the locale of the first Citizenship Day program.

Eagles endorsed the principle of the guaranteed annual wage back in 1930 and are campaigning for a wider acceptance of the "52 pay checks a year" employment guaranty.

Eagles originated the observance of June 20 as Emblem Day, making the adoption of the American bald eagle as the official emblem of our country.

Eagles, at the request of the sponsors of the measures, joined in the fight to secure enactment of the GI bill of rights, as a framework for future veterans' service legislation.

#### HISTORY OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

The Fraternal Order of Eagles today is America's greatest benefit paying fraternity. More than a million members are affiliated with the fraternity that bears the banner of liberty, truth, justice, and equality in almost 1,800 communities in the United States, Canada, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, and Guam. Dedicated to brotherhood, friendship, and helpfulness to their fellow men and their communities, the Eagles have been a potent force for happiness and the enrichment of the lives of its members and all fellow citizens.

Who are Eagles? Eagles are people, your neighbor, the butcher, the grocer, the judge, the lawyer, the businessman, the civic leader. An Eagle may be the President of the United States, for four Eagles have served in the White House. An Eagle may be a celebrated sports figure like Jack Dempsey, or another famous American, like the late Father Flanagan of Boys Town. He may be a member of the Cabinet, or a Congressman. But whether he is known to millions, or only to his family and circle of friends in his home town, an Eagle is drawn into his

fraternity by his yearning for sociability, friendliness, and the opportunity to participate in worthy endeavors. In service to others through the Fraternal Order of Eagles, he finds a medium for enhancing the welfare of others, and contributing to his own inner satisfaction and joy.

Founded more than 50 years ago, the Eagles have achieved a noteworthy record in its programs and movements for economic and human betterment. It is a record that is still being written. It includes pioneering for the great social legislation of our time—the National Social Security Act, State old-age pensions, mothers' pensions, and workmen's compensation. The order has paid out millions to its members in sickness and death benefits. Its humanitarian service to all, regardless of race or creed, runs into inestimable totals. And with its benefactions, the Eagles have built up an organization with financial stability and integrity, with net assets exceeding more than a hundred million dollars. Today there are 1,778 aeries in the United States and Canada.

The growth of the Eagles achieved tremendous proportions under Administrative Director Matty Brown, who served as managing organizer from 1944 to 1950. During that period the membership reached more than a million. A total of 595 new aeries were instituted. The organization of ladies auxiliaries attained impetus, with the institution of 360 such units, and doubling of the membership to 92,000. Formation of the Junior Order of Eagles was launched, youth groups, sponsored by subordinate aeries, to provide sports, civic and recreational programs for boys and girls in a movement to build better citizens. Other significant developments included the establishment of an Eagle employee's pension system, the Eagles National Life Insurance Co., the architectural service department, the reserve membership department, and the benefit fund security plan.

#### THE MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

But undoubtedly most significant of all, the most humanitarian undertaking of many in the history of the order, was the establishment and operation of the Fraternal Order of Eagles Memorial Foundation. The foundation was born out of World War II, the brain child of the then managing organizer Matty Brown, who conceived it as a living memorial to benefit the lives of children whose Eagle fathers had given their lives for their country. The foundation was established through the generous donations of aeries and individual Eagles for philanthropic purposes associated with the order's programs and ideals. The initial work of the foundation is the providing of medical, dental, and other physical welfare services and college educations for the children of Eagle fathers whose lives were lost in World War II. Hundreds of these children are now being aided. As a perpetual fund, with the principal remaining intact, and only investment proceeds used, the foundation will in later years contribute to other worthy causes advancing Eagle ideals.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles was founded on February 6, 1898, by six theatrical men who sauntered over to the tideflats at Seattle and sat on a lumberpile to discuss the formation of a "Seattle order of good things." Little did they realize that their idea of a friendship society would be seized upon with such enthusiasm. The six founders, none of whom are now living—John W. Considine, John Cort, Tom J. Considine, Harry Leavitt, Mose Goldsmith, and Arthur Williams—invited a few more friends the following Sunday to join the new organization. At a meeting the following Sunday at the Bella Union Theater, with the stage of the theater as the lodge room, a constitution was adopted. A short time later the name of the organization was changed to the Fraternal Order of Eagles. New aeries were formed in

the region, and the purpose of the order broadened to include serious and significant programs for the general welfare.

#### THE EARLY DAYS

It is interesting to learn about the early development of the Eagles from the man who was in the best position to tell it, John Cort, one of the founders and the first grand worthy president. Speaking at the first grand aerie convention held at Seattle, May 6-9, Cort said:

"We called our lodges aeries because an eagle's nest is called an aerie," he said. "Shortly after the founding of the order, I went to Spokane, my old home. I talked to some of the boys about our organization, and out of that came Spokane Aerie No. 2. Then a little later, one of us happened to be in Tacoma and talked to some of our friends there. Out of that came Tacoma Aerie No. 3. Someone went to Portland, and we had Portland Aerie No. 4. Someone else went to San Francisco, and so we had San Francisco Aerie No. 5."

"You see, we theatrical people traveled extensively, and wherever we went, we usually found men who were interested in having an aerie. That's one of the reasons why you find aeries with low numbers even in the East; No. 40 in New York City, No. 42 in Philadelphia and No. 46 in Buffalo."

Aeries mushroomed rapidly. Soon the Fraternal Order of Eagles became nationally known, and the influence and prestige of the fraternity began to make itself felt in significant movements.

#### EAGLE MOVEMENTS

The first public plea for a national Mothers' Day was made by an Eagle, Frank E. Hering, on February 7, 1904, on the stage of English's Opera House in Indianapolis during a memorial program by Indianapolis Aerie. Under the leadership of Mr. Hering, who became grand worthy president and editor of the Eagle magazine, the idea spread. Subordinate aeries began observing a Mothers' Day, and in 1912 the grand aerie placed Mothers' Day upon the Eagle calendar, 2 years before the event was officially designated for national observance by Congress. In 1929, the American War Mothers officially honored Mr. Hering and the Eagles for their Mothers' Day role by dedicating a plaque at the site of the first Mothers' Day address.

The movement for State old-age pensions, which finally was to spread to practically every State in the Union, began through the initiative of the Eagles in Montana where the first old-age pension act was drafted by Representative Lester H. Loble, who later became grand worthy president. Supported by the Eagles, the measure was signed by the then governor, Joseph M. Dixon, a life member of the order, who said at the time: "You Eagles have planted this seed and you can no more stop the progress of old-age pensions than you can stem the tide of the Pacific Ocean." His words were prophetic. Led by the Eagles, other States began the enactment of similar old-age pension legislation.

Simultaneously, the order launched its pioneering campaign for the National Social Security Act. More than \$1,000,000 was spent to publicize the need for such a measure through pamphlets and other literature. When President Roosevelt, a life member of Buffalo, N. Y., Aerie, signed the act in 1935, in presenting the pen to the Eagle delegation which he had invited, he said:

"The pen I am presenting to the order is a symbol of my approval of the fraternity's vision and courage. May its possession inspire your members to rededicate their own efforts and those of the fraternity to the insuring of such economic and political conditions as will bring a greater degree of happiness to our people. \* \* \* Our countrymen owe the Eagles good will for their unselfish service."

Shortly before Mothers' Day was recognized by the Eagles, the order launched two campaigns for social legislation which were to bring a measure of economic security to millions in America.

A mother's pension act, the first in the Nation, was enacted by the State of Missouri in 1911, after Eagles initiated the measure and propelled it into law. The legislation was fathered by the late Judge Edward Everett Porterfield of Kansas City, an Eagle, who had observed the distress of needy widowed mothers in his courtroom. Other States began to follow the lead of Missouri.

A workmen's compensation act, also the first in the Nation, became law in Wisconsin about the same time as the Missouri legislation for mothers, again through the support of the Eagles. Daniel W. Hoan, an Eagle who became mayor of Milwaukee, drafted the measure, and although his proposal was bitterly fought in those early days, it passed, due to the efforts of the Eagles and organized labor.

#### PATRIOTIC LEADERSHIP

The FOE has taken the leadership in advancing patriotic observances. Emblem Day, commemorating the adoption of the eagle as the national emblem, by the Continental Congress on June 20, 1782, was first observed by aeries, and placed upon the Eagle calendar in 1943. Today, this event is annually observed by aeries and a movement has been started in Congress to proclaim the day as one for national observance. Eagles played an important role in launching America's first Citizenship or I Am an American Day with Manitowoc, Wis., the scene of the first observance.

In peace, staunch champion of the American ideals of freedom and democracy, the FOE in two World Wars rallied with all its resources and energies in the struggle to preserve this heritage.

In World War I, more than 47,000 Eagles served in the Armed Forces. On the home front, aeries bought millions in Liberty bonds, provided entertainment for veterans, boosted morale with letters and gifts to servicemen, and sparked blood donations and salvage drives in many Eagle communities. In World War II, 56,000 Eagles served on all battle fronts of the world, and 3,123 made the supreme sacrifice. On the home front, aeries purchased more than 25 millions in war bonds and the activities to aid the war paralleled those in World War I, only on a more expansive scale as the war continued in intensity.

#### THE FUTURE

More than a half century of noteworthy achievement and unselfish service behind it, the Fraternal Order of Eagles marches toward new and glorious goals, inspired by the slogan of its golden anniversary year in 1948—"Hats off to the past, coats off to the future." In the offing lies the objectives of Administrative Director Matty Brown: 2,000,000 members and 2,000 aeries. A vital and moving force for brotherhood among all men, America's greatest fraternity, remains steadfast to its oft-proclaimed ideals—liberty, truth, justice, and equality—and to the aims voiced with its founding—"to make human life more desirable by lessening its ills and promoting peace, prosperity, gladness, and hope."

#### SENATOR McCARTHY'S CHARGES AGAINST THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, today is the birthday of a great American. I well remember that last year I was severely criticized—incidentally, not by Democrats—for making a speech on Lincoln's birthday before the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in which I lauded Abraham Lincoln as a great, outstanding, and wonderful President.

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln once made a remark which is doubly appropriate on this day. That wise and honest man said:

If you forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never again regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all of the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

It is peculiarly fitting that we recall this quotation by Abraham Lincoln, for this is not only the anniversary of Lincoln's birthday, but also the anniversary of the bringing of the charges against the State Department by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

The junior Senator from Wisconsin made his first charge against the State Department and the Secretary of State in a Lincoln Day speech last year in my State. He spoke before the Republican Women's League at Wheeling, W. Va., and his speech was broadcast twice over radio station WWVA. I have before me his words which are still preserved on recordings of his speech.

The Senator from Wisconsin said:

I have here in my hand a list of 205 that were known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who, nevertheless, are still working and shaping the policy of the State Department.

Mr. President, many words have been uttered and spread upon the printed page since last year, and from this river of words a fog of confusion has risen and spread across the land. It is, therefore, in keeping with this anniversary that we penetrate to the source of this fog and see what we can do about clearing it up.

In the first place, the junior Senator from Wisconsin soon retreated from his Wheeling, W. Va., speech a few days afterward—on February 20, 1950—the junior Senator from Wisconsin told the Senate:

I told him there were 57 Communists in the State Department—205 who, according to the President's own Security Board, are security risks.

He retreated still further and on May 3, 1950, he explained to me on the floor of the Senate:

I will tell the Senator exactly what I gave the radio station, as far as I know. They were given a rough draft of the speech. It is entirely possible—I have not seen the draft since I gave it—that there was an error and that 205 was used in place of 57 instead of in connection with the Byrnes letter, but there is no doubt in anybody's mind—or in the mind of the Senator—

Referring to me—

that in that speech that night I used the figure of 57 as I stated. I said: "I have the names of 57 people in my hand who are either members of or loyal to the Communist Party."

The Wheeling, W. Va., speech was recorded. Affidavits have also been signed by Paul Myers, program director of Station WWVA, and by James K. Whitaker, news editor of radio station WWVA, that the Senator from Wisconsin indeed used the figure of 205.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has ceased calling them card-carrying

Communists and has called them "Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers."

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has attacked what he called the "silly numbers game" in connection with these charges.

Mr. President, let us assume that it is not important whether the junior Senator from Wisconsin accused 205 or 57 State Department employees of being Communists. It is important that he said they were employees of the State Department at the time the charges were made and that that fact was known to the Secretary of State. It is important that he stated at the time he made that speech that a definite number were card-carrying Communists and that the fact was known to the Secretary of State, thus casting a reflection upon that official.

Mr. President, 1 year has passed. The time has come for the junior Senator from Wisconsin to name the alleged Communists in the State Department. Who are they? While the controversy was raging on the floor of the Senate, when the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was being presented, the question was asked by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. As I recall the question—and I think I can quote it verbatim—the Senator from Washington said:

I am going back to my home State of Washington, and the first question I am going to be asked there is, "Are there Communists in the State Department?" Now I ask you, Did your committee find at the time of your investigation that there were Communists in the State Department?

To which the Senator from Massachusetts replied, in effect, that the committee did not so find.

Mr. President, for 1 year we have listened to a blue whirl of charges and accusations, but where is the proof? Where it is, Mr. President? Why can it not be introduced? Why can we not have the names of the men who have been charged with being members of the Communist Party and employed in the State Department, even though there be 57 of them? That was the last figure stated. If there are but 57 of them, why have their names not been presented to the Senate of the United States? If there are not that many, why have their names not been presented to the Senate of the United States by the real author of the accusation, whether there be 205 or 57?

Mr. President, I cannot make such a presentation. I would be worried if there were one Communist in a policy-making position in the State Department, as would be every other Member of this body. Yet when I go home to my State, where that speech was originally delivered, I am constantly faced by questions. The Presiding Officer well knows the kind of questions that can be asked by people in Greenbrier County, Mercer County, Monroe County, or Pocahontas County, W. Va. The people in those counties are of pioneer stock. They want to be sure that everything is right. How can I answer their questions unless

the names of the alleged Communists are disclosed? If their names cannot be disclosed, we should know who the author is. Who set the number? We should know, Mr. President, so that the people of my State, for whom I speak, can be told the facts.

I represent people of pioneer stock. However, such people are not found only in my State. Thank God, the places where they are found are limited only by the shores of the Atlantic, the shores of the Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico, the Mexican border, and the Canadian border. Thank God, they are found even beyond those borders. Mr. President, we want real government, not phony government. How can we answer the questions unless we know the names of the persons against whom charges were made a year ago? A year's time should be sufficient for anyone to be able to disclose the names of the persons who were so charged. If the names cannot be furnished, we should know who the author is.

