

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 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:

Our Father God, into the calm and confidence of Thy presence we would bring our drained and driven souls that the benediction of Thy peace may fall upon our restless lives. May this little shrine of daily devotion, built by our fathers on the high hill of the Nation, open for us vistas of green pastures and still waters where our jaded souls may be restored.

In a difficult and desperate era, be Thou our pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, as patiently and obediently we follow the kindly light. May we close our national ranks in a new unity, as deadly peril threatens the birthright of our liberties. Save us from living on a small scale in a great day. In this hour of destiny, O be swift our souls to answer Thee, be jubilant our feet. In Thy name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 12, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE JAPANESE CONGRESSIONAL AGRICULTURAL MISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that we have present in this Chamber today a number of distinguished members of the Japanese Diet, who are visiting various places in our country in order to acquaint themselves with American institutions. We are very happy to have them with us in the Senate. The Chair has a list of their names and a statement which Mr. Katano Mori, the chairman of the delegation, desires to have printed in the RECORD, rather than to be called upon to deliver it on the floor.

The Chair asks the members of the Japanese Diet to rise, so that Members of the Senate may see them.

[The members of the delegation from Japan rose from their seats in the rear of the Chamber and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. We all hope that the contacts which are being made between the representatives of the Japanese people and the American people since the end of the late unfortunate war, and their effort to create a new govern-

ment, new institutions, and new relationships will result in the resumption of the long friendship which, until the late unpleasantness, existed between the people of Japan and the people of the United States, and between the Japanese Government and the Government of the United States. All who find it possible to come here from Japan, and all those in this country who find it possible to visit Japan, contribute to that happy result. Therefore, we welcome the distinguished group from the Japanese legislative body, and the Chair hopes they will profit by their visit to the United States, and will carry back to their people very happy memories of their contact with our people and our Government.

The Chair asks that the statement prepared by the chairman of the delegation and the list of the members of the delegation who are present may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The statement and list of members of the delegation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. KATANO MORI

Mr. President and Senators, it is indeed an honor and a privilege bestowed upon me and members of the Japanese Congressional Agricultural Mission to the United States of America to be so cordially received by this distinguished gathering of United States Senators.

Permit me in behalf of our Government to take this opportunity to convey through you to the American people the greetings of the Japanese people and an expression of their sincere appreciation for the generous food supplies given during the immediate postwar period and for the continued sympathy and understanding of your people. I cannot recall without feeling fresh pain in my heart that dreadful period of acute food shortage. The war's end brought in its wake social chaos and mental apathy. Worst of all, people were on the brink of starvation. This danger was averted mostly by the timely relief of foodstuffs shipped over from your country through the good offices of the occupation authorities. We were touched by the generosity shown by the American people to their former enemy. It is by no means an exaggeration that this relief gave hope and impetus to the man in the street to work for his own salvation and for Japan's rehabilitation. Given a right start, our people have been working hard for the last 5 years, and today I am glad to inform you that our livelihood is improved and our people restored to composure.

The American people are pleased, I am sure, to know that the overwhelming majority of the Japanese people stand today for the cause of democracy and its defense against the Communist menace, both from within and from without. We are fully prepared to offer our contribution to the defense of the peace in east Asia and in the world at large. We are all eager to see that the day will come soon for Japan to join the family of nations as a free and independent nation, and you may be assured that she will stand with the free nations of the world.

The object of our mission is primarily to see on the spot how your agricultural policy is formulated and executed in conformity with the will of the people. We are thankful to the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers and his staff in Tokyo for accorded us this opportunity of direct observation. We are determined to make the most of our visit for the benefit of Japan's agriculture, farmers, and people in general, and ulti-

mately of the mutual interest of our two peoples. Underlying problems which we face today, apart from those which are in the limelight at the moment, are those of food and population. For the further improvement of our basic agricultural policy and the solution of these difficult problems, we shall need your continuous help, for which, I assure, the Japanese people will be forever grateful.

Since our arrival in the United States a few weeks ago we have experienced the warm friendship and hospitality of the American people in their homeland. We now better understand the spiritual qualities which motivated the policies and conduct of the occupation in our country. During the years of that occupation a new and closer friendship has been developed between our two countries, based upon the best qualities and characteristics of our peoples. With this solid foundation, we are now able to give a happy end to the unhappy period of our history and to open the door to a bright and fertile future for our two nations.

JAPANESE CONGRESSIONAL AGRICULTURAL MISSION, JANUARY 1951

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (466 MEMBERS)

Liberal Party (285)

Kotaro Mori (chairman of mission): (61), Shiga Prefecture, fifth term, former Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, chairman of discipline committee.

Minoru Sakamoto: (46), Yamaguchi Prefecture, third term, former Vice Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, former chairman of agriculture and forestry committee, member of budget committee.

Tokuro Adachi: (40), Shizuoka Prefecture, first term, member of agriculture and forestry committee.

Raizo Matsuno: (33), Kumamoto Prefecture, second term, former member of agriculture and forestry committee, member of labor committee.

Democrat (67)

Kazumi Kobayashi: (45), Nagano Prefecture, second term, member of agriculture and forestry committee.

Social Democrat (46)

Ryoji Inoue: (52), Kochi Prefecture, fourth term, former Vice Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, former chairman of agriculture and forestry committee, member of agriculture and forestry committee.

Secretariat

Kazuo Ichihashi: (38), Kanagawa Prefecture, chief translation officer.

HOUSE OF COUNCILORS (250 MEMBERS)

Liberal (76)

Kazuo Kitamura: (53), Niigata Prefecture, second term, former Vice Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, chairman of judicial affairs committee.

Social Democrat (62)

Soji Okada: (48), Tokyo, first term, chairman of agriculture and forestry committee.

Green Breeze Society (group of independents) (56)

Yoshio Kusumi: (45), Hyogo Prefecture, first term, former Vice Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, former chairman of agriculture and forestry committee, member of budget committee, member of cabinet committee.

Democrat (29)

Hajime Miyoshi: (35), Kagawa Prefecture, first term, member of agriculture and forestry committee.

Secretariat

Mikitaro Matsuno: (38), Gifu Prefecture, chief translation officer.

REPORTS OF FINANCE COMMITTEE FILED
DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 12th instant,

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which were referred the following bills, reported them on February 14, 1951, and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 1. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91);

H. R. 1724. A bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92); and

H. R. 2141. A bill to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 93).

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT BY NAVY DEPARTMENT ON FOREIGN
EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess property disposal by the Navy Department, calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

RECORDATION OF SCRIP, LIEU SELECTION, AND
SIMILAR RIGHTS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSOLIDATION OF PARKER AND DAVIS DAM
PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO MANASSAS
NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD, VA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the addition of certain lands to Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR GEOLOGICAL
SURVEY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; 43 U. S. C., sec. 36b), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ABOLITION OF CASTLE PINCKNEY NATIONAL
MONUMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument and to transfer the jurisdiction and control of the lands contained to the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAW ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a law enacted by the Legislature of Guam, making appropriation for the compensation of a member of the President's Commission on application of the Federal laws of Guam (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN
ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, suspending the deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE
TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report, dated December 29, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES
COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oreg., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TERM OF JUDGE FOR DISTRICT COURT OF VIRGIN
ISLANDS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix the term of the judge of the district court of the Virgin Islands at 8 years (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Food and Drug Administration, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FINANCIAL AUDIT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the Director, National Organization of the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of the American Legion for the calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Concurrent Resolution 32

"Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation which will exempt employees of the State and the political subdivisions thereof from the present wage stabilization order

"Whereas the Federal Wage Stabilization Board has announced a wage freeze in conjunction with a price freeze at the highest levels between December 19, 1950, and January 25, 1951; and

"Whereas the said wage freeze includes hundreds of thousands of employees of the State and its political subdivisions; and

"Whereas the salaries of government employees have fallen far below the level necessary to maintain a decent standard of living; and

"Whereas this order jeopardizes and forestalls the present wage adjustments which have been promised by State and municipal authorities for such employees: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the people of the State of New York through their representatives in the senate and assembly hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation, if necessary, and the Wage Stabilization Board to promulgate orders which will exempt employees of the State and its political subdivisions from the said wage stabilization order; and it is further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to Cyrus S. Ching, Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

"By order of the senate,

"WILLIAM S. KING,

"Secretary.

"In assembly, February 5, 1951, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,

"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress thereof to take no steps to establish or to join a world government at this time

"Whereas it is the desire of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of

Colorado to encourage and aid in the establishment of peace among the nations of the world, and it is the firm determination of this same general assembly to preserve the sacred rights of the people of Colorado and of the United States as have been determined by the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas there are in the world today as well as in these United States people who are strenuously endeavoring to establish a world government and to cause the United States to become a member thereof; and

"Whereas it is the sentiment of this thirty-eighth general assembly that the peoples of the world are not yet sufficiently acquainted with or cognizant of the freedoms the American people enjoy to have attained that altruism which is essential to the harmonious and successful realization of peace among nations, the lack of this altruism having been made evident by the dissensions in the United Nations; and

"Whereas the organization of the world government as proposed is of a nature such that the people of the United States will be required to surrender part of their sovereignty to nations which have no concept of world peace and cooperation; and

"Whereas the sentiment of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Colorado is not in accord with the whole intention expressed by the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-eighth general assembly (the senate concurring therein), That the President and the Congress of the United States be and are hereby petitioned to make no effort to create or join any world government whatsoever until there shall have been displayed by the peoples of the world sufficient altruism, and such desire to have and willingness to sacrifice to assure world peace and stability that it will unquestionably be established, but that their endeavors shall be such as will strengthen the cooperative efforts of the United Nations; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be immediately forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Colorado of the Congress of the United States.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"K. EVELYN MILLER,

"Assistant Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

"GORDON ALLOTT,

"President of the Senate.

"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,

"Secretary of the Senate."