The Senator from Wisconsin said he had a list of them. If he had such a list, why was it not put into the RECORD? If a list were put into the RECORD, our people would be satisfied. In that way we could get to the bottom of the charge. Let us not chase around and hunt down some college professor in Baltimore or somewhere else. Let us find out what is wrong. Let us restore the confidence of the American people. We are not concerned so much with newspapers. We are concerned with the foundation of our country, which lies in the men who live in the hollows, along the creeks, on the mountain tops, and on the plains, the harvesters of America's crops and the men in America's factories. They produce the material wealth of this country. Let us satisfy them. If we do so, it will be easy to get rid of persons who are justly accused. If they are erroneously charged, it is easy to clear up the charge. Mr. President, is it not time that the Member of this body who made the charge should come to bat with his proof and not merely with allegations?

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understand that the first statement which was made by the Senator from Wisconsin was to the effect that there were 205 persons in the State Department or closely associated with the State Department against whom charges would lie. I think he made that statement in West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. It was made in Wheeling, W. Va. The Senator from Wisconsin said that there were card-carrying Communists in the State Department who were known by the Secretary of State to be such.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator how many of the 205 persons in the State Department, or any other number which was mentioned, who were charged with being such card-carrying Communists, have been proved to be card-carrying members of the Communist Party?

Mr. KILGORE. To the best information of the present speaker, not one such person has been proved on the floor of this Chamber, in any report filed in this

Chamber, or in any report filed anywhere to be a card-carrying Communist. For the benefit of the Senator from New York, I may say that I was charged with attempting to whitewash the State Department. All I am asking is what I have been asking for the past 10 months, and I have not had an answer yet. Nevertheless, the author of the charge said I was trying to whitewash the State Department.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that not only did the Senator from West Virginia ask that question but that his colleague the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] asked the same question, and neither Senator has received any satisfaction or information?

Mr. KILGORE. That is absolutely correct. The State of West Virginia was in a turmoil on that point. Everybody was worried. I may say to the Senator from New York that we are a conservative-liberal State. In other words, we are liberal in government, but very conservative in the methods of its operation. Our people are of the pioneer class. They believe in loyalty to their Government. They cannot see anything else. They were terribly upset to hear that a department of their Government might have policy-making officials who were in the Communist category.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from West Virginia is raising the point because the charge was made in his State. Is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. Partly so.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is making the statement because he feels that the people of the United States ought to know the facts. Is that another reason?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator feel that if the facts were made known with respect to what has taken place during the last year since the statement was made the people might have a little different opinion concerning their State Department. Is that another reason?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. Not only that, but I may say to the Senator from North Carolina—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. South Carolina.

Mr. KILGORE. South Carolina. I beg the Senator's pardon. It is like calling a West Virginian a Virginian, or vice versa. It starts them fighting. The distinguished Senators from Virginia were born in West Virginia within 3 months of each other, in the same block of the same city, but they are still Virginians, and I am still a West Virginian. I understand the feeling of the Senator from South Carolina. However, that is the situation.

I think that we must have confidence in the policy-making top of the State Department. If we do not have such confidence our entire effort toward winning international peace will fail. If the head of the State Department is in such a position that he should be ousted, I say to the Senator from South Carolina, I want to help oust him. If he

should not be ousted, I want the people's confidence restored to the extent that they will back his policies.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator feels, does he not, that when a man holding a position as high as that of United States Senator makes a statement to the effect that there are 205 Communists in the State Department and that he can name them, he should have named them during the last year?

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly, I do. There can be no question about it. We have heard nothing but blanket charges. The Senator from South Carolina knows that there could not be maintained in court a blanket charge that there were 50 murderers loose in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is anyone who says that he can name 205 Communists in the State Department, but keeps those names unto himself for a year, doing justice to America?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I do not have my notes before me. The Official Reporter has taken them. I think my notes show that the statement which was made by the Senator from Wisconsin was, "I have in my hand a list of 205 known Communists who are known to the Secretary of State to be Communists, and who are in a policy-making position in the State Department." I cannot quote the statement verbatim because I do not have my notes before me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but is there any record anywhere that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] at any time before making the statement to which reference has been made went to the State Department and told the officials there that he knew of any Communists in the State Department?

Mr. KILGORE. It was later developed here that he had notified them. It came out in connection with the number of 57, or something else.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did he give the Department the names of any of them?

Mr. KILGORE. No; the names of the 205 or the 57 have never been procured, or of the 7. How many wise and how many foolish virgins were there? I am not playing the numbers racket; I am discussing traitors—let us call them plain, common, garden variety of traitors—and I want to know their names.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. In addition to the statements to which the Senator from West Virginia has referred, covering a list of 205 alleged traitors, none of whom have been shown to be in any way disloyal, and the names of none of whom have been disclosed, does the Senator not recall, as I do, that on the floor of the Senate there has been an attempt to blacken the names of great Americans, patriotic and loyal Americans, who have served their country with distinction and devotion? I can mention

the names of only a few to show the type of men who have been attacked on the floor of the Senate without one shred of evidence, purely on the basis of irresponsible and vicious statements, men like Secretary Acheson, Ambassador at Large Philip P. Jessup, Minister Vincent, Secretary Marshall, and Secretary Hull.

Mr. KILGORE. What the Senator says is true, but not one scintilla of evidence has been offered to prove the statements. It is easy to call men names. Let me say that people called Abraham Lincoln, with all his Americanism, a Socialist, which in his day was equivalent to calling a man a Communist or even worse. People called Thomas Jefferson a Red Communist. Various others have been called all sorts of names. But the question always has been as to producing some evidence to prove the charge. It is possible to call a man almost anything, provided he does not take it out on his traducer personally, or is in a position where he can sue him. In New York State there is a ruling of the supreme court to the effect that calling a man a Communist is libelous per se. Unfortunately, such rule does not prevail in many other States. Had it prevailed, there would have been many "busted" people in this country due to libel suits. It is possible to charge anyone with anything.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator not agree with me that to seek to blacken the names and reputations of men of the character of those I have just mentioned is below the dignity and responsibility of a Member of the United States Senate?

Mr. KILGORE. I would say yes, because, let me say to the distinguished Senator from New York, relatively a Member of the United States Senate ranks next to the President and the Vice President, even higher than a Cabinet officer, or the head of any department or agency, even higher than the Chief of Staff of the Army, or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. For a man so elevated by his people to take an unfair advantage, and to so use his position is—I do not believe I need to say just what I think it is.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator. I fully agree with him.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to make an observation with reference to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and also to commend him upon his forthright statement today. I had hoped at an earlier time, when the able junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] was making his remarks, likewise to commend him for his courage and for his insight into what I consider to be a most difficult and perplexing problem before the American people.

Mr. President, I have this observation to offer in my own behalf. Without looking into the merits or demerits of what has transpired during the past year, I wish to say that the greatest tragedy that can befall the cause of human freedom in this critical hour of world history is to undermine faith in representative gov-

ernment, to undermine faith in the elected representative of the people, and the apparatus of government which serves our Nation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the elected representatives of government are the difference between totalitarianism and democracy?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is, indeed.

Mr. KILGORE. If we eliminate the elected representatives of the people as a curb upon the executive branch of the government, we wipe out any idea of either a republican or democratic form of government. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore an effort to undermine the confidence of the people in their Government is a direct blow at the American way of life. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It surely appears that way to the Senator from Minnesota. Now I should like to continue my observation, and then I shall yield to any other Senator who desires to make any inquiry.

It appears to me that fear and suspicion is growing throughout the country. American freedom cannot live in an environment filled with suspicion, and American political institutions cannot live in an environment filled with fear. It is true of those of my colleagues with whom I have talked about the matter that, unfortunately, much of the mail received from home during the past year has indicated that there is doubt and great suspicion in the hearts and minds of thousands and thousands of people.

It is true that the attack of the junior Senator from Wisconsin has been very effective politically, but it has been very unfortunate morally, and in terms of the preservation of free institutions. I have no doubt that politically, speaking in terms of elections, it has been a powerful and perhaps successful attack, but I think what is more important to keep in mind is not whether this kind of attack is successful politically, but what it means in the long run, for the solvency, the security, and the stability of free political, economic, and cultural institutions.

Unfortunately, it seems to me, there is today a psychosis of fear in our Nation, at a time when our people should be imaginative and creative, at a time when we should have people in Government who are trying to think out new answers to meet new problems. I would say that it is a tragedy that members of the Senate permitted this to happen.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to get the idea of partisanship on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle out of the picture. We frequently denominate ourselves as being the greatest deliberative body in the world. The Senator has heard that statement made, has he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. We frequently hear speakers make that statement. We are

prideful of the fact that we are the greatest deliberative body in the world. Deliberation means thoughtful consideration. We are a deliberative body. That means that we should have a basis of fact upon which deliberation may be based. I want to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he does not think it is incumbent upon this body, as the greatest deliberative body in the world, to insist that the proofs be shown to this body, that it be shown that the charges are factually correct, and if not, that the charges be retracted?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe the Senate should defend itself in the eyes of the people of the United States as being the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to me almost axiomatic that a man sitting on a committee which has the responsibility of appropriating money for a bureau or a department should approach his task in a purely objective manner, without either favor or bias. The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, very courageously pointed out the fact that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] had been appointed a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the State Department, and that there could be no question with regard to his bias against the State Department. Hundreds of utterances by the Senator from Wisconsin have given clear evidence of this. He should not have been appointed to the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with funds for the State Department.

Yet, even after that clear and courageous statement by the Senator from Connecticut, very few newspapers in this country made any substantial mention of the speech, or of the issue involved. In my opinion it was a very great moral issue, a very great issue of good government. The newspapers simply permitted the issue to die without any substantial reference to it. It seems to me that this circumstance bears out just what the Senator from Minnesota said a few minutes ago, that there is hysteria, that there is panic, that there is fear on the part of people that if they raise their voices in any way in defense of those who may be accused irresponsibly, they will be accused of being "soft" toward communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York for his statement. The reason the Senator from Minnesota referred to the fear, hysteria, and suspicion is that it is a disease which can consume our strength. This is a time when we need to put away fear, this is the time when we need a sense of calm, this is the time when we need a sense of trust in our Government.

Many letters have come to my office on this subject. Last evening I took home with me between two and three thousand letters which have come to my office in the last few weeks on the issue of foreign policy. In many of the letters I read of

the lack of trust and lack of faith in our Secretary of State, in our President, in our Government, arising from charges made on the floor of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to make this comment in reference to our Secretary of State, because the charges center around him and around our State Department. Without having too much intimate knowledge about the State Department, but just about as, I would say, the average Representative or the average United States Senator has, I say that the present Secretary of State is an able, conscientious, patriotic, devoted public servant, who has dedicated a lifetime of service in the struggle for freedom, and has dedicated his physical energy, his emotional and mental capacities in the struggle against communism. I think that is a matter of record. There is not one scintilla of evidence that could lead anyone to believe any time, any place, anywhere, that the present Secretary of State or any of his predecessors have ever been even remotely sympathetic to communism as a philosophy, an ideology, or as a practicing form of political organization. I submit that many of the men who have been under attack are great Americans. The distinguished Senator from New York mentioned Philip Jessup, who is not only a great American, but who is a great world citizen.

I likewise submit that there are as many capable, honest, devoted servants in the State Department as there are in any branch of our Government or in any branch of any government in the United States—State or local. There may be some incompetents, but I would venture to say one could find some incompetents in the largest corporations or in the best trade-unions, or even within the Congress or the judiciary.

I submit that if there are Communists in the State Department, we have the machinery to find out. I shall always believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its agents are more qualified to find Communists than any United States Senator. If there is a United States Senator who is better qualified than Mr. Hoover, I submit he should seek Mr. Hoover's job, because we need the best at the top of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I am likewise convinced that our Attorney General, the man at the head of the Department of Justice, a man of deep religious faith, a man of conviction and honor, a former United States Senator, who served in this body with honor, as well as the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, would not be going around coddling Communists or covering up for them to please any political party or any member of the Government.

If the Department of Justice does not have the manpower it needs in order to do the things which need to be done, I submit that we should vote for the necessary appropriations, instead of trying to get ourselves junior G-man badges and trying to act as supersleuths, when we are not equipped, by either experience or background, to do so.

The question before us is a simple one, as was the question a year ago—namely, are there 205 Communists, known to the

Secretary of State, in the State Department? If 205 is the wrong number, the next question is, are there 57, or are there 7, or are there any?

If the charges are not true, then I suggest that someone should refrain from further comment about the alleged subversion in this Government, because the best way in the world to break down the spirit of the American people and their morale, the best way to destroy the faith of the American people in the entire mobilization program, the best way to sell out this country to the Communists, is to make false charges—any kind of false charges, whether false charges of corruption or subversion or whatever else it may be.

Mr. President, this is a time when we need to believe in democracy. Our procedures should conform to the democratic spirit.

No one in the world has a greater responsibility to live and breathe for democracy and to do his utmost to make it work than the Members of the United States Senate or of the House of Representatives of the United States Government. We are the ones who at this hour should lead in asserting a steadfast belief in democracy, and we should do so by exercising leadership, both political and moral.

So let me suggest to the Senators on both sides of the aisle that charges be documented so that they will be able to stand up in a court of law. If there is not such evidence and such documentation, the charges never should be made, because to destroy faith in our Government is to strike a blow deep in the heart of freedom; and to destroy the name of a man is to perform the most immoral, un-Christian, indecent act which possibly could be done, for, Mr. President, after all, the name, the reputation, and the character of a man are his most precious heritage.

I submit to you, Mr. President, that the Secretary of State of our country has been maligned and abused, and he has been the victim of unfair and unjustified criticism, to a point where the poor man's heart must be breaking. Bad enough it is that he should be maligned by false charges, but it is worse that one who is in such a responsible position should be maligned. Have you noticed, Mr. President, that every time our Secretary of State is about to enter into negotiations or is about to attend a conference of foreign ministers, or every time he is about to go to a meeting of the United Nations, on a great mission of hope and of peace, every time our Secretary of State is about to enter into such important transactions, the daggers come out and the epithets are hurled against him. To me, Mr. President, such action is not very patriotic, particularly at times like the present ones.

As long as Mr. Acheson is our Secretary of State and as long as he is to be our negotiator in the councils of the nations, he has to be the strongest man he possibly can be; and we should not undercut him every time he is about to enter into consultations and negotiations. We would do well to remember that wars are not won by military power alone. They are also won by the spirit

of the people, the high moral sense of the people, the idealism of the people, and the forthrightness of the people and their leaders.

We are spending billions of dollars now to equip ourselves with atomic weapons, B-36's, and bazookas. I think it would be well for us to spend a little time each day in equipping ourselves with honesty of purpose and a carefully planned and carefully considered program, and to work for confidence in and respect for our own leaders, as they try to protect the best interests of this Republic.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, with considerable surprise I have listened to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and my distinguished colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and just now the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. It seems to me, Mr. President, that if they are good Democrats, the less they say about this matter the better, because it stinks to high heaven.

Mr. President, we appropriated \$2,000,000,000 for the development of the atom bomb, and we turned that money over entirely to the Democratic Party, to Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt. We said, "Go ahead. Hire whomever you wish. You do not have to account for a dollar of the \$2,000,000,000; but we are depending on you, sir, as President of the United States, to protect even the most humble citizen of this country."

Mr. President, how did the Democratic Party perform that assignment? They spent the \$2,000,000,000, all right; but although the FBI had millions of dollars, although the Secretary of State had million of dollars more, all the time—for 14 months—down in New Mexico sat Dr. Fuchs, the spy, the known Communist, the man who, day after day after day after day, as our Government was developing the atom bomb, was giving the secrets to Russia.

I say shame on a party, shame on the Democratic Party, which would defend that kind of thing. They had warnings. The President had warnings from Canada. In Canada the spies were convicted; and the Canadian Government said to our Government, "In your Government there are spies working in conjunction with the spies who have been at work here in Canada."

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

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield; I did not interrupt any of the three Senators whom I have mentioned. I sat here in disgust, listening to their speeches, in which they attacked a Member of the Senate who is not present today. They attacked a fellow Senator at a time when he was not present.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] has been on this floor day after day, week after week, month after month, but those Senators waited until he was away, when they knew they would be safe, when they knew he was absent from Washington, giving a Lincoln Day speech; and then they rose here on the floor of the United States Senate and attacked him.

To whom did the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] go? Did he go to a subordinate? Did he go to a Cabinet officer? No, he went to the President of the United States. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 2, page 1953, I find a telegram sent to the President by the Senator from Wisconsin, reading as follows:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,  
White House, Washington, D. C.:

In the Lincoln Day speech at Wheeling Thursday night I stated that the State Department harbors a nest of Communists and Communist sympathizers who are helping to shape our foreign policy. I further stated that I have in my possession the names of 57 Communists who are in the State Department at present. A State Department spokesman promptly denied this, claiming that there is not a single Communist in the Department. You can convince yourself of the falsity of the State Department claim very easily. You will recall that you personally appointed a board to screen State Department employees for the purpose of weeding out fellow travelers—men whom the board considered dangerous to the security of this Nation.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is a telegram which was sent to Harry S. Truman, as President of the United States, by a United States Senator. I continue:

Your Board did a painstaking job, and named hundreds which had been listed as dangerous to the security of the Nation, because of communistic connections.

While the records are not available to me, I know absolutely of one group of approximately 300 certified to the Secretary for discharge because of communism. He actually only discharged approximately 80.

That is, 80 out of 300. I continue:

I understand that this was done after lengthy consultation with the now-convicted traitor, Alger Hiss. I would suggest, therefore, Mr. President, that you simply pick up your phone and ask Mr. Acheson how many of those whom your Board—

“Your Board,” Mr. President—the Board appointed by the President, himself. Continuing—

how many of those whom your Board had labeled as dangerous Communists he failed to discharge. The day the House Un-American Activities Committee exposed Alger Hiss as an important link in an international Communist spy ring you signed an order forbidding the State Department's giving any information in regard to the disloyalty or the communistic connections of anyone in that Department to the Congress.

The President would not give any information to this very body. The telegram continues:

Despite this State Department black-out, we have been able to compile a list of 57 Communists in the State Department. This list is available to you but you can get a much longer list by ordering Secretary Acheson to give you a list of those whom your own Board listed as being disloyal and who are still working in the State Department. I believe the following is the minimum which can be expected of you in this case.

1. That you demand that Acheson give you and the proper congressional committee the names and a complete report on all of those who were placed in the Department by Alger Hiss, and all of those still working in the State Department who were listed by your Board as bad security risks because of their communistic connections.

2. That you promptly revoke the order in which you provided under no circumstances could a congressional committee obtain any information or help in exposing Communists.

Failure on your part will label the Democratic Party of being the bedfellow of international communism. Certainly this label is not deserved by the hundreds of thousands of loyal American Democrats throughout the Nation, and by the sizable number of able loyal Democrats in both the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, what more could any United States Senator do than that?

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

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

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from North Dakota has propounded a question.

Mr. LANGER. I propounded no question to the distinguished Senator, and I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. What more could any United States Senator do than to advise the President of the United States? I do not know why Harry Truman did not promptly pick up his telephone and call the Senator from Wisconsin. That is what the average President certainly would have done. He would have said, “Senator McCARTHY, come to see me. You are only five or six blocks away. Come here, and lay down your list. You say there are 57 Communists in the Department. I want to know who they are. If my Secretary of State has not been doing a good job, I want to know about it. I appointed him, and the Senate voted to confirm him. Together, the Congress and I, we put him in the State Department. Let us talk it over. If there is anything wrong in the Department, I, Harry Truman, want to know it.” Was not that due any United States Senator? Whether he belonged to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party or was a nonpartisan, was it not a simple courtesy due him? But Harry S. Truman did not even reply to the telegram.

Mind you, Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin and President Truman had not had any trouble, they were friends. Several Senators have been Governors of their States, as I have been the Governor of my State. When a complaint came in against the head of any department, what would any governor do but call in the man who made the complaint and say, “Present your proof today, away from any newspapers.”

President Truman could have said to the Senator from Wisconsin, “I want your proof.” There is all the more reason for the President to call upon him, because Mr. Acheson had said, after Alger Hiss was convicted, “I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss.” That should have put the President on notice.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin, when he offered to present all his proof to the President of the United States,

did as much as any Senator could be expected to do. No sane man will contend that a United States Senator, with a salary of \$12,000 a year and an expense account of \$2,500, is going to be able to make an investigation entailing the spending of thousands upon thousands of dollars.

Let us look at it in reverse, Mr. President. Supposing the Senator from Wisconsin had not telegraphed the President and it could be shown afterwards that he had knowledge of these men being in the State Department; then the very Senators who today are condemning the Senator from Wisconsin would be condemning him for not telling the President of the United States about it. They would say, “You had notice that there were 57 Communists in the State Department and you kept silent. Because of your silence you are guilty.”

I say, Mr. President, that when a United States Senator gets in touch with the Chief Executive he does all that my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], my distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], or my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] could do had they been in a situation in which the Senator from Wisconsin found himself.

I myself as a Senator from North Dakota, when, on two occasions, there was something wrong, promptly called the White House and told all about it. I think that is a duty which every Senator owes to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, a charge is made with reference to the Senator from Wisconsin being on a certain committee. I do not know the facts about it, but I have here the statement made by the minority leader of February 1. He said:

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are certain rules by which we operate. Those rules have absolutely been maintained in connection with the appointment of Senators to committees, legislative committees and otherwise. I am quite satisfied that the members of the Republican committee on committees did not interrogate anyone with reference to his feelings about the State Department or how he felt regarding the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. They went ahead and organized efficiently according to the rules of the conference with reference to seniority. Of course there were some disappointments in connection with membership on some committees. For example, last year the Republicans attempted to place on the Small Business Committee certain Senators who had had long service in that connection, and we very humbly made suggestions to the majority party. But what happened? They were all ignored; their service did not count for anything. Oh, no; they had been somewhat hard on the administrator, and, therefore, there would be new faces on that committee.

The minority leader said there was nothing unusual about the way in which the members of the committee were chosen. He said:

They went ahead and organized efficiently according to the rules of the conference with reference to seniority.

If that is not true, certainly some Senator on the other side of the aisle should



have told the minority leader about it. I do not hold any brief—

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator says someone should have told the Senator from Nebraska about it. The Senator from Nebraska made a half-hour speech on the subject.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] had spoken ahead of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and it is the reply of the Senator from Nebraska that I have been reading. He said:

They went ahead and organized efficiently according to the rules of the conference with reference to seniority.

If that was not true, the fact should be established.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. With all respect to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], it was my feeling when I heard that reply, and it is still my feeling, that it was not responsive to the statement made in the speech of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

Mr. LANGER. Let us see. That can be very easily determined. I have before me the speech of the Senator from Connecticut. Shall I read it all?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should be glad if the Senator would read his speech.

Mr. LANGER. I have read it, and I think the answer of the Senator from Nebraska was a perfect reply.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understood the Senator from North Dakota to ask me whether I suggested that he read the speech of the Senator from Connecticut. I might say that I think it is such a good speech, and so important, because it raised an issue of government, that I should be delighted to have the Senator read it again on the floor of the Senate. I think it is a most important speech. But I do not want to advise the Senator to read it and take up the time of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. I do not mind. We have plenty of time—at least, I have. But I think the Senator from Nebraska answered the speech of the Senator from Connecticut perfectly. Here is what the Senator from Connecticut said, and it appears at page 865 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I rise to utter a brief but very solemn warning. This week I called on former Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Secretary Hull honors me by permitting me to visit him every few months, and it has been my custom to do so since even before my service as Assistant Secretary of State.

As I entered the room Secretary and Mrs. Hull were watching on the television the proceedings at Lake Success. I wish every Member of the Senate could have been with me and could have heard Secretary Hull's wise and penetrating discussion of the vast problems with which we are faced today. I am sure Secretary Hull will not mind my reporting to his old colleagues in the Senate that he is deeply concerned because we here are devoting so much of our time to matters

of relative insignificance, while the world is trembling on the edge of catastrophe. I am sure he will not—

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think most of us heard the speech made by the Senator from Connecticut or have since read it. I do not think the Senator from Connecticut has been available to have a conference with me since he made his speech. As chairman of the Republican committee on committees, I intend to do him the courtesy of a personal interview. I personally do not think it is necessary to read his speech at this time, unless the Senator from New York insists.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York did not suggest the reading of it. He simply replied to an inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota. The discretion with regard to the reading of the speech rests entirely on the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the only reason I suggested reading it was that my distinguished friend from New York said that the Senator from Nebraska was not responsive in his answer to the Senator from Connecticut. I think his answer was responsive. I think the speech of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] fully answered the Senator from Connecticut. I happen to be a member of the committee on committees, and, so help me, I do not know of one solitary thing that was done for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] that was not done for every other Member of the United States Senate. We took them in order of seniority.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest that the difficulty which exists between my good friend the Senator from Connecticut and the members of the Republican committee on committees be resolved in a private conference, as our fine friend from Nebraska suggests. I think all of us have read the RECORD. I heard the speech of the Senator from Connecticut. I also heard the distinguished minority leader's reply and my colleague's reply. I believe it is merely a matter of difference of opinion as to whether or not the appropriate policy was carried out. Since a quorum is not present—and perhaps we should have present if we are to go into a discussion of this subject—I suggest that we rely on the integrity of everyone's rereading the address of the Senator from Connecticut, and coming to his own conclusions with respect to what was suggested by the Senator from Connecticut. I know that my good friend from North Dakota would give a most interpretative reading of the speech delivered by the Senator from Connecticut. However, I heard the speech when it was delivered. It was a very good speech. I thought so the first time I heard it. I still carry with me in my heart and soul the impression that it was a good speech, and I should like to leave it that way.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps I could do a better job than the Senator from Con-

necticut did the first time, though his is a very interesting and fine speech.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I had in mind making a short address on a subject entirely foreign to the matter which has been under discussion for some time. However, it is entirely proper for me to have at least a few words to say with respect to the subject which was initiated by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

As one Member on this side of the aisle I am delighted to know that my friends on the other side of the aisle take recognition of the great day of February 12, and help us celebrate it. I think a February 12 appearance in West Virginia last year must have made quite an impression. It is being repeated here today. To the best of my recollection it has been repeated perhaps thousands of times over the Nation. I was impressed with the patriotic speech made by the acting majority leader. If my recollection serves me correctly, in describing the Secretary of State he referred to him as "an able, patriotic, and devoted servant."

Mr. President, I know of no more able, patriotic, or devoted servant of the American people than the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. Certainly we can have differences of opinion without losing all sense of reason. I trust that the Members of the Senate on the majority side are not too discouraged because they think that 1 member of a committee of 21 members is not in complete accord with the views of the State Department. I do not know why they should think it to be such a terrible thing. Surely 1 man on a committee of 21 members is not going to control the committee. He is only one member. I do not know how many members sit on the subcommittees. I think it is five. Surely one member out of five is not going to have any undue influence. Therefore I hope that my good friends on the other side of the aisle will not become too much exercised over the appointment that was made by my committee of the Senator from Wisconsin to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to get to my other statement.

Mr. KILGORE. I have only two short questions to ask.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Nebraska, of course, recognizes the fact that I was not on the floor when the controversy arose with respect to the membership of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he agrees with me—and I am making no reflection on the junior Senator from Wisconsin—that the Senator from Wisconsin should furnish to the Senate the names of the persons to whom he referred. That is all I ask.

I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he agrees with me that this

body should be furnished with the names of the persons who were employed by the State Department in policy-making capacities on February 12, 1950, who were known by the Secretary of State to be card-carrying Communists. I do not think that is an unreasonable request to be made by a member of the majority party, a member of the minority party, or by any Member of this body in any capacity. It should not be considered unreasonable to make such a request 1 year after the charge was made in numbers only, particularly when the charge caused so much disruption in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will answer the distinguished Senator's question in this way. I believe the Senator said not once, but several times, as did the junior Senator from Minnesota, that he did not care whether the charges involved 201 persons or 1 person.

Mr. KILGORE. The junior Senator from West Virginia, not Minnesota.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. If my memory serves me correctly, in the last year there has been more than one conviction in court of men who certainly were indirectly, if not directly, connected with the State Department.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President—

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I do not care to yield again at this time. There are thousands of people in every one of the 48 States in the Union who have confidence in the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. I am sure there are millions of people all over the Nation who have confidence in the McCarthy charges.