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

"A 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 of 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.

"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."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto

"Whereas each year the overflow of the many rivers, streams, creeks, and tributaries which empty into the Wabash River creates a flood condition imperiling life and causing property damage throughout the entire Wabash Valley, contributing at the same time to similar conditions which exist in the southern States through which the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers flow; and

"Whereas the specific consequences of such flood conditions are: silting and sedimentation of stream channels, reservoirs, dams, ditches, and harbors; loss of soil and water; an increase in the speed and volume of rainfall run-off, causing severe and increasing floods, which bring suffering, disease, and death, impoverishment of families, damage to roads, highways, railways, buildings, and other property from floods; and losses in navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, and underground water reserve: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. The Eighty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the preven-

tion of soil erosion, to preserve natural resources, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers, protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

"Sec. 2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact a law relieving all members of the Armed Forces now on active duty from paying any Federal income tax on any compensation received for services performed as a member of the Armed Forces

"Whereas during the World War II members of the Armed Forces were not required to pay any Federal income tax on any compensation received for services performed in the Armed Forces; and

"Whereas the present members of the Armed Forces are required to pay Federal income tax: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the Eighty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Indiana hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact a law to relieve all members of the Armed Forces now on active duty from paying any Federal income tax on any compensation received from the Government in payment of services performed by them as members of the Armed Forces.

"Sec. 2. That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Senate and to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Indiana."

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Memorial to Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton, Senators from Montana; Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt, Senators from Wyoming; Carl Hayden, Senator from Arizona, and chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; Mike Mansfield and Wesley D'Ewart, Congressmen from Montana; William Harrison, Congressman from Wyoming; Clarence Cannon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior; Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation; Dillon Meyer, Commissioner of Indian Affairs; Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Budget, requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation authorizing that sufficient appropriations be provided the Bureau of Reclamation for the immediate construction of Yellowtail Dam located in Big Horn County in southern Montana

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located on the Big Horn River in Big Horn County, in southeastern Montana, and the Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon—about 35 miles southwest of Hardin, Mont., and 44 miles southeast of Billings, Mont.; and

"Whereas, the Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, as an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project to prepare preliminary surveys for the construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has completed preconstruction surveys, and work necessary for full construction work, and said surveys—including those of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Power Commission, and other interested Federal agencies—are now in the hands, or are ready to be placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Oscar Chapman, to be presented by him to the Congress and the President of the United States; and

"Whereas our Nation is now, of necessity, embarking upon a period of rearmament and defense planning, the ultimate end of which no man can foresee; and

"Whereas electrical energy is of the greatest importance in any defense industry. Already, and with industrial mobilization only just beginning, there is consideration being given to the necessity of enforcing electrical brown-outs in certain areas; and

"Whereas there is remaining no potential and undeveloped power site comparable to Yellowtail Dam. The Yellowtail power plant, as projected, will have an installed capacity of 200,000 kilowatts with an estimated annual firm energy capacity averaging 584,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In addition to this firm energy, this Yellowtail power plant is expected to have an average annual nonfirm energy output of 163,920,000 kilowatt-hours, bringing the average total estimated production to approximately 748,000,000 kilowatt-hours; and

"Whereas irrigation is one of the additional important contributions Yellowtail Dam will make to the economy of the area, and that of the Nation as a whole. Approximately 45,000 acres of irrigable land will be placed under the ditch by waters made available by Yellowtail Dam. In addition, there are a number of desirable pumping units along the Big Horn, Tongue, Powder, and Yellowstone Rivers that will be made feasible by low-cost power derived from Yellowtail Dam, which will serve to irrigate some 180,000 additional acres, or an approximate total of 225,000 acres, of fertile land will be brought into production of food essential to our Nation's on-coming-wartime needs; and

"Whereas Montana has an immense, and mostly undeveloped, mineral wealth, that should be contributing to our Nation's defense program. (Herbert Hoover has stated that Montana possesses a greater mineral potential than the U. S. S. R.) The time may come, before this emergency shall pass, when Montana's minerals may be desperately needed. The low-cost power that Yellowtail Dam will provide will be a tremendous asset in bringing these minerals to a usable stage; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam, in addition to providing hydroelectric power and irrigation, will also bring a vast contribution to flood control, silt and soil control, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreational development, and other related and beneficial uses too numerous to mention for the benefit of all mankind; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam will be an arch-type, concrete structure, towering about 500 feet above the river bed, with a crest of 1,480 feet, and a storage capacity of some 1,366,000 acre-feet, and will flood about 27 square miles of almost totally unusable land. The lake so created by Yellowtail Dam will extend for 75 miles through tortuously winding, steeply walled canyons, flooding land that is of no economic value. Yellowtail Dam will be exceeded in size only by Boulder, Shasta, Grand Coulee, and Hungry Horse in the order named, and will cost approximately \$100,000,000, which, by the sale of power, irrigation, and other benefits, will

be repaid to the Federal Treasury through a 50-year period: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1951 now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to make such funds immediately available that may be necessary to start construction of Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana at once; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Crow Tribe, upon whose lands the site of Yellowtail Dam is situated, be adequately and fairly compensated for the site at a price agreed upon by the Federal Power Commission, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Crow Tribe; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this Yellowtail Dam memorial be submitted by the secretary of state, Sam Mitchell of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate, Mr. Alben Barkley; the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Sam Rayburn; the Governor of the State of Wyoming, Paul Barrett; the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Wyoming; the regional director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Paul Fickinger; the regional director of Land Management, Albin Molohon; the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, Kenneth Vernon; and the district director of the Bureau of Reclamation, D. C. Ketcham.

*"CHARLES H. MAHONEY,
"President of the Senate Pro Tempore.*

*"CRY J. ARMSTRONG,
"Speaker of the House.
"Approved February 2, 1951.*

*"JOHN W. BONNER,
"Governor."*

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 1

"TO HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; HON. CHARLES E. WILSON, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION; HON. W. STUART SYMINGTON, CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL SECURITIES RESOURCES BOARD; HON. OSCAR CHAPMAN, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR; THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES; and to HON. E. L. BARTLETT, DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FOR THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alaska, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the opportunity exists for a major contribution to be made to the defense effort and the national economy by developing the tremendous potential hydroelectric power resources of Alaska; and

"Whereas a private company has signified its willingness to develop at its own expense the so-called Taiya hydroelectric power project in southeast Alaska and to install an aluminum reduction plant which would produce a large quantity of this metal so urgently required by the Nation; and

"Whereas statements have appeared in the press that this outstanding Alaska project is being deferred in favor of a similar project at Kitimat, British Columbia, whose construction would be made possible only by the United States defense officials negotiating a contract for purchase of a large quantity of aluminum from the Canadian producer; and

"Whereas the Taiya project in Alaska possesses many features of superiority over the Kitimat project in British Columbia, namely:

"1. Construction could start sooner and be completed at an earlier date because in

contrast to the proposed Kitimat site, Taiya adjoins a well-developed harbor and town at Skagway, Alaska, which provides services and facilities allowing an immediate start to be made on the work, and which has good transportation connections including a new airport recently constructed by the Territory of Alaska, a railroad extending all through the area where the power development would occur and a new road direct to the proposed plant site at Dyea.

"2. The power at Taiya would be developed by the diversion of the headwaters of the Yukon River through large tunnels under the coast range which would be immune to enemy attack in contrast to the Kitimat project which entails the construction of a large dam.

"3. The Taiya project entails no transmission of power as the power plant would be right at the reduction plant site in contrast to the Kitimat project which would require transmission of power 55 miles over a high mountain range where lines would be subject to severe icing conditions and snow and rock slides.

"4. The ultimate power-producing capability at Taiya is greater than at Kitimat and the unit cost thereof cheaper. All of which considerations strongly recommend the Taiya project over that proposed for Kitimat; and

"Whereas construction of the power and electrometallurgical project at Taiya would contribute greatly, both during the present emergency and in the future, to the economic development of Alaska, which has been declared to be a national policy; and

"Whereas the private American company desiring to build this plant in Alaska has stated 'if we are granted governmental assistance comparable to that which is suggested would be given the Canadian company in connection with its proposed British Columbia development, we will undertake the Alaska project and carry it through to an early completion'; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has an official interest in this matter by reason of the fact that great effort has been expended by the Territorial agencies, including the Alaska Development Board, in bringing the Taiya project to its present state of readiness for early development;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in twentieth regular session assembled, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States, in consultation with the national-defense authorities, reexamine immediately the situation with respect to the Taiya project and its proposed alternatives in Canada to the end that this large development shall take place on American soil; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted by telegram immediately after adoption to Delegate BARTLETT in Washington for filing with the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee which has announced it will investigate this matter.

*"And your memorialist will ever pray.
"Passed by the house January 25, 1951.*

*"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

*"MARGARET O. GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Approved by the Governor January 25, 1951.

*"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."*

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the National Council of Women of the United States, New York, N. Y., signed by Mrs. Thomas G. Evans, president, praying for the enactment of legislation to send surplus grain to India; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition signed by Virginia A. Smith and sundry other citizens of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to send surplus grain to India; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against any increase in the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Tribal Council of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., relating to the payment for lands, interests in lands or improvements owned by nonmembers of the tribes, and so forth; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Central Labor Union, favoring the enactment of legislation providing a 17-percent increase in pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Committee on Legislation and its administration, United Spanish War Veterans, Washington, D. C., signed by Edward S. Matthias, chairman, favoring the enactment of legislation to create a Veterans' Affairs Committee of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 445. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 96).

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 94)

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted a report relating to the study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and States and municipalities, which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MURRAY, Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate bill 337, to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 95) thereon.

On behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] be added as cosponsors of the original bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without ob-

jection, the request to add the names of additional cosponsors is agreed to.

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. IVES:

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Frank N. W. Doodha, Kay Doodha, Eugenie Frances Maureen Doodha, and Frank Norman Winthrop Doodha, Jr.;

S. 868. A bill for the relief of Carlo Silvestrelli and his wife, Geneva; and

S. 869. A bill for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 870. A bill for the relief of Dr. Robert S. Amritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 871. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNING, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. YOUNG) introduced Senate bill 872, to furnish emergency food aid to India, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 873. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired by gift, trust, annuity, devise, bequest, inheritance, or as beneficiary of any insurance policy from an American citizen or national and to provide that in any present or future conflict similar property be held in trust for such enemy alien by courts of competent jurisdiction or by an agency of the Government appointed by the President, subject to the use of the United States Government for the successful conclusion of hostilities, to be returned to such alien after the end of hostilities under certain conditions as set out herein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 874. 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 procedure for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the railway mail service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 875. A bill for the relief of Col. Francis B. Upham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 876. A bill to extend the benefits of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Air Corps," approved June 16, 1936, as amended, to certain former officers in the Army Air Forces who were erroneously commissioned in the Army of the United States rather than in the Air Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced Senate bill 877, to prescribe terms of office for members of the Civil Service Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 33, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates, by popular vote, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], my colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to furnish emergency food aid to India.

I am very much gratified, Mr. President, that such a large and distinguished bipartisan group of Senators has joined in sponsoring this bill, the purpose of which is to provide food grains available in the United States to help the people of India overcome a very serious famine situation which threatens them this year. As Senators know, the President sent a message to Congress on Monday last recommending legislation for this purpose.

The sponsors of this bill do not pretend that it is perfect, and I am sure that its various provisions will be thoroughly considered in the Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate. But the bill as it now stands does represent an intensive study of the matter over a period of several weeks by a considerable number of Senators on both sides of the aisle, in consultation with the executive departments concerned and with interested citizen groups.

For my own part, I wish to say only that I have joined in this bill in a spirit which I believe is in the best American tradition—the spirit of neighborly assistance for human beings in distress. To

my mind the fact that we are in clear opposition to the Government of India in vital matters of far eastern policy should not enter at all into our consideration of how best we can come to the aid of the Indian people in their hour of need.

That need is urgent, Mr. President, and I know all the sponsors of this bill join in the hope that the Senate will give it speedy and favorable consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with an explanatory statement on behalf of the sponsors, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951."

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to serve the cause of world peace and thus provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency food assistance to the people of India in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in that country.

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President during the period ending December 31, 1951, sufficient funds to provide not in excess of 2,000,000 long tons of food grains and to provide for such administrative expenses as are not covered by local currency furnished by the Government of India in accordance with sections 4 and 5 of this act: *Provided*, That the expenditures authorized hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of meeting the emergency need in India arising during the period ending December 31, 1951.

SEC. 4. No assistance under authority of this act shall be made available until an agreement is entered into between India and the United States containing the following undertakings, and any others the President may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this act, on the part of India:

(a) To distribute the supplies made available under this act, as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported from outside sources by the Government of India, among the people of India without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief.

(b) To give full and continuous publicity in India to the assistance furnished by the United States.

(c) To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in India of supplies made available under authority of this act.

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of India equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of India from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder, this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the United States and the Government of India for the benefit of the people of India in programs to increase food production and in other projects and programs in the mutual interest of the United States and India.

(e) To make available to the Government of the United States from the account established in subsection (d) local currency in the amounts required by it to meet its local currency administrative and operating expenses in India in connection with assistance supplied by the United States.

(f) To pursue all appropriate measures to reduce its relief needs and to increase production and supply and improve distribution of foodstuffs within India so as to lessen the danger of similar emergencies in the future.

SEC. 5. Local currency made available to the United States by India under the provisions of the agreement required by section 4 may be used for local currency administrative and operating expenses in India in connection with assistance provided by the United States without charge against appropriated funds.

SEC. 6. All or any portion of the funds made available under authority of this act may be transferred by the President to any department or agency of the executive branch of the Government to be expended for the purpose of this act. Funds so transferred may be expended under the authority of any provisions of law not inconsistent with this act applicable to the departments or agencies concerned, except that funds so transferred shall not be commingled with other funds of such departments or agencies and shall be accounted for separately.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to section 3 of this act, to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$50,000,000 to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act in such manner, at such time, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available to any department or agency for the purpose of this act: *Provided*, That to the extent that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for the transportation of supplies made available under this act, funds may be advanced hereunder to the Department of Commerce for activation and operation of additional vessels from the national defense reserve fleet for such transportation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, receipts from such operations may be used by the Department of Commerce to repay such advances.

SEC. 8. All or any part of the assistance provided hereunder shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unnecessary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to India under this section may include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under this act and not yet delivered.

The statement presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

BACKGROUND STATEMENT ON BILL FOR EMERGENCY AID TO INDIA

The purpose of the bill introduced today for emergency food aid to India is stated at the beginning of the bill in these words: "to serve the cause of world peace and thus provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency food assistance to the people of India in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in that country."

THE FOOD EMERGENCY IN INDIA

This bill is the result of careful study of the emergency food situation in India by

interested Members of Congress. The emergency grew out of a series of natural disasters in the grain-producing areas of India, which seriously reduced the harvests of late 1950 and early 1951 and have brought about a net food grain deficit for the whole country estimated at between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 long tons. This deficit directly affects the food rationing system now in effect in certain regions of India, on which approximately one-third of the population depends. The seriousness of the situation is emphasized by the recent reduction of the per capita grain ration in some areas from 12 ounces to 9 ounces per day, which is well below the normal subsistence level.

To meet the threatened deficit for 1951, the Indian Government has purchased or is in the process of purchasing some 3,000,000 tons of grain on the world market, including the United States, and has stated her intention of purchasing an additional amount close to 1,000,000 tons.

In view of the threatened residual deficit, India on December 16, 1950, formally requested the United States to make available 2,000,000 tons in time to meet the emergency expected during the summer of 1951.

EMERGENCY AID IS IN UNITED STATES INTEREST

The sponsors of this bill are convinced that it is clearly in the interest of the United States, and within its capacity, to meet the request from India. A rejection of this appeal would mean widespread starvation during 1951 and a serious blow to the efforts of the new Indian republic to achieve economic and political stability and progress. Bearing in mind the position of India as the second most populous nation in the world and a natural leader in Asian affairs, such a development could have adverse effects throughout the area of non-Communist Asia, seriously hampering the growing efforts of countries in that area to solve their social and economic problems within a framework of political democracy.

United States aid in this emergency, on the other hand, would furnish a concrete demonstration of the friendly attitude of the American people for the people of India, and would be in harmony with our national tradition of relieving human distress.

As to the capacity of the United States, the current grain carry-over amounts to some 375,000,000 bushels. If the maximum of 2,000,000 tons should be shipped to India, this would amount to about 74,000,000 bushels, a quantity which could be spared without endangering the grain position in this country.

GENERAL PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Following are the salient provisions of the bill which deserve comment:

1. An appropriation is authorized sufficient to provide up to 2,000,000 long tons of food grains to India, plus necessary administrative expenses. It is expected that the major part of the grain will be wheat. The President, in his message to Congress of February 12, expressed his intention of requesting initially an appropriation to provide 1,000,000 tons. Facts already available make it clear that at least that amount will be needed, and an immediate appropriation for that amount will make it possible to get shipments under way in time to meet the emergency. The size of any further appropriation request will depend on on-the-spot studies to be made by officials of the Economic Cooperation Administration as to the remaining requirements of India and the degree to which those requirements can be met from other sources.

The appropriations authorized do not include the cost of ocean shipping, for which India is prepared to pay.

2. The bill requires that before any aid is provided an agreement must be entered into under the terms of which the Government of India will undertake to distribute food supplies, including those provided under this

act, without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; to give full publicity to American assistance; to permit United States representatives to observe the grain distribution; to set up a counterpart fund equivalent to the proceeds from sale by the Indian Government of United States relief grain, this fund to be used to increase India's food production and for other projects in the mutual interest of the United States and India; to make available local currency for on-the-spot administrative expenses of American personnel in connection with this program; and to take appropriate measures to lessen the danger of similar future emergencies.

3. The President is authorized to transfer funds made available under this act to any department or agency of the Government. A number of agencies may be involved in the program, although it is anticipated that the Economic Cooperation Administration will have the major administrative responsibility.

4. The bill authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances not exceeding \$50,000,000, at the direction of the President, to carry out the purposes of the act, such advances to be repaid without interest out of appropriated funds. This provision will make possible immediate preparatory action, particularly with respect to shipping, pending appropriation by Congress.

It is particularly provided that advances may be made to the Department of Commerce for activation and operation of ships from the so-called "moth ball" fleet, to the extent that this is necessary to supplement private shipping. Since India will pay the cost of ocean transportation on "moth ball" ships as well as other vessels, it is expected that any advance to the Commerce Department for operation of reserve ships will be repaid out of receipts for the services of these vessels, and the bill provides that such receipts may be used for this purpose.

5. Finally, the bill provides that the President shall terminate assistance under the act whenever he, or Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that continued aid is unnecessary or undesirable.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Two aspects of this bill deserve special mention. First, the bill provides that the aid shall be furnished to India on an outright basis rather than as a loan or in exchange for money or other economic considerations. The initial Indian request expressed India's willingness to try to repay the aid requested, but from the facts now available it appears that India is not in a position to repay the United States for this consumption item in the foreseeable future without seriously jeopardizing her own domestic economy and thus making necessary further assistance. It is expected that the complex economic factors bearing on this question will be fully explored in committee.