Mr. President, a subcommittee was appointed following the adoption of a resolution by the Senate. We thought the resolution was a good resolution. We thought it was watertight. Nevertheless, the subcommittee did an excellent job of whitewashing. I am inclined to think that if the subcommittee had done a thorough job we would have been spared much of the worry that has arisen since that time.

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

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I decline to yield at this time. If President Truman will take the padlocks off the files of the State Department, the McCarthy inquiry can be completed. It will not be completed until the padlocks are taken off the files. I should like what I have said to be the final word, if the Senator from West Virginia is agreeable.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator has not answered my question. Does he think it fair to this body not to be told the names of the persons to whom the Senator from Wisconsin has referred, and of whom he said he had a list?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will refer the Senator from West Virginia to the records of the Tydings subcommittee. I think they contain all the answers he wants.

Mr. LANGER. And the election.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Yes, Mr. President, I should now like to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

#### GERMAN COOPERATION IN THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, in the course of General Eisenhower's report to the Congress a little over a week ago, he said:

I am not even going to mention my several conversations in Germany and for a very specific reason. I personally think that there has to be a political platform achieved and an understanding reached that will contemplate an eventual and earned equality on the part of that nation before we should start to talk about including units of Germans in any kind of an army. I, certainly, for one commander, want no unwilling contingent, no soldiers serving in the pattern of the Hessians who served in our Revolutionary War, serving in any army I command. Therefore until the political leaders, the diplomats, and the statesmen find the proper answer, it is not for a soldier to delve in too deeply.

Mr. President, what General Eisenhower obviously meant, without putting it into so many words, is that we cannot expect the Germans to be loyal to western ideals and to the western alliance so long as we continue to persecute them. Nothing can be more obvious than that fact. Many of us over the years have taken the floor of the Senate to emphasize that fact and to point out how our policies toward Germany have been destructive of any possibility of cooperation with the German people. The tragedy is that we had to wait so long for any slight recognition of that problem by anyone in the councils of this administration.

If we really want the cooperation of the Germans, we shall have to right some of the wrongs of the last few years, and it may be good for our souls to recall some of those wrongs.

First was the Morgenthau plan, that foolish and unworkable notion that German industry could be destroyed and the Germans forced to resume the life of a peasant nation with most of her people living off the land. That idea was completely unworkable, simply because there is not enough land in Western Germany to support all of her population. Yet that program was seriously tried. Until very recently, we were still tearing down German factories, while with the other hand we dispensed relief to the starving German unemployed.

Next was the displacement of millions of German people and those of German extraction from the border lands of Czechoslovakia and Poland and from settlements in Eastern Europe. Thirteen million of them were displaced altogether—forced into Western Germany and simply turned loose without food, clothing, or shelter. No adequate provision or program for these poor people has ever been made by this administration, even when we had displaced persons legislation up for action. It was almost impossible to secure real consideration for these unfortunate people.

Next is the problem of the property of Germans seized by the Alien Property Custodian in this country. Time after time proposals have been made for some slight relaxation of the rigid rules of the Office of Alien Property so as to recognize at least a few of the meritorious claims of Germans to their own property. During the last 2 years, I have sponsored two

different bills designed to do justice to the Germans on this question. One of them would simply have extended the date within which time claims could have been filed for the return of property to which the claimants were already legally entitled. The second one, in which I joined with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and several others, would have permitted Germans to acquire property bequeathed or given to them by American citizens.

On both those bills, we had the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. Both measures passed the Senate, but they were pigeonholed in the House because of the hostility of the Alien Property Custodian.

The treatment of those two bills is a sample of the attitude of this administration toward the German nation. Some spokesmen of this administration occasionally speak a kind word for Germany, but their actions do not support their words.

Now we are in trouble and we ask for the help of the Germans. They are not inclined to join our armies. Is there anything surprising in that?

Mr. President, we must have German cooperation if Western Europe is to be saved. We cannot expect to secure it so long as we treat Germany as a second-class nation. Most of us now realize that we must grant the Germans full equality and recognize their rights and legitimate aspirations. Since that is the case, why do we not accept them into full partnership willingly and promptly? Why must we appear to make each concession grudgingly, only after it has been forced from us? How can we expect to secure a willing partner that way?

Mr. President, we have played into Communist hands throughout in our treatment of Germany. The Communists wanted us to be severe and unreasonable toward the Germans, while at the same time Communist Russia pretended to be friendly and generous. By that means, the Communists hoped to turn the Germans against democracy and toward communism. If they have not succeeded, it is not our fault. Our policies since VE-day and before have been tailored to suit the wishes of communism.

Mr. President, it is time we make a drastic change in our whole outlook toward the German nation and the German people.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] for what he has just said relative to the friendly and unfriendly relations between the people of Germany and the people of America. What he says about the actions of the American people being influenced by Communists is, in my opinion, the absolute truth.

The Morgenthau plan of starvation was not drawn up by Mr. Morgenthau at all; it was drawn up by Harry Dexter White, a man who was in the Department of State, and who committed suicide, I believe, 5 days after he was subpoenaed by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

In regard to the dismantling proposal, time and time again the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], both the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], both the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. WHERRY], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and others, rose and pleaded that the dismantling be stopped.

For example, take the case of the fertilizer plants. At the very time the fertilizer plants in Germany were being torn down, New York firms got contracts to ship fertilizer to Germany, the contracts running into the millions of dollars. The sad thing is that this fertilizer arrived in Germany too late, long after the time had gone by for the German people to use it in the spring of the year. So that fertilizer was wasted. Plant after plant after plant in Germany was dismantled and bodily moved to Russia.

Mr. President, that is not the worst of it. There were men on the payroll of the United States Government who had worked here on the Daily Worker, and had taken part in communistic activities, who changed their names. They were on the payroll of the United States Government, and were sent to Germany to assist American courts, where there were American judges and American prosecutors. They assisted there in the denazification program.

The result was that every school teacher, every scientist, every engineer, was automatically banned from work. Russia did not have a denazification program, and very promptly hired all these people, 50,000 of them, as nearly as we can estimate the number, including engineers who had been operating under Hitler preparing engines of destruction, and working on submarines. All of them were put on the payroll of the Kremlin. There they finished up the different jobs they had commenced under Hitler, and today, according to the Navy, Russia is almost supreme in the matter of submarines, having many more than we have, and having some which can remain under water longer than ours can.

Mr. President, that is not all. In addition to all I have mentioned, there are in Germany the 13,000,000 expellees, men from the Sudeten lands, so well described by the senior Senator from Nebraska. Under the German law these people automatically became German citizens. They did not have to be naturalized in Germany. They were citizens the moment they entered, although their ancestors may have left 100 or 200 or 500 or 800 years before. What happened? The International Refugee Organization was established. Its purpose was to take care of every child in the world except German children. The Senate approved that organization. The German children could starve to death so far as the International Refugee Organization was concerned.

That was not all. We now send over there General Eisenhower, the man whose forces had previously bombed the Germans and who held off his troops while the Russians moved in and raped, according to the statistics, 85 percent of

the women in Austria and Germany. The very man, Mr. President, who had charge of the American troops, and held them off, and did not let them go in, we send now to Germany to plead with the Germans to join up with the Americans and the other Atlantic Pact forces and to fight shoulder to shoulder with us.

What do the German people think about that, Mr. President? They held an election there about 8 weeks ago Sunday, and in Württemberg-Baden, which it is stated had never before voted Social Democratic, the people voted for the Social Democrat ticket. The chief plank of the Social Democratic Party was a plank in opposition to rearmament. That is the first time such a thing had occurred in Württemberg-Baden.

In the state of Hesse a similar election was held, and by an overwhelming vote similar action was taken.

Bavaria is a solid Catholic state, a state overwhelmingly opposed to communism; yet, by an overwhelming vote, the Social Democrats carried Bavaria.

So is it any wonder that on the 19th day of January the Wall Street Journal said that the high commissioner, Mr. McCloy, had taken a secret poll and found that only 5 percent of the Germans would volunteer to fight with us? He also found that if a draft law were passed, only 10 percent would obey the draft. Is it any wonder that when General Eisenhower returned to the United States and talked to us he very skillfully omitted any reference to Germany at all? He counted them off as far as we were concerned, and as far as defense is concerned.

Mr. President, I want to pay public tribute to the work done by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] who time and time again has risen on the Senate floor and pleaded with Senators on this subject. He prophesied what would take place unless we stopped the dismantling of German industrial plants, unless we treated the German people on more of a basis of equality than we were doing at that particular time.

Mr. President, an American soldier could marry a German girl if he obtained the consent of the military. Congress passed the Anti-Communist Act some time ago in spite of what many of us tried to do to stop it. That act bars from coming to America and joining her husband the bride of an American soldier, if she is of German origin and went to school in Germany, even though she went to school only until she was 10 or 11 or 12 years old, and even though she may have a baby. Even though the man who married this German girl is a veteran, he cannot bring his wife to this country. The night that act was passed 200,000 Germans had applied for visas to come to America. One thousand two hundred of them were on a ship. They had sold their property in Germany. They had quit their jobs. They had said good-by to their relatives. They had sold their furniture. They were coming here to the land of the free and the home of the brave. When they got to Ellis Island the 1,200 of them were taken off the ship and sent back to Germany.

Mr. President, I do not have time to go into all the details of the matter, but I could not refrain from complimenting my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska. I want the people of Germany, and I want the people of Nebraska to know that the German people have a friend in the Senate who time and time without number has risen to the defense of what was right in trying to secure justice for the relatives of the 33,000,000 citizens of German ancestry who live in this country. We have them in Nebraska, we have them in Missouri, we have them in Montana, in North Dakota, in South Dakota, in Minnesota—we have them all over in America, and they are good citizens. They are loyal, true Americans. But they cannot bring in their sister or brothers or other relatives because of the so-called Anti-Communist Act which was passed a short time ago. That is simply a travesty on justice.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with my distinguished colleague from Nebraska at this particular time in bringing to the attention of the Senate the situation of the people of Western Germany.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think it is fitting and proper to end this legislative session with a little quotation from Abraham Lincoln, who said:

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right.

We have had a heated discussion this afternoon. I am always very much moved by the eloquence, the oratory, and persuasiveness of the arguments of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I should like, however, to correct the RECORD in one respect, because I know the Senator from North Dakota is accurate in his presentations. He has a great legal mind. I should like to have the RECORD read as it should read.

No. 1: The telegram on the part of the junior Senator from Wisconsin to the President, to which the Senator from North Dakota referred, was sent after the speech in West Virginia. It was after the charge was made.

Mr. LANGER. The 20th of February.

Mr. HUMPHREY. After the date. I am very happy the date is properly recorded.

Secondly, that the number of 57 alleged Communists in the State Department was a number that was resurrected, recreated, rehabilitated out of the rather moth-eaten and weather-beaten records of the Eightieth Congress in the House of Representatives when the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and one of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, after having held exhaustive hearings, came to the conclusion unanimously that the 57 were not Communists; and after a full and exhaustive examination, recommended that all charges be dismissed. There were speeches galore made on the floor of the House of Representatives to the effect that it would be better if we just forget the whole thing. I thought maybe it would be good to bring that point up right now, and

I do bring it up in the spirit of the profound remarks made by the immortal emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now desire to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor. Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNING in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing sundry nominations in the Coast Guard, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William Jennings Bryan, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination which has just been stated?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the nomination of William Jennings Bryan, Jr., I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a pamphlet entitled "Civilian Nominations," which I obtained a few days ago, which gives a list of all civilian nominations submitted by the President to the Senate during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, from January 27, 1950, to the sine die adjournment on January 2, 1951. I know everyone will be interested to know what appointments were made, and from what State the appointees came. The first one with respect to whom his State is given, is Holmes Baldrige, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Attorney General. Then others follow: Robert T. Creasey, of Texas, Assistant Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor; Henry G. Bennett, of Oklahoma, Technical Cooperation Administrator; Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board.

Rockefeller's job is Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board.

Next is Thomas D. Cabot, of Massachusetts, Director for International Security Affairs.

Then we come to the nominations to boards, bureaus, commissions, and so forth. I call the attention of the Senators now present to the fact that we look at this list in vain to find one appointment from the great State of North Dakota.

First in the list of appointments to boards, bureaus, and commissions, we find a Californian, Lt. Col. William R.

Shuler, of California, a member of the California Debris Commission.

Next we find Charles E. Wilson, of New York, Director of Defense Mobilization.

Next is John W. Gibson, of Michigan, a member of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Next is William C. Foster, of New York, Administrator of Economic Cooperation.

Next is Richard M. Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation.

Next is Allen Valentine, of New York—that is the fourth appointment from New York in this list—Economic Stabilization Administrator.

Next is Stephen J. Spingarn, of New York—this is the fifth nominee from New York in this list, Mr. President—a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

Next is Hugh W. Cross, of Illinois, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Next is John L. Rogers, of Tennessee, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Next is John D. Small, of New York—the sixth from New York—Chairman of the Munitions Board.

Next is George J. Bott, of Maryland, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Next is John Thad Scott, Jr., a member of the National Mediation Board.

Next is Sophie Bledsoe Aberle, of New Mexico, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Chester I. Barnard, of New York—this is the seventh from New York—member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Robert Percy Barnes, of the District of Columbia, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Detlev W. Bronk, of Maryland, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Gerty T. Cori, of Missouri, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Charles Dollard, of New York—that makes eight from New York—a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Robert F. Loeb, of New York—that makes nine from New York—a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Audrey A. Potter, of Indiana, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Lee A. Dubridge, of California, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Donald H. McLaughlin, of California, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Edward L. Moreland, of Massachusetts, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Next is Joseph C. Morris, of Louisiana, a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Harold M. Morse, of New Jersey.  
James A. Reyniers, of Indiana.

Elvin C. Stakman, of Minnesota. As I understand, he is quite a good friend of my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota, and was appointed, I believe, on his recommendation.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from North Dakota state again the name of that distinguished citizen of Minnesota? I did not understand the name as he read it.

Mr. LANGER. It is Elvin C. Stakman. Mr. HUMPHREY. Excellent.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, an excellent appointment.

Next is P. H. Yancey, of Alabama. James B. Conant, of Massachusetts. John W. Davis, of West Virginia.