The second important aspect of the bill is the omission of all political conditions. This is a deliberate decision of the sponsors, and is based on the belief that, as stated in a letter sent by certain of the present sponsors to the President on January 30, 1951, "the need to prevent starvation is entirely separate from all political considerations." It is recognized that differences exist between India and the United States on questions of international policy, particularly with respect to the Chinese Communist aggression in Korea. But it is the spirit of this bill that the people of India who are threatened with famine and starvation deserve to be assisted entirely on the merits of their predicament—entirely aside from the wisdom or unwisdom of the policies of their government.

CONCLUSION

This bill is offered out of genuine concern for the serious food predicament facing the people of India, and after thorough consultation with appropriate agencies of the execu-

utive branch. In view of the urgent time factor involved, the sponsors hope that this bill will receive the earliest possible action consistent with thorough consideration of the issues involved.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement in connection with the bill which has just been introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] providing for aid to India in the form of grain.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to be associated with the senior Senator from New Jersey and with many other distinguished Members of this body in sponsoring the bill introduced today to provide emergency assistance to the people of India, to help alleviate the terrible privations which are threatened in that country as a result of natural forces beyond their control.

The American people have always had the deepest affection for and interest in the people of India. We have long sympathized with their aspirations for independence. For many years popular sentiment in this country had urged upon the British Empire the great boon of granting independence to this country of 300,000,000 people.

Certainly it is in our interest to see that these people are not exposed to the extreme rigors of famine, insofar as it is within our power to prevent it.

This is not a question of sitting in judgment on the political policies of the Indian Government toward Pakistan or toward Kashmir or toward us. Those are questions which must be worked out in the political sphere, and on which judgment must be passed in the political sphere.

It is not particularly pertinent at this moment to conjecture what India might have done to prevent the threatened calamity. The calamity is now impending. When a neighbor's house is on fire, we do not stop to reproach him for having failed in the past to have it fireproofed.

We should urge the Government of India to devote any local currency obtained as a result of our aid to the improvement of the conditions which have contributed to the present danger. Provision for such an undertaking is included in the bill we have today introduced.

India is a land of almost 300,000,000 people—300,000,000 people whose institutions are devoted to the expansion of freedom. Our struggle today is for the protection and expansion of the areas of freedom in the world. Anything which threatens disaster in that area threatens us. Anything which we can practically do to shore up the free world should be done.

The proposal to provide aid to India is one which, if carried through in the spirit in which it was conceived, namely, of humanitarianism and of enlightened self-interest, will bring many benefits. It will raise our prestige throughout Asia. It will demonstrate to the people of all the free world, and perhaps

even some of those behind the iron curtain, that we are willing to give some of our resources to help other peoples wherever and whenever we can, and that we do not insist on absolute conformity as a condition of our giving aid.

But most of all, the chief benefit should be, and will be, the knowledge in our own hearts and spirits that we have done the right thing, the generous thing, the human thing.

I may add, Mr. President, that this proposal has evoked a very favorable response in the national press. I call special attention to six editorials from leading newspapers throughout the Nation, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 5, 1951]

UNITED STATES GRAIN FOR INDIA

It is encouraging to find that 24 influential Senators and Representatives of both parties are sponsoring the proposal to contribute 2,000,000 tons of foodstuffs to India, to avert imminent famine there, in spite of India's failure to support the American position in the United Nations. This is wise. For if ever this country began to use its surpluses of basic foodstuffs as a weapon to coerce hungry peoples into acceptance of our political policy, we shall be asking for the enmity of the world.

India's need for food supplies is now quite clear. Her request was made about 6 weeks ago. The State Department has made its own investigation of the facts, and has found the danger of famine and widespread deaths to be a real danger. It is taken for granted that the administration will recommend aid to India, chiefly in bread grains, although it has not done so yet.

To be sure, the Government of India and the Indian delegation to the UN have been increasingly unsatisfactory. India was the leader of the bloc in the UN which opposed stamping Red China an aggressor. India has sometimes played Russia's game, in its effort to iron out the Russian-American cleavage—to reconcile the irreconcilable.

It would be easy to stall on India's request for food, and to let it be known unobtrusively that American foodstuffs are reserved for those who stand with us on the great issues of world politics. That might bring results. But that would be a dangerous game to play. It would invite the Indians and other peoples of Asia to believe that the ugly things said of America's motives and policy by Soviet propagandists were true. It would appear to Asians as proof that the great Western Powers are still determined to treat Asian peoples as pawns.

The wiser course is to treat India's hunger as a wholly separate problem, to be dealt with on the merits, and in the light of America's traditional humanitarian spirit. In the long run, this will do far more than coercive or punitive pressure to win the Indians to full support of the American viewpoint on world political issues.

There will be opposition in Congress to the allocation of food to India. And that opposition will be understandable. But such a question needs to be handled, not in terms of any tactical advantage we may get, but in terms of long-range strategy. And the wise strategy is to act decently and generously. For India is not an enemy. Its opposition to some measures we have sought is not inspired by any pro-Soviet alignment, but only by a difference of opinion with us as to the best way to assure peace in the Far East.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 5, 1951]

TO HELP INDIA

Americans have a great deal to say about the ways in which Soviet Russia dictates to its satellites or attempts to dictate to other nations. They will need to watch their own thinking that they do not fall into some of the same pitfalls of power with reference to the request of India for 2,000,000 tons of grain.

India needs the grain to meet famine conditions, while the United States could spare this 75,000,000 bushels of wheat and still have 300,000,000 bushels in storage. Though some wheat could earlier have been purchased from Pakistan, that grain is not now available. And though India has diverted some land to cotton and jute, its own wheat acreage has been increased 8 percent in the last year.

There will be a severe temptation in some quarters to try to penalize India for its reluctance to go along with American efforts in the United Nations to indict Communist China for aggression in Korea. Yet if America does stand for freedom of honest thought here is a place to prove it. Hungry people in India should not be obliged to forswear their leaders' convictions in order to obtain bread from a friendly power.

The Indian Government has not asked for a gift of grain but rather for opportunity to purchase it on long-term credit. It would be more humanitarian and probably more realistic simply to make a grant of the wheat.

If Congress is reluctant to release the wheat without at least partial payment, it would be a very good idea to set aside any payments received and use them for technical assistance (point 4 aid) to India in solving its agricultural problems or for American scholarships to Indian students.

In any event, two points are important about this request for aid: Congress should act promptly in order not to prolong distress; and Congress should act magnanimously in order to prove the nature of American motives in world affairs.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of February 7, 1951]

PLAYING POLITICS WITH HUNGER MIGHT HURT US WORSE THAN THE STIFF-NECKED NEHRU

The question of sending grain to save a million starving natives of India puts on trial the conscience and good intentions of the American people. It also poses a severe test of our hard practicality in world politics.

Some observers believe that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which turned a cold shoulder to the Indian request for aid, will moderate in time, especially since India failed in its vigorous efforts to block branding Communist China the aggressor in Korea.

That India has no intention of kowtowing to the United States Senate was demonstrated this week, however, when its UN delegate, Sir Benegal N. Rau, refused to continue serving on the United Nations good offices committee. The aim of this committee is to seek a settlement of the Korean conflict.

So what could develop into a serious cold war may be developing with the only important Asiatic nation which has made a strong pretense of being on the side of the free world.

It is natural that Senators should be irritated over the appeasement policies of Prime Minister Nehru. It is only natural that Americans should be more than a little bitter about philanthropy, especially in view of Russia's changed attitude since World War II and the growing hostility of the Chinese. Both received much assistance from us in the past. There are convincing arguments for being rigidly realistic in our foreign relations—based on the assumption that Uncle

Sugar has been played for a sucker in the past. The question is, What is realistic? We cannot carry the whole world on our shoulders, to be sure. We cannot play the rich uncle to every poverty-stricken country. But what of our oft-repeated boast that humanitarian motives rather than politics prompt our aid programs?

How realistic would it be to exhibit before the world a kind of polite blackmail in which the Indian people are told to conform with our policies or starve? On the other hand, we must not be put into the position of bribing the Indians with food under threat they will turn against us if we don't. We can't buy friendship directly.

Communist propagandists already have made much of the theme that American philanthropy has strings tied to it, that it undermines the independence of nations accepting it. If we let a large number of Indians starve because their government refused to vote as we wished it in the United Nations, will not our vast humanitarian programs all over the world be grossly undermined?

What are the facts in the India controversy? Drought and locusts caused a severe food shortage and about 100,000,000 people, now depending on rationed food, are already down to nine ounces of rice or wheat a day. The Indian Government needs about 6,000,000 tons of grain from the outside. Two-thirds of this is being purchased. The United States is asked to furnish the remaining 2,000,000 tons. Nehru offered to pay for it on easy terms, but the State Department thinks that the Indian Government cannot afford to go into debt for the amount.

We have the grain. Our warehouses are bursting with surplus wheat which, if not moved to foreign markets, will grow stale. We have the necessary ships to move it, though some may have to be taken out of moth balls.

Questions arise as to why the State Department presented the Indian request to the Senate at a time when emotions were high over the Korean war and India's sensitiveness to the cause of Communist China. State Department officials are supposed to take the long view in such matters. Did they deliberately plan a slap at the Nehru government?

Another question: India's Moslem neighbor, Pakistan, reportedly has 600,000 tons of grain surplus which could be purchased. By refusing to use Pakistan grain, Mr. Nehru gives the impression he would rather let Hindus starve than to bolster Pakistan's economy by resuming normal trade relations. This should be looked into as well as reports of rice surpluses in Burma.

The strategic position of India with respect to the rest of Asia must not be overlooked in our realistic study. Nor should we fail to consider the Soviet policy of capitalizing on human misery and discontent. By refusing to assist the starving Indians, are we not putting ourselves in the category of the people we oppose?

By sending the needed wheat to India the United States could demonstrate to the world that we do not buy the consciences of other peoples. "If ever there was a chance to justify our friends and to confound our enemies," says Walter Lippmann, "it is here and now—by rising above all the petty feelings of the moment in order to play that part in the world which, when we are at our best, we find it a joy and a pride to be able to play."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 13, 1951]

A WORK OF MERCY FOR UNITED STATES:
FEEDING INDIA'S HUNGRY

The sending of relief to the hungry people of India, which President Truman requested of Congress yesterday, is strictly in accord

with this Nation's traditional readiness to help the needy and distressed, wherever they are.

Congress is asked to authorize the shipment of 2,000,000 tons of grain to India and to make an initial appropriation, estimated at \$100,000,000, for half that amount. Prompt action must be taken if lives are to be saved. Food deliveries have to begin by April 1 if they are to reach India in time to meet the emergency.

There has been understandable opposition in Congress to this project because of the stand India has taken in the United Nations, in upholding Red China's cause, and because of Prime Minister Nehru's repeated attacks upon the United States.

For the head of a government that is looking to ours to keep its people from starving, Nehru has been acting in a strange fashion.

His meekness toward Communist China, and his refusal to label that regime as an aggressor in Korea, contrast sharply with his policies elsewhere: in Kashmir, for instance. He has been demanding that the United Nations brand Pakistan as the aggressor in Kashmir and has already imposed Indian sanctions against the Moslem state. His pacific tone in relation to Peiping is contrary to his belligerent attitude at home.

Some Congressmen naturally resent this behavior and wonder why the United States should take insults from Nehru and still spend millions to feed Nehru's countrymen.

But we cannot punish innocent persons because of their rulers' conduct. Most of India's teeming millions haven't the remotest idea of what Nehru has been talking about or what political issues are involved. All they know is their families are starving.

They ask us for help, and we are not the ones to turn aside from their pleas. Feeding India is another work of mercy in which Americans will be glad to join.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 9, 1951]

MR. HOOVER SPEAKS TO UPHOLD OUR ROLE

When ex-President Herbert Hoover spoke out for sending United States wheat to India to fight a famine, he cut the ground from under most of the congressional opposition. His agreement to act as an adviser to the administration on transportation and food resources in this emergency goes a long way toward restoring aid to India to its true perspective.

Mr. Hoover's work in European famine relief after World War I is a matter of history. So is his conservatism with regard to international involvement of the United States. It is impossible, then, for the most intense of his fellow Republicans to accuse him of advocating either waste or coddling a nation which is too soft toward the Soviet Union.

It was on the latter rather distorted argument, of course, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sidetracked India's request for help. India's Prime Minister Nehru and UN Delegate Sir Benegal Rau had opposed the United States resolution under which the United Nations formally affixed on Red China the charge of aggression in Korea. We disagreed at the time, believing China's aggression to be obvious. At the same time we felt that Mr. Nehru and Sir Benegal were earnest in their efforts to arrange a ceasefire, despite the fact that the proposals they were able to tender from China were specious.

The important point is that the United States has presented itself in the role of a protector of the oppressed and a champion of free opinion. If we had penalized India because we disliked what her representatives were proposing, why, then, we would have proved ourselves both an enemy of the oppressed and of free opinion as well—if it differed from our own.

As Mr. Hoover remarked, "The United States has never in its history failed to be helpful to a famine-stricken people." Of all times in history, this one is not the occasion to begin failing. Our granaries are bulging. Millions in India are hungry, and more face starvation because of crop failures. One may shrug and say India has always had famines and always will have; but he will be party to an exceedingly foolish attitude. As a free commonwealth, India faces a new day. Whether it will be a day of slavery or of emergence into the light of real advancement depends on the continued grimness of the free nations against Communist imperialism.

India is buying millions of tons of wheat from this country. Whether it is necessary for us to give 2,000,000 more tons or to advance them through long-term credit to avert real famine, the wise course is clear. Let us declare our intention and prove it with action without delay.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of February 9, 1951]

HOOPER AND INDIA

The prestige lent by Herbert Hoover to the project of providing food to the famine-stricken areas of India should weigh heavily with Congress.

As Mr. Hoover says, this kind of relief has always been humanitarian, not political, and should remain so.

Each Congressman has the right to agree or disagree with the international policies of Prime Minister Nehru and the Indian Government; but to try, as have some Congressmen, to use food shipments as a lever to move Indian policy into line with the views of Congress is worse than useless.

It would not, in the first place, have the desired effect. That kind of pressure notoriously arouses intense resentment. India's hungry millions would hardly establish a connection between the food we were denying them and the behavior of their government in matters of which they were only vaguely aware. And India's governmental functionaries are not the ones who are starving.

On the other hand, the indignation resulting from such an action would not be confined to Indians; people all over the world would resent this kind of callous squeeze play.

Whatever America provides should be provided without any political strings whatever—provided, as Mr. Hoover says, in consonance with our fundamental Christian faith and our traditions.

TERMS OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prescribe terms of office for members of the Civil Service Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the purposes of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 877) to prescribe terms of office for members of the Civil Service Commission, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

I am today introducing a bill to place the three members of the Civil Service Commission on a term basis of 6 years each. My bill proposes that the terms of the members be rotated, to provide original appointments of 2, 4, and 6 years each, and to begin as of March 1, 1951.

The three members of the Civil Service Commission now serve at the pleasure of the President—one of the few agencies where this situation has continued to exist. Under such a system, where the members serve for extended periods, the Senate is provided with only infrequent opportunities to examine the records and qualifications of those who direct our civil-service system.

I need not remind my colleagues that my bill would follow the policy laid down by the Congress in recent years in adjusting the terms of other members of Federal commissions and boards. We have enacted laws that stagger the terms of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, the members of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as well as those of other agencies.

I am sure we all agree that a rotating system of commission and board members is both sound and in the interest of good government. Such a system would insure the continuity of experienced people to guide our Government agencies.

It is my opinion that my bill would strengthen the bipartisan nature of the Civil Service Commission as it would attract highly qualified persons in the field of personnel to the Commission. May I emphasize that my bill does not disturb the present bipartisan Commission. The Commission membership would continue on its present basis: Two members of the majority party, one member of the minority.

My bill provides that the present membership on the Civil Service Commission would serve until successors have been appointed and qualified, but not to exceed 60 days following enactment of my bill.

May I point out that my bill recognizes the basic policy expressed in the original Civil Service Act of 1883—to provide equal opportunity for consideration and appointment to civil-service positions for all citizens of our great Nation.

I shall refer this bill to the special subcommittee set up within the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to make a study of civil-service and Government manpower policies generally. A major objective of that subcommittee will be to draft legislation to strengthen the Civil Service Commission.

I urge the support of my colleagues for this worthy measure.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for the direct election of President and Vice President by the people and for primaries. It is the same as the joint resolution introduced by me in the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for

election of such candidates, by popular vote, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF OPERATIONS UNDER CERTAIN MINERAL LEASES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

WHERE AMERICA STANDS TODAY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McFARLAND

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Where America Stands Today," delivered by Senator McFARLAND at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Raleigh, N. C., on February 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE MONTGOMERY COUNTY REPUBLICANS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Manor Club on Monday, February 12, 1951, before the Montgomery County Republicans, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, at the Lincoln Day dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on February 12, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO RESIST COMMUNISM—LETTER BY JOSIAH E. DUBOIS, JR.

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Josiah E. Dubois, Jr., to the editor of the New York Times and published in that newspaper on January 28 under the caption "To resist communism," which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWING OF GUAYULE IN THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding the growing of guayule in the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

FORUM OF PUBLIC OPINION AT SUNRAY, TEX.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. W. E. Simpson, chairman of a public forum meeting held at Sunray, Tex., and an accompanying statement of the consensus of local opinion on a number of vital issues, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE DEFENSE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IN ALASKA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD

a statement prepared by him relating to the defense construction program in Alaska, which appears in the Appendix.]

**THE MILITARY MANPOWER PROGRAM—
EDITORIAL COMMENT**

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a number of editorials from leading newspapers regarding the manpower hearings and bills, which appear in the Appendix.]

**WHY NOT A NATIONAL HOLIDAY TO
HONOR F. D. R.?—EDITORIAL FROM
THE MACHINIST**

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Not A National Holiday To Honor F. D. R.?" published in the January 25, 1951, issue of the Machinist, organ of the International Association of Machinists, which appears in the Appendix.]

**PRINCIPLES OF STUDENTS FOR DEMO-
CRATIC ACTION OF THE STATE OF
NEW YORK**

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Richard A. Givens and published in the March 1951 issue of the Newsletter of the Students for Democratic Action of New York State, which appears in the Appendix.]

**ENLISTMENT OF 18-YEAR-OLD BOYS—
STATEMENT BY CLINTON N. HOWARD**

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Shall We Enlist 18-Year-Old Boys," made by the editor of Progress, official publication of the International Reform Federation, before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on January 31, 1951, and published in the February 1951 issue of Progress, which appears in the Appendix.]

**AGED AND DISABLED RETIRED ENLISTED
MEN—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT BY
JOHN H. HOEPEL**

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 6, 1951, written to the President by John H. Hoepfel, founder, National Defense magazine, pleading for greater consideration for aged and disabled retired enlisted men, which appears in the Appendix.]

**A DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY—
ADDRESS BY MICHAEL STRAIGHT**

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Democratic Foreign Policy," delivered by Michael Straight, editor of the New Republic, at Pittsburgh, Pa., January 25, 1951, at the annual Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by the Pittsburgh chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action, which appears in the Appendix.]

**LABELING OF FURS—LETTER FROM ASSO-
CIATED FUR INDUSTRIES OF MILWAU-
KEE, WIS.**

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the fur labeling bill now pending before the Senate, having been reported on February 5 by the Interstate Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the text of a letter which I have received this morning from Robert Kottke, president of the Associated Fur Industries of Milwaukee. I believe that my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Kottke's views.