Mr. President, John W. Davis left West Virginia 30 years ago. He has lived in New York for more than 30 years, and has practiced law there during that period. Yet, to keep the people from knowing that he comes from the State of New York, he is listed, because he was born in West Virginia some 60 or 70 years ago, as coming from that State. As a matter of fact, he is a New Yorker, has his office at 23 Broad Street, has been there all these years, and is labeled the No. 11 New Yorker.

Edwin B. Fred, of Wisconsin.  
Paul M. Gross, of North Carolina.  
George D. Humphrey, of Wyoming.  
O. W. Hyman, of Tennessee.  
Frederick A. Middlebush, of Missouri.  
Charles E. Wilson, of New York. That is the twelfth appointment from New York.

Michael V. DiSalle, of Ohio.  
Walter E. Cosgriff, of Utah.  
Walter Lee Dunham, of Michigan.  
W. Elmer Harber, of Oklahoma.  
G. Edward Rowe, of Massachusetts.  
William E. Willett, of Maryland.  
Seth W. Richardson, of the District of Columbia.

Peter Campbell Brown, of New York—the thirteenth appointment from New York.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that Seth W. Richardson is a native of the great State of North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. I wish to say to my distinguished friend that he is entirely mistaken. Seth W. Richardson is a native of the great State of Wisconsin. He came to North Dakota and played baseball there for a while, and at one time was admitted to the bar there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. For over 30 years he has resided in the District of Columbia, and it will be noted that he is listed as being, not from North Dakota, but from the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that Seth W. Richardson did practice law for a period of time in the State of North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; and he also practiced law in the great State of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LANGER. Minnesota is across the river from North Dakota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that, as was done in the case of John W. Davis, we change the listing of the residence of Seth W. Richardson, as it appears in the statement from which the Senator is reading, and have Mr. Richardson listed as coming from North Dakota. Then there would be an appointment from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we have no authority to change the listing. If I could, I would do so, because Seth W. Richardson was one of the outstanding men of North Dakota, when he resided there. President Hoover appointed him Assistant Attorney General of the United States. But he came to the city of Washington, and he has been here now for more than 30 years. I want to treat him as I treated John W. Davis, who left West Virginia, and now lives in New York, and has lived there for more than 30 years, and now is from New York. Mr. Richardson left North Dakota 30 or 35 years ago, and has not been back there since then.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is not Seth W. Richardson, in the mind of the Senator from North Dakota, a very competent and able man?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; he is very able and very competent; he is one of the best officials in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. His loyalty is beyond question, is it not?

Mr. LANGER. Absolutely; and his appointment is one of the best appointments ever made by a President of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota is aware of the fact, is he not, that this is the same Seth W. Richardson who screened the employees of the State Department for their loyalty?

Mr. LANGER. I am very much aware of that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota believes that Mr. Richardson was honest and patriotic and conscientious in performing that task, does he not?

Mr. LANGER. There is no question in the world about the patriotism, honesty, and loyalty of Seth W. Richardson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from North Dakota agree with me that Seth W. Richardson when appointed the head of a loyalty board for either the State Department or any other department, or when appointed the head of any antisubversives board—regardless of the department for which such a board might be appointed—would, if he found any Communists in that agency, be the first to expose them?

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to my friend that there is not a shadow of doubt about that. There is no one in the entire Government more able or more loyal or a finer citizen than Seth W. Richardson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to have the Senator's observation in that connection, because I agree with him that there is no one more able than Seth W. Richardson. It gives me real assurance to know that he was head of the Loyalty Board in that case; and I feel deep in my heart that he did an honest, conscientious job. Therefore, I can look with some ease of conscience at the personnel of that department.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to my friend the Senator from Minnesota that, if Seth W. Richardson is appointed to any important position, I expect to vote for the confirmation of his nomination, and I expect to fight for it, because, as I have said before, Mr. Richardson is not only honest and capable, but he is patriotic and loyal and absolutely one of the finest public servants this country has ever had.

Mr. President, a moment ago I read the name of Peter Campbell Brown, of New York, the thirteenth appointee from New York appearing in this list.

Now I come to Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, a representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Her appointment is the fourteenth from New York in this list.

Then I come to the nomination of Irving Florman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia—the fifteenth appointment in this list from New York.

Paul C. Daniels, of New York, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador. That is No. 16.

Walter S. Gifford, of New York, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain. That is No. 17.

In other words, of the four ambassadors appointed during all this time, three came from New York State. The other one, the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay, Howard H. Tewksbury, came from New Hampshire.

We come now to the Diplomatic and Foreign Service. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the scores of nominations on this list, but shall merely say that not one of them comes from the great State of North Dakota, although, as I recently said, and proved, on the floor of the Senate, there are thousands of men and women in North Dakota who are capable of filling any one of these positions.

I again call attention to the fact that under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, six New Yorkers were in the Cabinet at one time, while the State of North Dakota has never, in its entire history, since it became a State in 1890, a period of 62 years, had an ambassador. We have had only one consul during all that time. He was appointed consul at Quebec.

A perusal of the names will disclose that the only appointments the State of North Dakota has, as shown by the Executive Calendar which is before the Senate today, and the nominations on which the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, who is acting ably as

majority leader, has asked me to permit to be confirmed, are of two little postmasters; and, under the law, those postmasters had to live in the State of North Dakota. Those two postmasters are Elmer L. Schielke, of McClusky, and Edward J. Sondag, of Sykeston. Both are very small towns.

I do not see on the Executive Calendar today anyone who is appointed to a policy-making department. I want to thank the distinguished acting majority leader for at least not taking postmasters from outside the State of North Dakota, for instance, from the State of Minnesota, and bringing them into the State of North Dakota. I remember that but a short time ago a man by the name of Tom Moody was brought in from Minnesota and ran for Governor of North Dakota. It was necessary to take the case to the Supreme Court in order to have him thrown out. Not satisfied with running the State of Minnesota alone, but an effort was actually made to put a man from Minnesota into office as Governor of North Dakota.

I might add, Mr. President, that the citizens of North Dakota are much more able than the citizens of Minnesota, if I may say so without disparagement to the great State of Minnesota, a State which I very much like. I think the distinguished Senator will agree with me that we in the State of North Dakota, time and time again, have furnished very able citizens to take jobs in the State of Minnesota. The people of Minnesota are intimately acquainted with the high caliber of men to be found in the State of North Dakota. I remember that, when the distinguished Floyd Olsen was elected Governor of Minnesota, he looked all over the State of Minnesota, trying as best he could to find a man whom he could trust to be his private secretary. Do you know, Mr. President, out of the great population of Minnesota, of, I think, a million and a half, as I now remember, Governor Olsen could not find one. So he came to North Dakota. There he hired his private secretary. A little later he looked around, and he called me. I was Governor at the time. He said, "I need a tax commissioner." Out of all the people in the State of Minnesota he could not find one who would make a good tax commissioner, and he appointed George E. Wallace, of Wahpeton, N. Dak. A few days later the Governor again telephoned me and said, "Governor, there are in northern Minnesota a million and a half acres of pine brush, State-owned land, and I must get someone who is smart enough and capable enough to take care of it. I do not have anyone in the State of Minnesota who is competent and whom I can appoint." So I said to him, "We have a man in McLean County by the name of Harry Dunbar." So Governor Olsen got Harry Dunbar from North Dakota to take care of the land.

A little later he again called me and said, "I am in terrible trouble. There is bootlegging of gasoline all over the State of Minnesota. I must find someone who will stop it." I said, "That is simple. We have a dozen men who will do it for you." He got George W. Griffith, of

Burke County, N. Dak., who went to Minnesota and did a remarkable job of stopping the bootlegging of gasoline.

Governor Olsen realized the high character, ability, efficiency, and honesty of the men of North Dakota, and he again called me a few days later, and said, "We need a bank examiner in Minnesota." Out of all the thousands of accountants and bankers in the State of Minnesota he could not find one who was capable of being bank examiner of that great State. In North Dakota, in Grant County, there is a little town by the name of Carson, and in that town there was a banker by the name of Robert D. Berry. I recommended Mr. Berry to Governor Olsen, who appointed him to be bank examiner for the great State of Minnesota. A little further along, again he called me and said, "I need a man who can drive an automobile so that, when I go out for a ride, I know I am going to get there—a man who will not drive me into the ditch. I need a private chauffeur." Out of the million and a half people in the State of Minnesota he could not find one to drive his automobile safely and carefully, so he hired Morris Rose, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., to be his personal chauffeur.

Mr. President, without saying anything disparagingly of any other State, I may say that while I was Governor, a man by the name of Dave Nolan escaped from our penitentiary. He was serving a life sentence for murder. It took us 3 years to find him. And do you know, Mr. President, when we located him, in Arkansas, we found that he had been elected public printer of the State of Arkansas. [Laughter.] In other words, in Arkansas they recognize true merit. When Mr. Nolan was returned to the penitentiary of North Dakota to serve the remainder of his life sentence, it was necessary for the people of Arkansas to call a special election to fill the office of public printer of the State of Arkansas.

So I want to say to my distinguished friend and colleague here today, I am not going to object to the nominations on the calendar. I am delighted to know that Minnesota is not trying to put Minnesota men into office as postmasters in the State of North Dakota; and I am grateful for the little crumbs we get from the Democratic administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from North Dakota it appears that the process of elevation of prominent North Dakota citizens is by way of Minnesota. After hearing the very informative address of the Senator from North Dakota and learning that the distinguished former Governor of my State recruited all this splendid talent in North Dakota, I want to say, in the tradition of Floyd B. Olsen, an honorable man and a great governor, how grateful we are to the people of North Dakota for the talent they have shared with us. That was the original, I may say, of the Marshall plan; in a sense, the Marshall plan of the time. They were sharing the resources of the abundant and prosperous State of North Dakota with the good and, I may say, conscientious and sincere people of Minnesota. We are extremely grateful, and the Senator may be sure that if Minne-

sota can be helpful in securing any recognition for North Dakota in the upper echelons of government, we shall be happy to do so.

Mr. LANGER. I thank my distinguished colleague; but the trouble is, he says one thing and does another. Last week there were vacancies on the Economic Stabilization Board. At that time, notwithstanding the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, four nominations were made, two from Minnesota, one from Montana, and one from South Dakota. Poor, poor North Dakota was left out. So I can only say that I hope the distinguished Senator will take a week off from his duties as Senator from Minnesota and will join me in being Senator from North Dakota, and during that time will help me get a member of the Cabinet, that we have never had; will help me get at least half a dozen consuls we have never had; will help me get some ambassadors, whom we have never had, and will help me get somebody into the policy-making divisions of the departments of the Government, whom we have never had. Minnesota has a proud record. The people of Minnesota have had men in the Cabinet, they have had consuls, they have had ambassadors. They have had everything that it is possible for them to have. Now I think they have two ambassadors, one of them to Cuba, Mr. Butler—

Mr. HUMPHREY. He resigned.

Mr. LANGER. And Mrs. Anderson, who is at present Ambassador to Denmark.

There has never been a man from the State of North Dakota on the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Judicial District. Minnesota has had as many as three at one time; South Dakota, two; Nebraska, two.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his offer of help. I accept it in the spirit in which it is offered. His office is next to mine, and I want to become better acquainted with him and find out how he does it for the State of Minnesota and whether he goes into the back door of the White House, as suggested the other day by the Senator from New Hampshire. I am going to ask the Senator from Minnesota to show me the back door. I do not know where it is. I always go to the front door.

In behalf of the people of North Dakota, I thank my distinguished colleague, and I assure him that I shall take advantage of his invitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William Jennings Bryan, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of customs in customs collection district No. 27?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining nominations on the calendar will be stated.

#### POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

#### RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unless there be some further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Thursday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, February 15, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 12 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

##### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John L. Rogers, of Tennessee, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1957. (Reappointment.)

##### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the term expiring June 30, 1953.

Walter Lee Dunham, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the term expiring June 30, 1951.

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for terms of 2 years from July 1, 1950, to which office they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Walter E. Cosgriff, of Utah.

W. Elmer Harber, of Oklahoma.

C. Edward Rowe, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of 1 year from July 1, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

##### SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Seth W. Richardson, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 3 years, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons to be members of the Subversive Activities Control Board for terms of 2 years, to which office they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Peter Campbell Brown, of New York.

Charles M. LaFollette, of Virginia.

The following-named persons to be members of the Subversive Activities Control Board for terms of 1 year, to which office they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

David J. Coddair, of Massachusetts.

Kathryn McHale, of Indiana.

##### CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Chuck Mau, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

##### IN THE NAVY

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Robert F. Jortberg

Anson C. Perkins

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William Jennings Bryan, Jr., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif.

## IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

CHIEF OF STAFF, SUPREME HEADQUARTERS, ALLIED POWERS, EUROPE, WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL, AND LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Lt. Gen. Alfred Maximilian Gruenther, [REDACTED]

CORPS COMMANDERS, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL, AND AS LIEUTENANT GENERALS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. John William Leonard, [REDACTED]  
Maj. Gen. John Breitling Coulter, [REDACTED]  
Maj. Gen. Edward Mallory Almond, [REDACTED]

DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PLANS, UNITED STATES ARMY, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL, AND AS A LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Charles Lawrence Bolté, [REDACTED]

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

## To be major general

Maj. Gen. Lawrence Carmel Jaynes, [REDACTED]

## To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Lemuel Mathewson, [REDACTED]

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

## To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harlan Nelson Hartness, [REDACTED]  
Brig. Gen. Hugh French Thomason Hoffman, [REDACTED]

Brig. Gen. John Howell Collier, [REDACTED]  
Brig. Gen. Miles Reber, [REDACTED]  
Brig. Gen. William Brooks Bradford, [REDACTED]  
Brig. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, [REDACTED]

Brig. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, [REDACTED]  
Brig. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, [REDACTED]

Brig. Gen. Wayne Clifton Zimmerman, [REDACTED]  
Brig. Gen. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler, [REDACTED]

Brig. Gen. Lemuel Mathewson, [REDACTED]  
Brig. Gen. Edmund Bower Sebree, [REDACTED]  
Brig. Gen. Crump Garvin, [REDACTED]  
Brig. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, [REDACTED]

## To be brigadier generals

Col. Homer Case, [REDACTED]  
Col. John Charles Macdonald, [REDACTED]  
Col. Samuel Tankersley Williams, [REDACTED]  
Col. Onslow Sherburne Rolfe, [REDACTED]  
Col. Horace Harding, [REDACTED]  
Col. Frank Camm, [REDACTED]  
Col. Charles Wilbur Pence, [REDACTED]  
Col. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, [REDACTED]  
Col. Leslie Dillon Carter, [REDACTED]  
Col. Thomas Joseph Cross, [REDACTED]  
Col. William Thrower Fitts, Jr., [REDACTED]  
Col. Arthur William Pence, [REDACTED]  
Col. Joseph Jones Twitty, [REDACTED]  
Col. Claude Henry Chorpeneing, [REDACTED]  
Col. Orville Ernest Walsh, [REDACTED]  
Col. Eric Spencer Molitor, [REDACTED]  
Col. Hammond McDougal Monroe, [REDACTED]  
Col. Francis Andrew March, [REDACTED]  
Col. Wilbur Eugéné Dunkelberg, [REDACTED]  
Col. Robert Gibbins Gard, [REDACTED]  
Col. Ernest Aaron Bixby, [REDACTED]  
Col. John Joseph Burns, [REDACTED]  
Col. John Bartlett Murphy, [REDACTED]  
Col. William Lemuel Mitchell, [REDACTED]  
Col. Thomas Edward Lewis, [REDACTED]

Col. John Joseph Binns, [REDACTED]  
Col. Kenneth Shearer Sweany, [REDACTED]  
Col. William Thaddeus Sexton, [REDACTED]  
Col. Howard Everett Kessinger, [REDACTED]  
Col. Samuel Glenn Conley, [REDACTED]  
Col. Robert Lee Howze, Jr., [REDACTED]  
Col. George Bateman Peplow, [REDACTED]  
Col. John Albert Dabney, [REDACTED]  
Col. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., [REDACTED]  
Col. Robert Frederick Sink, [REDACTED]

## IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947) and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

## To be majors, United States Air Force (Medical)

James G. Espey, Jr., [REDACTED]  
Livingston P. Noell, Jr., [REDACTED]  
John A. Norcross, [REDACTED]

## To be captains, United States Air Force (Medical)

Peter H. Dillard, [REDACTED]  
Tom W. Duke, [REDACTED]  
Paul W. Myers, [REDACTED]

## To be captain, United States Air Force (Dental)

Benjamin C. Gore, [REDACTED]

## To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force (Medical)

Samuel E. Neely, [REDACTED], United States Naval Reserve.

## To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (Dental)

Robert W. Bergmann, [REDACTED]  
James H. Diriam, [REDACTED]  
Lee W. Helm, Jr., [REDACTED]  
Raymond C. Morris, [REDACTED]  
Charles T. Schwatka, Jr., [REDACTED]

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 2, Public Law 775, Eightieth Congress (act of June 25, 1948):

## To be first lieutenants

Samuel E. Birdsong, Jr., [REDACTED]  
David A. Botte, [REDACTED]  
William A. Crawford, Jr., [REDACTED]  
James S. Dale, Jr., [REDACTED]  
John V. Davies, [REDACTED]  
Cornell DeGrothy, [REDACTED]  
John J. Ensley, [REDACTED]  
Nicholas E. Gasaway, [REDACTED]  
Carl Goldschlager, [REDACTED]  
Morris A. Hale, [REDACTED]  
Fred Hamblen, [REDACTED], United States Naval Reserve.

Billy S. Holland, [REDACTED]  
LeRoy Kahn, [REDACTED]  
William J. Keeler, [REDACTED]  
James J. Keough, [REDACTED]  
Francis G. McDonald, [REDACTED]  
William H. Packer, [REDACTED]  
Carl R. Pearson, [REDACTED]  
Robert A. Prince, [REDACTED]  
John M. Rankin, [REDACTED]  
Albert M. Scruton, [REDACTED]  
William E. Shannon, [REDACTED]  
Everett S. Van Matre, [REDACTED]  
Robert L. Vickers, [REDACTED]  
Charlie Y. Wier, [REDACTED]  
John E. Wilcox, [REDACTED]  
John C. Wiley, [REDACTED]  
George M. Wilson, [REDACTED]

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Senior Division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Robert P. Adams  
Conrad F. Ahrens  
Dale R. Anderson  
Richard M. Anderson  
Gerard J. Andeskle  
William O. Armstrong  
Robert B. Artz  
Earl L. Babcock  
Billy N. Baker  
John W. Baker  
Robert E. Baker  
Melville R. Barlow  
Warren S. Barnes  
Lee N. Barnett  
Herbert E. Bell  
Schuyler P. Berry, Jr.  
Herman M. Blegg, Jr.  
Charles H. Blanchard  
Robert G. Blanchard  
John M. Blount, Jr.  
Waldemar E. Bode  
Stanley Braun  
Edmond J. Bronner  
James H. Broussard  
Edward A. Brown  
Howard J. Browning  
Gerald B. Bunker, [REDACTED]  
George M. Burgess  
Duane C. Burton  
Robert P. Cady  
Charles R. Campbell  
Albert M. Card  
William E. Carr  
John L. Carson  
Robert D. Carter  
John E. Catlin, Jr.  
Joe L. Church  
Ralph A. Clack  
Billy M. Collins  
William J. Collins  
Thomas P. Connelly  
Vernon L. Connor  
Fred D. Courtney  
Francis G. Crawford, [REDACTED]  
Clifford D. Crompton  
Walter R. Danielson, [REDACTED]  
Hubert P. Davis  
Thomas B. Deen  
Charles G. Deese  
Randolph L. Dodd  
Henry A. Domian  
Cloyd J. Dowling, Jr.  
Hans H. Driessnack  
Charles H. Dudley  
Richard E. Dussault  
Richard A. Dutton  
William C. Eagle  
Gordon C. Edgar  
William E. Elmore  
Merle W. Emmert  
Robert B. English, [REDACTED]  
William C. Evans  
Donald M. Fehlings  
Bruce H. Ferguson  
John A. Fiebelkorn  
Bruce M. Fisher  
Stephen M. Flanagan  
Harold L. Fox  
Frank D. Frazier  
Francis W. Freeman, [REDACTED]  
Donald F. Fryauf  
David L. Gasser  
Allison G. Glover  
Paul F. Goodwin  
Vernon D. Gores  
Carl K. Greene, [REDACTED]  
Kenneth W. Grubaugh  
Leo W. Hall  
Edward D. Hallett  
Lawrence C. Harrington  
William E. Harris, Jr.  
James B. Harrison  
John T. Hart  
Joseph L. Hart  
Edmund H. T. Hay, Jr.  
Daymond E. Helton  
John R. Higson  
Lawrence W. Hitchins  
Anthony E. Holland  
Lemuel D. Horton  
David R. Howard  
William F. Hoyer  
John D. Hunt  
Evan E. Huston  
Delmar G. Jacobs  
John H. James, Jr.  
Arthur L. Jarvela  
Nathan L. Joel  
Thomas H. Johns  
Eugene A. Johnson  
Harlan W. Johnson  
William T. Johnson, Jr.  
Richard A. Johnston  
Frank G. Jones  
Jacob N. Jones, Jr.  
Nolan T. Jones  
Richard M. Joppa  
Leonard I. Kaplan  
Evangelis H. Karalis  
Arthur Karma  
Edward W. Kassor, Jr.  
Francis M. Kavanagh  
Dare K. Keelan  
Philip E. Kelgard  
Robert J. Kiker  
Paul E. Killion, [REDACTED]  
William M. King  
Dennett H. Kinnard  
Philip E. Klein  
John S. Knowles  
Frederick G. Koehler  
Edward F. Kramer, Jr.  
Raymond A. Kuchar-chuk  
Thomas J. Kuchera  
Gladstone S. Lewis, Jr.  
James P. Lindberg, Jr.  
John T. Lindsay  
Robert G. Little, Jr.  
Curtis C. Love  
Robert M. Lucas  
John H. Ludwig  
William G. MacLaren, Jr.  
Solomon L. Madison  
Hughie M. Maples, Jr.  
Gerald E. Marsh  
Don L. Marshall  
James H. Marshall  
Fernand F. Martin  
Daniel P. Maxfield  
Edward P. Mazak, Jr., [REDACTED]  
John P. McConnell  
David R. McDonald  
Joseph H. Mendenhall  
John Miller  
Frank A. Modic  
Marshall W. Moore

Guy L. Morrison, Jr. Richard R. Stanton,  
 Jimmy W. Mullins, Gerald E. Starkey  
 Robert B. Murray, James G. Steger  
 Spencer Struble  
 Roger R. Neel Emil Sturmthal,  
 Earle E. Nelson George E. Swick, Jr.  
 Crawford Nevins Shoji Takasugi  
 William L. Nichols Henry L. Thomas  
 Joseph W. Noah Ralph W. Thomas  
 Paul L. Norris James C. Thompson  
 Raymond C. Nutt Robert P. Tiel  
 William C. O'Brien, John O. Tinius  
 Robert L. O'Connell George P. Tynan  
 James J. Odom, Jr. John N. Van Dusen  
 David J. Ottensmeyer William P. Venable,  
 Henry W. Parlett Jr.  
 Frances W. Penney William A. Volk  
 George Penovich Charles W. Wallace  
 Donald K. Percival Ralph W. Wallenborn  
 Donald C. Peterson Frank A. Wallington  
 Harold E. Pfeifer Marvin L. Walters  
 George K. Pickett Eugene R. R. Warner  
 Joseph T. Pilcher, Jr. Robert W. Ward  
 Francis S. Plonowski Walter R. Weck  
 Jackson L. Raley Burton L. Weller  
 John W. Ray Jerry D. Wethington  
 Donald L. Reinertson B. D. White,  
 Charles R. Renfro, Jr.  
 William H. Risteen, Clarence W. White,  
 Jr.  
 Samuel M. Robinson John W. White  
 Samuel Romano Simon S. White, Jr.  
 John J. Ross III James L. Whitlaw  
 B. W. Ryan Edmund M.  
 James H. Scharff Whitmeyer  
 Alden A. Scott Richard B.  
 William S. Selers Whittington  
 James R. Selig Richard J. Wieland  
 Robert B. Shaw John C. Wilkerson  
 Hugh W. Shoults, Bernard R. Williams,  
 Jr.  
 Henry W. Simpson Henry N. Williams  
 Chadwick B. Smith James C. Williams III  
 Lowell J. Smith, Robert K. Wolf  
 Edward J. Woodhouse  
 Howard E. Wright  
 Benjamin F. Yancey,  
 Jr.  
 Samuel D. Young, Jr.  
 Clarence E. Young-  
 man

The following-named distinguished avia-  
 tion cadets for appointment in the United  
 States Air Force in the grade indicated, with  
 dates of rank to be determined by the Sec-  
 retary of the Air Force, under the provisions  
 of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth  
 Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

*To be second lieutenants*

Alfred S. Allen William H. Martin  
 Vernon H. Carter, Jr. William J. Pollock  
 Lynwood E. Clark Eugene Raunikar  
 Robert E. Darlington Eugene R. Starke  
 William E. Dudley, Jr. Virgil P. Swim  
 Leland R. Kirk William W. Yary,  
 Allen D. LeBaron  
 Gilbert F. Libby  
 Vincent P. Luchsinger,  
 Jr.

The following-named officers for promo-  
 tion in the United States Air Force under  
 the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509  
 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those  
 officers whose names are preceded by the  
 symbol (X) are subject to physical exami-  
 nation required by law:

*To be captains*

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Allen, Wallace Burns,  
 Atchison, Frank Kester,  
 Baggaley, Thaddeus Stevens,  
 Baker, Ellis Crain, Jr.,  
 Barnhart, Harley E.,  
 Bates, Thomas Lawson,  
 Bauman, Norman Joseph,  
 Benkoski, Ernest Felix,

Bernier, Norman William,  
 Berry, Robert Earl,  
 Berryman, Delbert Quinton,  
 Bice, John Ward,  
 Biles, Howard Kenneth,  
 Bolen, George Oliver, Jr.,  
 Bond, Byron Franklin,  
 Brady, Wendell Darrell,  
 Buckwalter, Charles Quimby,  
 X Buie, James Campbell,  
 Cairns, Oliver William,  
 Campbell, James Milton,  
 Campbell, Warren Franklin,  
 Canant, Orion Paul Davidson,  
 Carrington, Richard Thompson, Jr.,  
 Childress, James Brack,  
 Christian, Harold Winfield, Jr.,  
 Clark, Lester Earl,  
 Cox, Frank Leroy, Jr.,  
 Cron, Rodney Leonard,  
 Curfman, Arden Blain,  
 Currie, Donald Archibald, Jr.,  
 Curtis, Jack Franklin,  
 Davenport, Ernest Eldon, Jr.,  
 Davis, Burton Alfred,  
 Davis, Harold Elmo,  
 Deem, Ray Howard, Jr.,  
 DeSaussure, Hamilton,  
 X de Wolski, Constantine Taddeus,  
 Diehl, Alfred James,  
 Dienst, William Lewis,  
 Edwards, Dewey Fortner,  
 Elliott, Merle Munson,  
 Erbe, Robert Frank,  
 Fleming, Lawrence John,  
 Fritts, Robert Erwin,  
 Frost, Murl,  
 Gardner, Alfred James,  
 Garner, Lynn Ellis,  
 X George, Amin, Jr.,  
 Glover, Henry Atkins,  
 Griffith, William Walters,  
 Grissom, V. F., Jr.,  
 X Hallas, Gerald Edward,  
 Hamilton, Jeff Lee, Jr.,  
 X Hanson, Junior Ole,  
 Harnly, Merlin Wrightman,  
 Hart, Bernard David,  
 Hatch, John T.,  
 Hatton, Sam James,  
 Hennessy, Thomas Berchman,  
 X Henshaw, Daniel Stewart,  
 Hickcox, Harold Jennings,  
 Hickman, Robert Gardner,  
 Hicks, William,  
 X Hinman, Richard Horace,  
 Hoffman, Wesley Kammerer,  
 Holdsambeck, Herbert Snead,  
 Holley, Hazel Lee,  
 Howard, Waldon A.,  
 Howell, Howard Dempsey,  
 Hutchins, Raymond Henry, Jr.,  
 Jackson, Ralph Frederick, Jr.,  
 X Jacobsen, Raymond George,  
 Johnson, Herbert Justus,  
 Juhn, Kenneth Paul,  
 Jureka, John Francis,  
 X Keal, Thomas Lee,  
 Keefe, James Herbert, Jr.,  
 Keegan, Robert Emmett,  
 Kerr, Frank Ross,  
 Kimberlin, John Isham,  
 Klinikowski, Walter Paul,  
 Krieger, Andrew Warren,  
 Lake, Gordon Wentworth,  
 X Lansche, Robert Louis,  
 Libell, Robert Warren,  
 Marlow, Robert Dean,  
 Marshall, William Edgar,  
 Marxen, Edward Henry, Jr.,  
 McClelland, Robert Cornelius,  
 McElroy, Sam Medford,  
 McKay, Robert Barr,  
 McKenna, William Wilfred,  
 Meyler, Walter Patrick,  
 Michels, William Nicholas,  
 Miller, Edward Ashley,  
 Miller, Frank Edward, Jr.,  
 Mimmough, Walter Edward, 3d,  
 Mitchell, Vance Fitzgerald,