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

ASSOCIATED FUR
INDUSTRIES OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 12, 1951.
Hon. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As president of the Associated Fur Industries of Milwaukee and Wisconsin, representing a large group of Wisconsin retailers, I must urge you to consider the evils of the labeling bill now before the Senate for consideration. Our industry has suffered acutely since 1943, first from the excise tax, next from the public bickerings, promises, and retraction regarding the lowering of such tax.

This labeling bill would deal our industry another hard blow. We have always suffered from the unfair practice of manufacturers and jobbers selling directly to the public. Not removing their labels would result in the public going directly to the manufacturers. It would also mean that we would hand over to our competitors knowledge that we have been a lifetime accumulating, knowledge that oftentimes spells the difference between success and failure.

Take away from a man his experience and sagacity in choosing the best sources for any given fur and what has he left to offer his customers? Take from him his own label in coats coming from his store and you have reduced him from an individual with a reputation to a nonentity. Shall we of Wisconsin just hand over the fur business to wholesalers and jobbers?

Check the steadily falling revenue from the fur excise tax as a true criterion of the state our industry is now in. I can assure you we cannot stand further hardships.

This labeling would not give a customer any idea of quality in any given fur. Therefore I am unable to see where any benefit would result.

We urge you to amend the bill so that the individual furrier could substitute his own label for that of the manufacturer or jobber and thus retain his identity.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. KOTTKE,
President.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

**FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM
MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ON
DUTY ABROAD**

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 2141.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2141) to extend for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this is existing law. The bill merely extends the privilege to our soldiers abroad for a period of 2 years. It was unanimously reported by the Senate Finance Committee, and I believe there is no objection to it.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is not this the same provision which we had all through World War II?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly. This is a mere extension for 2 years.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2141) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXAMINATION OF RECORDS AND OB-
TAINING OF DOCUMENTS BY JOINT
COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE
TAXATION**

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 87, which is a noncontroversial measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) amending section 5012 of the Internal Revenue Code.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall make a brief statement in connection with the joint resolution. All the joint resolution does is to give to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation the privilege of examining records and obtaining documents from the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the same privilege which the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation had prior to the Congressional Reorganization Act. That act casts some doubt upon the right of the joint committee to obtain necessary documents and information from the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. This joint resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, and was unanimously recommended. I ask for its approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO SURVIVORS
OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES
WHO DIE IN ACTIVE SERVICE**

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I had intended to call up House bill 1, to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratu-

itous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who died in active service, and for other purposes, but certain amendments have been sent to the desk which are proposed to be offered, and I believe it will be necessary for the bill to go over. In no event, I think, could we dispose of it today.

If there are other amendments to be submitted to House bill 1, I hope Senators will avail themselves of the opportunity to have the amendments printed so that we have them before us on Monday.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to House bill 1, and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], I send to the desk two amendments to House bill 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. GEORGE. In view of the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] which I have not yet had an opportunity to examine, as well as the amendments offered just now by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] which I presume inject certain controversial features into the bill, I think it would be wise not to call up the bill now, but rather to have it go over until Monday or such other time as we may be able to obtain consideration of it.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be very glad to send copies of my amendments to the office of the Senator from Georgia.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his consideration in suggesting that the bill be put over until Monday or some other time when the matters in controversy can be carefully considered and acted upon.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. I shall be pleased to have the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any other business to come before the Senate?

RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the only other matter from the Finance Committee which, under a rather tentative understanding with the majority leader I might seek to call up today, is the Renegotiation Act of 1951, House bill 1724. I should like to have that bill made the unfinished business. I do not believe it can be disposed of today in view of the absence of a quorum from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of the bill (H. R. 1724) and thereby make it the unfinished business. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1724) to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the Senate would be wise to permit this bill to go over until Monday. It is a very important bill. It ought to be acted upon, and no doubt we can act upon it Monday, unless the majority leader should have some other more pressing business that he desires the Senate to consider first. In that event, I would be glad to have the unfinished business temporarily laid aside.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator intend to follow action on H. R. 1724 with House bill 1?

Mr. GEORGE. I have already mentioned that bill. I have not asked that it be taken up, but I expect to bring it up on Monday.

Mr. TAFT. After action has been had on the bill to provide for renegotiation of contracts?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I have asked Senators to offer any amendments to the bill they may have in mind to offer. Certain amendments have been offered by two Senators, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Those amendments result in certain controversial features in connection with H. R. 1, so I do not think we can dispose of the bill in the absence of a quorum of the Senate.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

C. Dickerman Williams, of New York, to the position of Solicitor, Department of Commerce.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Donald C. Miller, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 20, 1950.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

Emil E. Palmquist

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Manly B. Root

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

James W. Phipps

Leo R. Melcher

Robert J. Sillery

To be assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Harold M. Silver

To be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Irvin F. Buck

To be pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Arthur W. Dodds

To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Frederick F. Aldridge

To be junior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Morton I. Goldman

To be senior assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Harry Rubin

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James R. Solomon, Abbeville, Ala., in place of Bryan Whitehurst, retired.

Clyde D. Watson, Clayton, Ala., in place of N. M. Wallace, retired.

Buford L. Hughes, Cottonwood, Ala., in place of G. D. Ward, removed.

Esther M. Sims, Delta, Ala., in place of O. P. Braswell, transferred.

James W. Cyphers, Foley, Ala., in place of C. A. Boller, retired.

Sister Mary Basil, Holy Trinity, Ala., in place of Sister Mary Teresa, retired.

Katherine T. Perry, Lockhart, Ala., in place of R. K. Bullard, deceased.

Roy M. Williams, Midland City, Ala., in place of A. O. York, retired.

Helen T. Humphreys, Montrose, Ala., in place of E. T. Fell, retired.

James E. Channell, Odenville, Ala., in place of B. M. Forman, retired.

John R. Hinton, Prattville, Ala., in place of L. D. McCrary, retired.

Lucy A. Robinson, Waverly, Ala., in place of J. B. Robinson, Jr., resigned.

ALASKA

Arlene A. Webster, Platinum, Alaska, in place of M. F. Harwood, resigned.

ARKANSAS

William S. Huggins, Bauxite, Ark., in place of N. L. Connevey, retired.

Earl H. Neely, Jr., Benton, Ark., in place of C. F. Elza, retired.

Elmer R. Gatten, Coit, Ark., in place of C. N. Wood, resigned.

Eunice M. Harvey, Huntington, Ark., in place of M. N. Old, retired.

Jack H. Griffin, Lake City, Ark., in place of H. T. Griffin, retired.

Pierce A. Reeder, Leola, Ark., in place of I. S. Matlock, resigned.

Sam C. Ingram, Luxora, Ark., in place of S. M. Brown, retired.

William H. Bridgeman, Mineral Springs, Ark., in place of E. K. Calhoun, retired.

James B. Hill, Nashville, Ark., in place of R. R. Millwee, retired.

Marvin H. Massey, Palestine, Ark., in place of D. A. Massey, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Meryl G. Adams, Acton, Calif., in place of P. K. Ihrig, removed.

Margaret I. Higgins, El Granada, Calif. Office established November 16, 1947.

Nelson F. Smith, Petaluma, Calif., in place of Frederick Martin, retired.

Kenneth R. Rudisill, Tulalake, Calif., in place of W. L. Stark, deceased.

COLORADO

Ralph J. McDonald, Berthoud, Colo., in place of W. E. Rogers, retired.

Matthew Martinez, Milliken, Colo., in place of E. P. Winkler, resigned.

FLORIDA

Frank L. Burgust, Apopka, Fla., in place of M. H. Vick, resigned.

O. B. Fowler, Citra, Fla., in place of L. K. Stewart, transferred.

William P. Baker, Hawthorne, Fla., in place of L. A. Sherouse, deceased.

Howard S. Warner, Orange City, Fla., in place of H. A. Richey, retired.

Mark H. Shaw, Palatka, Fla., in place of J. A. Shelley, retired.

Marian J. Davis, Wabasso, Fla., in place of K. P. Harris, resigned.

Edgar M. Henderson, Winter Garden, Fla., in place of W. H. Reams, retired.

GEORGIA

Julian R. Grimsley, Adel, Ga., in place of L. J. Flowers, transferred.

Frank T. Paulk, Alapaha, Ga., in place of Blanche Chambliss, removed.

Charles W. Conley, Blairsville, Ga., in place of T. C. Conley, transferred.

Mary Sue Hampton, Clarkston, Ga., in place of E. R. Culpepper, retired.

Marion H. Reynolds, Clermont, Ga., in place of W. C. Haynes, removed.

Walter P. Hughes, Cumming, Ga., in place of K. A. Kemp, retired.

Charles H. Phillips, Dahlonega, Ga., in place of J. R. Jones, transferred.

Lanier R. Billups, Decatur, Ga., in place of Wylie West, retired.

Cephas S. Spruill, Dunwoody, Ga., in place of Ethel Nash, retired.

Robert C. Stembidge, Ellijay, Ga., in place of F. C. Wingate, resigned.

Huram R. Hancock, Gainesville, Ga., in place of J. F. Carter, retired.

Marion A. Burns, Hiawassee, Ga., in place of J. C. Puett, transferred.

James M. Stallings, Jr., Lithonia, Ga., in place of A. H. Flake, deceased.

Marjorie T. McCay, McCaysville, Ga., in place of C. J. Collis, resigned.

Guy H. Toles, Jr., Menlo, Ga., in place of J. W. Murphy, retired.

Ruth H. Grippio, Oglethorpe University, Ga., in place of M. A. Weltner, resigned.

Frank G. Owen, Stockbridge, Ga., in place of Fred Grant, transferred.

Robert A. Timmons, West Point, Ga., in place of F. K. Mize, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Gerald C. Hardiek, Dieterich, Ill., in place of Leland Adams, transferred.

Oliver W. Ator, Jr., Griggsville, Ill., in place of F. C. Hall, deceased.