Moullen, Roy Frederick,  
 Nelson, Claude Rufus,  
 Nicely, Gelvin Smith,  
 Nixon, Floyd George,  
 X Orrison, Charles Davidson,  
 Partin, George Garrett,  
 Pedracine, Patrick Charles,  
 Peterson, Carl Herbert,  
 Pickron, William Henry, Jr.,  
 Plame, Samuel, Jr.,  
 Porter, Philip Barton,  
 Prow, Emmett McCormack,  
 Quail, Donald Eugene,  
 Richardson, Ned West,  
 Robertson, Leslie Carol,  
 Rodgers, William Asklow,  
 Ross, Marvin Turner,  
 Roswurm, Richard Carl,  
 X Ruggles, Bertram Leon,  
 Salter, George Metz, Jr.,  
 Sampley, Troy Allen,  
 Schaffner, Donald Raymond,  
 Schroeder, Howard Richard,  
 Scott, Gordon Holborn,  
 Scott, Leon Luck,  
 Seller, Wilbur Western, Jr.,  
 Sherrard, James Lamar,  
 Smith, George Kitchen,  
 Smith, John Carlyle,  
 Smith, Robert Perry,  
 Spears, Simms Memory,  
 Spencer, Allan M., Jr.,  
 Spencer, Earl Wilber,  
 Spencer, Glen Harding,  
 Stevenson, Robin,  
 X Swan, Algernon Gordon,  
 Thompson, Raymond Farris,  
 Trautwein, Donald Frederick,  
 Van Dyke, Wallace Ford,  
 Venable, Calvin Houston,  
 X White, Gerald Harn, Jr.,  
 White, Miller Grieve, Jr.,  
 Wilson, Clarence Edgar,  
 Witham, Melvin Warren,  
 X Wolfe, Donald Jack,  
 Wright, Lawrence Chester,  
 Yurcina, Thomas,

MEDICAL SERVICE

Darling, Kenneth Perry,

*To be first lieutenants*

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Blalock, Woodrow Wilson,  
 Jenks, Harford Perry,  
 Lockridge, Clarence Reynolds,  
 May Edward Stanley,  
 Palmer, William Joseph,  
 Peters, Earl William,  
 Plowden, Douglas Randolph, Jr.,  
 Reid, Addison Taylor,  
 Sharp, David Martin,  
 Shiver, Morris Eugene,  
 Smith, Gayle LeRoy,  
 Snyder, John Thomas,  
 Tannenbaum, Leon Marvin,  
 Thompson, Lawrence A., Jr.,  
 Toothman, Byron Rimbey,  
 Trommershauser, John,  
 Walter, Harvey Peter,

MEDICAL SERVICE

Lubrant, Anthony John,

The following-named officers for promo-  
 tion in the United States Air Force under the  
 provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy  
 Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public  
 Law 514, Eighty-first Congress.

*To be captain*

AIR FORCE NURSE

Loyd, Eddie Ruth,

*To be first lieutenant*

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST

Deming, Elsie L.,

(NOTE.—All officers nominated for promo-  
 tion to captain and first lieutenant are eli-  
 gible for permanent promotion during the  
 month of March 1951. Dates of rank will be  
 determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)



## IN THE NAVY

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Felix B. Stump, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. John J. Ballentine, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Air Force, Atlantic Fleet.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Davis, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Director, the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Rear Adm. Ingolf N. Kiland, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet.

The following-named enlisted men of the Navy for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy in the grades indicated:

## LIEUTENANTS

|                            |                         |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Charles W. Adair           | Richard J. Long         |
| Irving M. Applebaum        | Richard M. Manders      |
| Carrol F. Bell             | Cecil Manship           |
| John E. Buchanan           | Joseph W. Mross         |
| Elmer "J" "B" Carr         | Clyde S. Newton         |
| John B. Copeland           | Gilbert H. Orr          |
| Roy E. Curtis              | Irving L. Patterson     |
| Edward C. Czopek           | John V. Patterson, Jr.  |
| George H. Doolittle        | David S. Rotchstein     |
| "R" "H" Dorman             | William G. Schaufier    |
| John V. Draggie            | James N. Scofield, Jr.  |
| Leon J. Drellicharz        | Edward O. Sentar        |
| Jack M. Farwell            | Henry G. Smith          |
| Lyle F. Flick              | Hiram E. Smith, Jr.     |
| Robert L. Gill             | Julian M. Steadman      |
| Walter J. Gregg            | Raymond O. Thuttedal    |
| Reaves S. Heflin           | Cyril L. Touchette      |
| Clarence H. Hutchison, Jr. | Evan K. Williams        |
| Harold Jennings            | William L. Williams     |
| Ralph R. Johnson           | George C. Willis        |
| Joseph F. Kakol            | Charles H. Wittman, Jr. |
| Raymond G. Lair            | Joseph J. Yakich        |
| Dean W. Larrick            | Frederick J. Young      |
| Charles H. Long            |                         |

## LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

|                        |                       |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Donald L. Arvidson     | Donald C. Hamilton    |
| David T. Avery         | Robert C. Harris      |
| Bertram E. Barker      | "S" "J" Harris        |
| Robert O. Barnes       | Thomas G. Hart        |
| Emzer H. Bizzell, Jr.  | Harlan J. Hays        |
| Victor E. Blitz        | Leo C. Hester         |
| Billie J. Bobek        | Delois V. Holloway    |
| Frank B. Bowen         | Wilton F. Johnson     |
| Carl D. Brown          | Richard F. Johnston   |
| Donald B. F. Brown     | Philip H. Jones       |
| James L. Chandler      | George E. Kenison     |
| Eugene C. Chase        | David V. Kyrklund     |
| Alvin L. Clark         | George L. Lamere      |
| Stuart W. Cochrane     | William H. Larson     |
| Frank A. Dandrea       | Walter G. Leon, Jr.   |
| Earl S. Dickson        | Francis G. McEnaney   |
| Jerome M. Dowling      | "G" "L" Marona        |
| William A. Doyle, Jr.  | Paul A. Montgomery    |
| Edward A. Duff         | Frank "E" Moy         |
| Joseph Dugger          | Charles E. Nester     |
| William W. Evans       | Walter E. Newell      |
| Carl Everson           | Jay J. Niemann        |
| Floyd A. Faircloth     | Willard V. Noble      |
| Howard D. Fields, Jr.  | Lawrence E. O'Donnell |
| William M. Foster      | Harry E. Patterson    |
| Arnold J. Fransen      | Seymour J. Premislaar |
| Bill B. Frink          | Thomas B. Pugh        |
| James E. Goodman       | John M. Richardson    |
| Thomas J. Guilday, Jr. |                       |

|                     |                        |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| Carl Sergun         | William W. Vaughn, Jr. |
| Wilson W. Sheehan   | Quinton O. Walters     |
| Willard M. Shepard  | George V. Warren       |
| Bert H. Smith       | Donald F. Watson       |
| Boney T. Smith, Jr. | Gerald M. Watson       |
| Robert W. Smith     | William H. Watson, Jr. |
| Harvey G. Speed     | David T. Williams      |
| Charles E. Spoerri  | Walter T. Zebrowski    |
| Gorman L. Strunk    |                        |
| Russell J. Timm     |                        |
| Harold R. Truesdale |                        |

## ENSIGN

## Francis D. Furey

The following-named midshipmen (Aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

|                    |                      |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| Donald E. Adams    | Arthur V. Kane       |
| Corby J. W. Hedges | Robert P. LaMontagne |
| John T. Higgins    | James M. Russ        |

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

|                          |                         |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Charles E. Axthelm       | Thomas J. Peterson, Jr. |
| Elmer A. Bloomquist, Jr. | Claude R. Stamey, Jr.   |
| Forrest A. Miller        | Donnell Van Noppen, Jr. |
| William H. Payne         |                         |
| Clifford L. Peacock      |                         |

The following-named (civilian college graduates) for temporary or permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

## LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

John R. Wassell

The following-named for permanent appointment:

## LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Edwin M. Leach  
Charles H. Ward

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy in lieu of lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Howard A. Baker  
John R. Wassell

Harold A. Davis (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Betty L. Dunnam  
Abbie C. Sheehan

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

|                    |                   |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| Robert E. Anderson | William M. Hunter |
| Ralph G. Caldwell  | Joseph C. O'Brien |
| Henry C. Duncan    | Edward O'N. Riley |
| Paul C. Hamner     | George B. Riley   |
| Martin J. Hoar     | Alla W. Robertson |

Harold F. Wimp (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

Will F. Graham (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy in lieu of lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

|                       |                        |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Albert E. Brown       | David O. Hamrick       |
| George P. Douglas     | Roger L. Hiatt         |
| Seaborn C. Early      | James D. McIlraith     |
| Martin Gellman        | Henry B. Murphree, Jr. |
| Neil E. Goodrich, Jr. | Paul "D" Grossnickle   |

Nancy M. Murtagh, woman (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

|                        |                         |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Elizabeth D. Betzinger | Margaret Kantor         |
| Louise A. Buckingham   | Mary A. Kelly           |
| Patricia P. Crowe      | Mary E. Kirkland        |
| Mary R. Easter         | Lillian D. Leutz        |
| Ruth E. Eldridge       | Catherine F. McCarville |
| Joan M. Engle          |                         |
| Vera L. Foster         | Frances P. Maguire      |
| Regina A. Graney       | Anna Sganga             |
| Elizabeth L. Jaeger    | Norma A. Sullivan       |
| Barbara E. Jago        | Marian J. Ulrich        |

The following-named warrant officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

## CHIEF BOATSWAINS

|                          |                      |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Willard C. Cannaday, Jr. | John B. Jackson, Jr. |
| Broadus L. Gardner       | Clellan K. Keefe     |
| Jack E. L. Carleton      | Oscar W. Kihlstrom   |
| Arnold M. Christiansen   | Arthur E. Mayle      |
| William L. Gordon        | Mark E. McKin        |
| Jasper S. Hardin         | Bernard F. Miller    |
| Ambrose H. Holdgrafer    | Richard A. Seigler   |
|                          | Kenneth R. Wolf      |

## CHIEF GUNNER

Fred Q. Gibson

## CHIEF TORPEDOMAN

William F. McNair

## CHIEF ELECTRICIAN

Kenneth G. Armstrong, Jr.

## CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

|                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Owen R. Brecker    | Walter I. Mitchell |
| Wlot L. Clarke     | Reginald Peterson  |
| Edgar E. Fuller    | David W. Snyder    |
| Jack E. Hayes      | Reid Wilson        |
| Ovie D. Hixson     | James W. Woods     |
| Wilfred R. Jackson | Norman G. Woods    |
| Kenneth C. Mathews | James T. Wright    |
| Claude W. Miller   | Guedon E. Zakotnik |

## CHIEF CARPENTERS

|                     |                   |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| Jesse D. Cannon     | Jeptha B. Hicks   |
| Gayland M. Copeland | Roy C. Tamez      |
| Wayne I. Egger      | Stephen P. Yorden |

## CHIEF SHIPS CLERKS

|                  |                    |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Millard T. Eaker | Robert W. Palmer   |
| John Borgens     | Ronald J. Stafford |
| Vincent Y. Jones |                    |

## CHIEF WARRANT OFFICERS, HOSPITAL CORPS

|                       |                     |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Ocie T. Adams         | Frank L. Maxwell    |
| Stewart K. Blanchard  | Cecil J. Peart      |
| Almon Carter          | Richard W. Ricker   |
| Robert H. Doud        | Bernard T. Stradley |
| Donald E. Feuquay     | Francis E. Sullivan |
| Ralph T. Goerner, Jr. | Lowell W. Swartz    |
| Robert F. Hoenscheidt | Johnny W. Young     |

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

|                       |                              |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Odeff M. Conoley      | Wendell H. Duplantis         |
| Louie C. Reinberg     | Joseph R. Little, Jr.        |
| William W. Buchanan   | Lawrence H. McCullley        |
| Jack Tabor            | Fenwick N. Reeve             |
| Joseph N. Renner      | Alexander A. Vandegrift, Jr. |
| William R. Collins    | George W. Hays               |
| Norman Van Dam        | "A" "E" Dubber               |
| Herbert H. Williamson | Paul R. Tyler                |
| John C. Miller, Jr.   | Edmund M. Williams           |
| Charles S. Todd       | Philip W. John               |
| Thomas S. Ivey        | Harold B. Meek               |
| Joseph L. Winecoff    | Rathvon M. Tompkins          |
| James S. O'Halloran   | Charles M. Nees              |
| William G. Robb       | Glenn D. Morgan              |
| Ralph L. Houser       | George B. Bell               |
| Robert C. Burns       | Andrew B. Galatian, Jr.      |
| Arthur A. Chidester   | Frederick R. Dowsett         |
| Reed M. Fawell, Jr.   |                              |
| Arthur J. Davis       |                              |

Elby D. Martin, Jr.  
Richard W. Wallace  
John H. Masters  
Harrison Brent, Jr.  
William F. Kramer  
Louis B. Robertshaw  
William D. Roberson  
Maynard M. Nohrden  
Richard Rothwell  
Herbert R. Nusbaum  
DeWolf Schatzel  
John H. Earle, Jr.  
Bryghte D. Godbold  
Glenn C. Funk  
Robert C. McGlashan  
Harold J. Mitchener  
Leonard M. Mason  
Joseph P. Sayers  
Max C. Chapman  
John D. Harshberger  
John L. Smith  
James S. Blais  
Robert E. Galer  
Cliff Atkinson, Jr.  
Henry H. Crockett  
David W. Stonecliffe  
Milo G. Haines  
Malcolm O. Donohoo