Joy A. Mitchell, Noble, Ill., in place of Webster Hanna, retired.

Jerry H. Elliston, Waltonville, Ill., in place of M. E. Patterson, retired.

INDIANA

Olive C. Mohr, Flat Rock, Ind., in place of Woodbury Mohr, deceased.

Loren R. Buse, Poneto, Ind., in place of D. E. Ulmer, transferred.

Howard E. Dike, St. John, Ind., in place of S. M. Boecker, resigned.

IOWA

Wallace W. Koestner, Centerville, Iowa, in place of J. B. Taylor, retired.

Thomas G. Clifford, Charlotte, Iowa, in place of A. J. Hanrahan, deceased.

Vertle DeVerne Lugar, Derby, Iowa, in place of L. W. Lugar, deceased.

George L. Johnson, Emerson, Iowa, in place of I. B. Stokes, retired.

Roger E. Klay, Hull, Iowa, in place of Timon Roetman, transferred.

Richard D. Claus, Plymouth, Iowa, in place of Anna Bilem, retired.

KANSAS

Willard Eugene Foes, Healy, Kans., in place of Dale Graves, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Mamie W. Higginbotham, Delhi, La., in place of W. A. Dearman, designed.

Austin B. Smith, Rayville, La., in place of A. L. Page, transferred.

Nellie M. Whittington, St. Landry, La., in place of L. T. Tubre, retired.

Raymond J. Jole, Weeks, La., in place of A. B. Darnall, resigned.

Simeon P. Cartier, Westwego, La., in place of E. J. Pierce, resigned.

MAINE

Orman M. Fortier, Guilford, Maine, in place of E. E. Ross, retired.

MARYLAND

Hubert Glen Caple, Cedarhurst, Md., in place of S. B. Caple, resigned.

James F. Burke, Taneytown, Md., in place of J. O. Crapster, deceased.

Francis M. Pickett, Woodbine, Md., in place of B. F. Dorsey, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Raphael F. McKeown, North Abington, Mass., in place of O. W. Gallagher, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Frank C. Middel, Detroit, Mich., in place of R. B. Huston, deceased.

Carl Knepp, Fairview, Mich., in place of E. L. Bailey, resigned.

John C. Lane, Galesburg, Mich., in place of R. G. Southworth, deceased.

William J. Johnson, Leland, Mich., in place of J. E. Lederle, retired.

MINNESOTA

Arthur J. Breen, Bemidji, Minn., in place of Thomas Hughes, retired.

John H. Sparrow, Ortonville, Minn., in place of J. C. Gowan, transferred.

Donald E. Cummings, Spring Valley, Minn., in place of Roy Viall, retired.

William H. Schaefer, Warren, Minn., in place of E. A. Swenson, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Nathan A. Riley, Dorsey, Miss., in place of F. G. Martin, retired.

Earl M. Whitehead, Roxie, Miss., in place of M. C. Flowers, retired.

MISSOURI

Clarence E. Whitton, Downing, Mo., in place of W. S. Smoot, deceased.

Edward D. Clay, South Kinloch Park, Mo., in place of B. E. Rainey, deceased.

NEW YORK

Emanuel W. Kuna, Hartsdale, N. Y., in place of R. M. Rooney, resigned.

Frederick B. Bertrand, Hempstead, N. Y., in place of T. J. Hartnett, deceased.

Francis J. Mahoney, Highland Falls, N. Y., in place of J. H. Wilson, retired.

Lawrence J. Ewart, Ogdensburg, N. Y., in place of A. J. Belgard, retired.

James L. Dam, Vernon, N. Y., in place of Anna Marriott, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edward Russell Johnston, Belhaven, N. C., in place of J. A. Leigh, deceased.

Walter Wellington White, Hertford, N. C., in place of S. M. Whedbee, resigned.

James H. Mullinax, Pomona, N. C., in place of M. J. Bell, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ralph F. Covert, Calvin, N. Dak., in place of H. R. McKechnie, deceased.

Nettie E. Bruning, Solen, N. Dak., in place of B. G. J. Schimansky, Sr., retired.

OHIO

William T. Felske, Castalia, Ohio, in place of M. E. Perry, resigned.

Mary Jane Rebbin, Donnelsville, Ohio. Office established September 15, 1949.

Richard D. Ferguson, Risingsun, Ohio, in place of C. C. Myers, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Taylor E. Cavins, Ringling, Okla., in place of J. B. Steele, retired.

OREGON

Kenneth V. Parnley, Banks, Oreg., in place of H. J. Atlee, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jack Kiser, Hungerford, Pa., in place of H. W. Albrecht, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carl C. Wilkes, Chester, S. C., in place of P. H. Wilkes, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Delbert W. Fitzler, Springfield, S. Dak., in place of M. L. Gaynor, retired.

TENNESSEE

James R. Wright, Trimble, Tenn., in place of R. M. Grills, deceased.

TEXAS

Kinchen V. Northington, Ballinger, Tex., in place of T. A. Caudle, transferred.

Victor J. Couture, Brackettville, Tex., in place of A. R. Davis, resigned.

Ernest I. Pratt, Copperas Cove, Tex., in place of A. L. Clements, transferred.

Alva C. Cotney, Jr., Follett, Tex., in place of A. C. Cotney, transferred.

Joyce W. Kemp, Fort Davis, Tex., in place of R. G. Ellis, retired.

Lem Ashinhurst, Henrietta, Tex., in place of D. A. Greer, transferred.

Carl M. Curry, Kennard, Tex., in place of Maud English, resigned.

John F. Bennett, Jr., McGregor, Tex., in place of S. H. Amsler, retired.

Morgan Haynes, Melvin, Tex., in place of H. O. Gainer, declined.

Leslie Alvin Smithwick, Miles, Tex., in place of H. W. Moynihan, transferred.

Archer T. Spear, Millsap, Tex., in place of A. S. Hightower, retired.

Ernest Lynn Fisher, Mullin, Tex., in place of S. S. Dorbandt, retired.

Henry G. Hankins, Newcastle, Tex., in place of B. B. Ward, retired.

Anna H. Dyer, North Cowden, Tex. Office established May 16, 1948.

Clarence B. Freiley, Poolville, Tex., in place of D. C. Waters, resigned.

Robert C. Phillips, Rotan, Tex., in place of J. V. Gray, deceased.

Claudine V. Kohutek, Rowena, Tex., in place of H. H. Wagner, deceased.

William E. Bryant, San Saba, Tex., in place of W. A. Smith, retired.

Henry D. Moreland, Snyder, Tex., in place of H. F. Shuler, resigned.

Willie O. Ham, Terminal, Tex. Office established October 1, 1948.

Kenneth B. Daws, Throckmorton, Tex., in place of J. T. Davis, Jr., resigned.

Irene New, Truscott, Tex., in place of A. S. Tarpley, resigned.

Julia J. Williams, Valentine, Tex., in place of E. S. Vick, retired.

Willie M. Johnston, Wolforth, Tex., in place of J. A. McWhorter, retired.

VIRGINIA

Virginia H. Phillips, Booker Washington Birthplace, Va. Office established February 12, 1948.

Homer G. Murray, Boones Mill, Va., in place of L. C. Jamison, retired.

Robert G. Jones, Buckingham, Va., in place of L. W. Jones, retired.

Mamie H. Covington, Burgess, Va., in place of W. H. Covington, deceased.

Lloyd B. Taylor, Clifton, Va., in place of D. W. Buckley, Jr., transferred.

Alan G. Rosenkrans, Crozet, Va., in place of S. H. Dawson, retired.

Thurston K. Stoneburner, Edinburg, Va., in place of A. G. Carter, retired.

William P. Heath, Esmont, Va., in place of W. H. Dawson, declined.

Linnette B. Peak, Glasgow, Va., in place of E. L. MacMillan, resigned.

Howard O. Shields, Hurt, Va., in place of J. S. Yeatts, retired.

James E. Willey, Jr., Irvington, Va., in place of H. O. Rock, retired.

Lewis R. Rash, Jr., La Crosse, Va., in place of R. K. Northington, resigned.

John W. Bullock, Louisa, Va., in place of J. N. Porter, resigned.

Charles O. Faulconer, Monroe, Va., in place of T. M. Hesson, retired.

William J. Shull, Mount Solon, Va., in place of C. G. Arey, transferred.

Jesse M. Inge, Pamplin, Va., in place of L. N. Ligon, retired.

Ward Blagden, Petersburg, Va., in place of G. L. Elmore, deceased.

Richard P. Davis, Phenix, Va., in place of H. F. Gilliam, resigned.

George E. Smith, Rawlings, Va., in place of G. H. Blick, transferred.

Aubrey E. Johnson, Jr., Strasburg, Va., in place of R. S. Wright, retired.

Calvin C. Holt, Sutherland, Va., in place of J. A. Vernon, retired.

Cecil M. Hunt, Sweet Briar, Va., in place of R. V. Martindale, retired.

Edward Ware, Tappahannock, Va., in place of F. B. B. Sale, retired.

Billy L. Hottle, Toms Brook, Va., in place of Lawrence Hottle, deceased.

Lewis M. Meador, Vinton, Va., in place of M. R. White, resigned.

Ernest M. East, Waynesboro, Va., in place of J. F. Harper, retired.

UTAH

William R. Green, Provo, Utah, in place of J. W. Dangerfield, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Joe Piccolo, Flemington, W. Va., in place of G. O. Sinsel, retired.

Virginia D. Sorensen, Fort Gay, W. Va., in place of Charles Pelfrey, transferred.

Nan G. McCormick, Helen, W. Va., in place of H. O. Lockman, retired.

Sybil G. Jimison, Kayford, W. Va., in place of T. O. Wash, resigned.

Lois Mae Powell, Mallory, W. Va., in place of W. H. Baker, resigned.