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harvey M. Miller  
John R. Barreiro, Jr.  
William McReynolds  
John E. Sundholm  
Robert W. Glickert  
John L. Hopkins  
Henry W. Seeley, Jr.  
Henry G. Lawrence, Jr.  
James G. Kelly  
William C. Ward, Jr.  
John T. Bradshaw  
Robert E. Collier  
Alexander A. Elder  
Ward K. Schaub  
Maurice L. Appleton, Jr.  
Alvis H. Allen  
Robert K. McClelland  
Clifford F. Quilici  
Rufus D. Sams, Jr.  
Thomas M. Burton  
Victor R. Bisceglia  
James H. Tatsch  
Robert Y. Stratton  
Amedeo Rea  
Nathaniel Morgenthal  
Louis G. Ditta  
Gerald F. Russell  
John T. O'Neill  
Tom N. Hasperis  
Ernest L. Medford, Jr.  
Frederick J. Mix, Jr.  
Ralph H. Currin  
Arthur H. Haake  
Oscar F. Peatross  
Frank E. Garretson  
Norman R. Nickerson  
George A. Rickert  
Norman Pozinsky  
Fraser E. West  
Quinton R. Johns  
Donald G. H. Jaekels  
Stanley S. Nicolay  
Darrel D. Irwin  
James K. Dill  
Stephen J. Zsiga  
Vernice S. Calvert  
Robert E. A. Lillie  
Anthony J. Dowdle  
Granville Mitchell  
Paul B. McNicol  
Charles C. Campbell  
Marvin L. Ross  
George C. Axtell, Jr.  
Harold B. Penne  
Walter J. Carr, Jr.  
Charles Kimak  
Wallace G. Fleissner  
Robert H. Gray

Stuart M. Charlesworth  
Walter N. Flournoy  
Robert F. Scott  
Thomas C. Moore, Jr.  
Kenneth A. King  
Paul J. Fontana  
Allen B. Geiger  
George S. Bowman, Jr.  
James G. Bishop, Jr.  
Thornton M. Hinkle  
Ronald K. Miller  
Edward W. Johnston  
Louis A. Ennis  
Charles L. Banks  
James L. Neefus  
James C. Murray, Jr.  
William H. Barba  
George F. Britt  
Robert W. Boyd  
Spencer S. Magruder  
Marion M. Bagruder  
August F. Penzold, Jr.  
George W. Killen  
Noah P. Wood, Jr.  
Jean H. Buckner  
John S. Twitchell

Eugene V. Boro  
Louie N. Casey  
John J. Wade, Jr.  
Karl N. Smith  
Horace C. Parks  
Bernard W. McLean  
Olin W. Jones, Jr.  
John L. Frothingham  
Chester L. Christenson  
Horace E. Knapp, Jr.  
Stephen C. Munson, Jr.  
Henry H. Reichner, Jr.  
Edwin B. Wheeler  
John B. Sweeney  
Grant S. Baze  
William T. Bray  
Quintin A. Bradley  
George D. Webster  
Carl M. Johnson  
George F. Vaughan  
Henry S. Campbell  
David M. Danser  
James G. Brady  
Robert N. Barrett, Jr.  
Harry W. Edwards  
James P. Rathbun  
Arthur J. Rauchle  
Edward J. Doyle  
Wilbur R. Helmer  
Paul H. Millichap  
Bernard T. Kafka  
Edward P. Dupras, Jr.  
Louis C. Griffin  
Houston Stiff  
James E. Herbold, Jr.  
John S. Hudson  
James K. Eagan  
Meryl F. Kurr  
Webb D. Sawyer  
Samuel L. Grigsby  
Winston E. Jewson  
Robert A. Campbell  
George E. Moore  
Donald E. Noll  
Edward R. Gilbert  
William P. Oliver, Jr.  
Maxie R. Williams  
Peter I. Olsen  
Harry D. Pratt  
Theodore A. Demos-  
thenes  
Sherman W. Parry  
Frank A. Long  
Robert T. Neal  
Richard G. Warga  
Kenneth N. Hilton  
Joseph C. Missar  
Charles E. Dobson, Jr.

Raymond C. Portillo  
Edward G. Roff, Jr.  
Walter M. Caulfield  
Arnold W. Harris  
Stanley M. Adams  
John P. Wilbern  
Raymond G. Coyne  
Leonard D. Reid  
Milton G. Cokin  
Howard E. Wertman  
Sidney J. Altman  
Harry O. Buzhardt  
James A. Feeley, Jr.  
John R. Spooner  
Joseph H. Elliott, Jr.  
James T. McDaniel  
Robert P. Keller  
Donald H. Sapp  
Richard M. Caldwell  
Alan J. Armstrong  
Robert E. Cameron  
Donald S. Bush  
Frank R. Porter, Jr.  
Walter E. Gregory  
Charles P. Weiland  
John S. Payne  
John P. Newlands  
Albert W. Campbell  
Fenton J. Mee  
Spencer H. Pratt  
Elwyn M. Stimson  
Albert Arsenault  
Frank A. Gunner, Jr.  
David A. Van Eveta  
John V. Kelsey  
John F. Corbett  
Robert B. Farrelly  
James H. Clark  
Kenneth R. Chamber-  
lain

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James F. Coady  
John A. Hefti  
Ernest E. Codere  
William R. Watson, Jr.  
Joseph H. Griffith  
George L. Shead  
William H. Kennedy, Jr.  
Harold L. Oppen-  
heimer  
Foster C. LaHue  
John J. Padley  
James M. Joyner  
Leo B. Case  
William J. Dickinson  
Irving Schechter  
Leonard G. Hicks  
Warren S. Siverstsen  
John E. Gorman  
George M. Chinn  
Henry W. Branson  
Blaine H. Boesler  
Edward J. McGee  
Charles D. Gray  
Paul E. Bardet  
Fred W. Haxton  
Clarence C. Gordon  
James W. Dodson  
John A. Reeder  
Glen E. Martin

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Kennard F. Bubier

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Helen J. McGraw  
Barbara J. Bishop  
Emma H. Hendrickson

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James B. Seaton

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Albert J. Assad  
James L. McGuire

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the

grade of commissioned warrant officer, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James H. Harrington  
Daryl G. Sheehan  
George C. Hunter  
Ray W. Patterson  
Ralph E. Johnson  
Charles W. Keeton  
Charles D. Pierce, Jr.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ALABAMA

Joseph H. Turner, Billingsley.  
Baugh E. Kilgore, Bynum.  
James B. Martin, Jr., Springville.

##### ALASKA

Clarence T. Larsen, Seward.

##### CONNECTICUT

Raymond J. Wamester, Middletown.  
Francis C. Brennan, Milford.

##### GEORGIA

Sybil M. Vickers, Ambrose.  
James L. Cauthen, Milner.

##### IDAHO

Jalma A. Riley, Ashton.

##### INDIANA

Kenneth D. Brunson, Alexandria.  
Norman A. Richwine, Clermont.  
Perry W. Foster, Vallonia.

##### KENTUCKY

Foster Ratliff, Lookout.  
Charles B. Westernman, Pleasure Ridge Park.  
Elmer H. Morrison, Wayland.

##### LOUISIANA

Robert G. Fitzgerrald, Oakdale.

##### MAINE

Rosaire P. Plante, Jackman Station.  
Harland E. Johnson, Monson.  
Joseph L. Cook, Portland.  
Villa M. Snow, Pownal.  
Dominick S. DeFilipp, Riddlonville.  
Leo N. Poirier, Van Buren.

##### MARYLAND

Manuel R. Diaz, Luke.

##### MICHIGAN

Leon D. Wallaker, Arcadia.  
Hazel D. Harrison, Conklin.  
William O. Kelly, Flint.  
Stella A. Ritchie, New Troy.  
Willet H. Schmidt, Port Austin.  
Valentine R. Smith, Saugatuck.  
William K. LaCombe, Trenary.  
Russell K. Kilpatrick, Vermontville.

##### MONTANA

James Roy Cramer, Polson.  
Ralph L. Benjamin, Shelby.

##### NORTH CAROLINA

Neva B. Wilkins, Butner.  
Francis H. Powell, Ca-Vel.

##### NORTH DAKOTA

Elmer L. Schielke, McClusky.  
Edward J. Sondag, Sykeston.

##### OHIO

Dory R. Swank, Butler.  
Arnold T. Schoch, Coldwater.  
Florence E. Gerty, Hamden.  
Oliver C. Metzger, Strasburg.

##### OKLAHOMA

Frederick M. Shaw, Oklahoma City.

##### OREGON

Margaret E. Wirth, Adair Village.  
Alice G. Kavanaugh, Manzanita.

##### RHODE ISLAND

Gianuario Spanedda, Georglville.

##### SOUTH CAROLINA

Troy J. Lynch, Coward.

##### SOUTH DAKOTA

Edward C. Hausmann, Bonesteel.

## TEXAS

Willard E. Howell, Alvord.  
Jack G. Holson, Bacliff.  
Harry O. Lindeman, Bartlett.  
Harold B. Manry, Corrigan.  
James H. Breeding, Encinal.  
Robert F. Henderson, Frost.  
Grace W. Blanchard, Fullerton.  
Elbert H. Brown, Hubbard.  
Ruth V. Hestand, Keene.

## VERMONT

George E. McCanna, Hardwick.

## VIRGINIA

Fitzhugh L. Adams, Appalachia.

## WYOMING

Oliver J. Colyer, Torrington.

## WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 12 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

## UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following personnel of the United States Coast Guard sent to the Senate on January 15, 1951:

|                      |                     |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Dwight H. Dexter     | Martin Lentz, Jr.   |
| Lewis H. Shackelford | Hamlett I. Allen    |
| Edward W. Holtz      | Michael J. Hoosick  |
| Herbert F. Walsh     | David H. Douglas    |
| William W. Storey    | Theron H. Gato      |
| Edwin J. Roland      | Edwin W. Coleman    |
| Christian R. Couser  | Robert S. Capp      |
| Willard L. Jones     | Leslie F. Cool      |
| Robert N. Williams   | John D. Roberts     |
| Russell W. Thresher  | Raymond J. Evans    |
| William E. Schwelzer | Scott P. Berryman   |
| George F. Erwin      | Willis G. Partridge |
| Wilfred Pantzer      | Nelson W. Allen     |
| Walter G. Davis      |                     |

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O, Thou infinite and eternal God, we rejoice that in the annals of our national history we have the record of the life and character of many God-fearing souls who served their generation according to Thy holy will and of whose fame there will be no end.

We thank Thee for this day when we are privileged to call to mind and pay tribute to the memory of a great patriot in whose heart the fires of faith in God and man burned brightly and who placed his supreme confidence in the sanctity and abiding reality of the moral and spiritual order.

Grant that our beloved country may continue to have as its glorious aspiration and far-flung goal the coming of that blessed time when men everywhere shall walk together, unitedly and joyously, as brothers, on the highways of freedom and peace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1951, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were com-

XCVII—78

municated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

## CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the House was considering the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] offered an amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the so-called escape-clause amendment. Mr. BAILEY's substitute appears in full on pages 1113 and 1114 of the daily RECORD of February 7, 1951. I made the point of order against that amendment on the ground that it was not germane and that point of order was sustained. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] then offered an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, containing the identical language of his first amendment with the exception of the heading which was altered to provide a specific amendment to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, instead of adding merely a new section to the bill under consideration. This amendment was germane. However, in the reading of it, page 2 of the amendment was misplaced. It was, I am informed, at the Clerk's desk. I am sure the Committee was aware that it was considering the language contained in the two pages of the Bailey amendment as originally offered. My friends on the other side of aisle accepted the amendment as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, and it was agreed to by the Committee of the Whole and subsequently by the House on a separate vote.

Permit me to read that part of the amendment which was read by the clerk, and then read the second page which was not read:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska: Amend section 350 of the Tariff Act, as amended, by adding thereto the following subsections:

"Sec. 5. (a) If in the course of a trade agreement any product on which a concession has been granted is being imported into the territory of one of the contracting parties in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting parties shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the concession in whole or in part, to withdraw or modify the concession or to establish import quotas.

"(b) Upon the request of the President, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party the United States Tariff Commission shall make an investigation to determine whether any article upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement to which a clause similar to that provided in subsection (a) of this section is applicable, is being imported under such relatively increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry or a segment of such industry which produces a like or directly competitive article.

"In the course of any such investigation the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings, giving reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I read the second page of the amendment which should follow at the end of section 7 of the bill:

Should the Tariff Commission find, as the result of its investigation and hearings, that serious injury is being caused or threatened through the importation of the article in question, it shall recommend to the President the withdrawal or modification of the concession, its suspension in whole or in part, or the establishment of import quotas, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury.

(c) When in the judgment of the Tariff Commission no sufficient reason exists for such a recommendation to the President it shall, after due investigation and hearings, make a finding in support of its denial of the application, setting forth the facts which have led to such conclusion. This finding shall set forth the level of duty below which, in the Commission's judgment, serious injury would occur or threaten.

In arriving at a determination in the foregoing procedure the Tariff Commission shall deem a downward trend of production, employment, and wages in the domestic industry concerned, or a decline in sales and a higher or growing inventory attributable in part to import competition, to be evidence of serious injury or a threat thereof.

Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] I feel that in all fairness to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] a correction should be made in the proceedings of the House, and I now ask unanimous consent that the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 1612 was passed be vacated and that the language of the amendment I have just read be agreed to in toto as an amendment to the bill at the point it was intended, section 7 of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been consulted on this matter; so has the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] stated.

I do want to say this, however, for a very efficient reading clerk, that I saw the confusion of the many papers that were on his desk at the time this amendment was read, and I can readily understand how this mistake could have been made. I have no intention whatever of holding the reading clerk to blame.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am not seeking to lay any blame at all, not for 1 minute, and what I have said and am saying is in no way to be construed as criticism of the clerk. It was not the fault of the clerk; it was just one of those errors that may occur when an amendment is presented to the clerk's desk consisting of two pages and the two pages are not attached.

Mr. REED of New York. I realize the gentleman was not making any such im-