Donald L. Jamison, Morgantown, W. Va., in place of C. L. Hall, retired.

Rosalie K. Eanes, Nellis, W. Va., in place of E. B. Keenan, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, grant that in this moment of sacred communion with Thy

spirit we may have an inspiring and uplifting sense of Thy greatness and goodness.

Help us to believe more sincerely and confidently in the efficacy of prayer, not as a power to take away our perplexing problems and difficulties, our trials and tribulations, but as a power girding our minds and hearts to meet them courageously and victoriously.

We humbly confess that when we forget Thee and lose sight of Thee, then we become anxious and are haunted with fears which rob us of all peace. We pray that Thou wilt enlarge and strengthen our faith in Thee and in the ultimate triumph of the true, the good, and the right.

May we continue to pray and labor for that blessed time when all the destructive and diabolical motives of hatred and selfishness which fill the hearts of men shall be supplanted by the nobler feelings of kindness and compassion and an eagerness to bear one another's burdens. Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FIFTY-CENT DOLLARS STARVE AMERICA'S AGED

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, 50-cent dollars are starving America's aged who should have first priority. Their meager incomes are static but food and the other necessities of life have skyrocketed in price until their real income is reduced one-half and many are now on a starvation basis in a land of plenty. To meet this problem I have today introduced a bill, H. R. 2678, embodying the Townsend social-security plan. My colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], is introducing an identical companion bill.

At a meeting with the Townsend executive committee, whose members are JOHN A. BLATNIK; RAY MADDEN, of Indiana; GARDNER D. WITHROW, of Wisconsin; J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio; ROBERT C. SECREST, of Ohio; EDWIN A. HALL, of New York; and myself, it was expressed as the opinion of the committee that the same bill be introduced in the Eighty-second Congress as was introduced in the Eighty-first Congress inasmuch as it so clearly deals with the needs of our aged citizens.

The bills we have introduced today with one minor exception are the same as those introduced by us in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136. As set forth in the heading, the purpose of this legislation is to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution

of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment there was never a more propitious time to enact this legislation. With the spiral of inflation confronting us and with the cost of food and other necessities of life at an all-time high, the elderly citizens of America are finding it impossible to meet the minimum costs to keep body and soul together. Not only food prices but shelter, medical attention, and every essential of living have skyrocketed beyond the ability of this low-income group to meet.

This legislation, if enacted, will solve this problem. It will be Nation-wide in its coverage, will afford modest but necessary income for the aged and at the same time will not unduly disturb our national economy. It will provide purchasing power for this large group of our citizens to secure the necessities of life and to that extent will tend to stabilize markets. When this problem is considered on an over-all basis and all forms of assistance and relief to the old people of the Nation are considered in toto it will be found that this method of meeting the problem, provided in the legislation we have introduced, will not be a greater drain on the resources of the Nation than the multitudinous overlapping programs already existing seeking to meet the problem.

I most respectfully urge all of my colleagues to give serious and immediate attention to this important legislation. It should have been enacted into law long before this in order to prevent unnecessary hardship to this great group of deserving citizens.

OLD-AGE-PENSION PROGRAM

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor and pleasure of joining with my very good friend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] to introduce once again the Townsend pension bill (H. R. 2679) to provide real economic security for the old folks of America. The decision to reintroduce this pension bill was made last week at the meeting of the Townsend executive committee, the membership of which includes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW], the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. SECREST], the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], and myself.

This bill which I have the privilege of sponsoring once again is identical—with one minor exception—to the Townsend bills (H. R. 2135, 2136) which were introduced in the Eighty-first Congress. Our reasons for reintroducing this bill are obvious to anyone who is familiar with the problems confronting the aged

of our country. The facts show that the present social-security program is wholly inadequate, both in coverage and monthly benefits, to give security to our senior citizens many of whom today are living in poverty and want.

The facts also show that the only solution to their problem is the enactment by Congress of a comprehensive and liberal old-age-pension program. The bill which I am offering to Congress today embraces such a program, and it is my sincere hope that Congress will meet its obligations to the fathers and mothers of America by enacting this bill into law without further delay.

MONETARY POLICIES

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is my responsibility to fight the battle against inflation on all fronts. This feeling that a better job must be done immediately is certainly shared by every housewife who finds her household costs still rising and by every worker who finds his wages frozen while his cost of living is being rapidly thawed out.

At the moment, the hue and cry of conflict centers around the familiar catch phrases of price control, wage stabilization, allocation, rationing. Even the mushrooming new agencies that sprout overnight out of the well-fertilized ground of bureaucracy come up with a new sequence of alphabet letters, but all doing the same job as before.

Whatever the combination of letters, unless they are backed by proper monetary policies, they all spell trouble for the housewife, the wage earner, the small-business man, the person living on a pension.

Still hidden behind the glare of exploding flash bulbs, and exploded economic theories, a battle goes on which has thus far escaped the general public eye and understanding. I refer to the battle between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department.

Upon the outcome of this battle hinges the success or failure of our entire effort to really do something about inflation. Here we come face to face with a problem which will require greater insight and more real courage than any yet displayed on the more popular and more easily understood other inflationary fronts.

The Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve has for a long time been supporting the market for Government bonds to help maintain their low interest rates. This committee has bought billions of dollars of marketable bonds and has placed the cash into general circulation. This cash has become a part of our general demand deposits in the banks. The bonds are used by them as a basis for further credit.

Many people are quick to say that Government spending alone is responsible for the present inflationary crisis. I recognize that the total cost of Gov-

ernment must go up in any time of emergency. However, I believe that the cheap-money policy of the Treasury Department is a more important factor in causing our present inflation than is Government spending.

This cheap-money policy which in fact has allowed an expansion of bank loans to the extent of more than ten billions of dollars in recent months is the keystone holding up the inflation arch.

Since President Truman ordered our troops into Korea in June of 1950, the rise in price inflation—the cost of the things you and I must buy in order that we may live—has paralleled the inflation of our currency or the cheapening of our dollar.

How can anyone talk about too much money in circulation? Do you know anyone who ever has enough money to circulate? Every housewife in America finds her pocketbook empty by the time she has paid the week's bills. Many find theirs empty even before the bills needed to keep the family together are paid.

Possibly we can understand better what is happening if we recall our recent history.

Ten years ago—just before the start of World War II—all of us as loyal, patriotic Americans bought series E war bonds. Many of us bought these bonds to lay away money for the education of our children, to help provide care for ourselves should we be unable to work as we grew older.

Now, as we prepare for world war III, the first of these World War II bonds are about to mature. Those bond holders who so desperately need the money now to pay current expenses will find when they cash in these bonds that every dollar put away 10 years ago now can buy only 60 cents worth of things—if the things still are available.

This is what is meant by cheap money. Every bond holder or potential bond buyer wonders if the dollar has cheapened from 100 cents to 60 cents during the past 10 years what will happen to it at the end of the next 10 years.

Unless this policy stops, wages will never be high enough to cover the legitimate needs of a wage earner's family, a life-insurance policy will not give adequate protection; the much-needed and well-deserved pension just will not be enough.

The administration must decide whether it is proinflation or antiinflation. In my opinion, it is dishonest to suggest an antiinflationary tax policy on the one hand while at the same time insisting on a proinflationary interest policy on the other.

President Truman has sent a tax proposal to the Congress suggesting that our tax bill—your taxes and my taxes—be increased \$10,000,000,000. This taking of an additional \$10,000,000,000 of your money is urged on the basis that it is antiinflationary. If such is the case, then you have a right to insist that the same interest and bond-buying policy by which the Federal Reserve System has increased our money supply in recent months by nearly the same \$10,000,000,000 be stopped immediately.

This is not a partisan political battle. The American people who today are be-

ing asked to do so much and to make so many real sacrifices have the right to demand from the present administration that it resolve immediately the very real crisis developing from the intramural battle being waged between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury. The time is now.

HELP FOR THOSE SUBJECT TO MILITARY CALL

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would help those subject to military call to secure employment or promotion in their present employment. This proposal, if enacted into law, would go a long way toward overcoming the handicap the armed services reservists, members of the National Guard, and those subject to selective service now face as they endeavor to secure employment or regular promotion in their present employment.

This measure amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide an incentive for employers to employ individuals subject to military call. The bill provides an additional deduction by way of a business expense for part of the remuneration paid to such employee.

No doubt many Members have received letters, just as I have, calling attention to the fact that employers are naturally hesitant to consider employing anyone subject to and likely to be called into the armed services. It seems to me that there probably are not many employers who take this attitude. However, there are apparently enough to make a rather serious situation which is causing general alarm among members of the National Guard, reservists, and those subject to selective service. I am confident that there is not any employer who does not personally wish he could take on employees who might be called into the service. However, the employer is faced with a hard problem, and it is understandable that this situation annoys him as much as it does the employee who is likely to be called into the service.

It seems to me that the National Defense Establishment should make every effort, insofar as it is possible, to overcome the uncertainty which results in this situation.

I believe that the proposal I have introduced today will go a long way in helping to solve this problem. I believe further that it will help our over-all effort to secure the maximum utilization of our manpower and productive facilities.

This measure will in all probability be referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, but I want to call it to the specific attention of the House Armed Services Committee because I believe it is a problem to which both committees must direct careful consideration and some action to relieve the unfortunate

uncertainties, handicap, and discrimination which have naturally come about as a result of our national defense manpower mobilization policies.

I submit here along with my remarks a copy of the bill and request that it may be printed in the RECORD:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an incentive for employers to employ individuals liable for induction or call to active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(cc) Special deduction in respect of employees entering Armed Forces:

"(1) In general: If during the taxable year any individual left a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of the taxpayer—

"(A) to be inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under the Selective Service Act of 1948, or

"(B) to enter upon active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, or the Public Health Service, in response to an order or call to active duty,

an amount equal to 50 percent of the sum of the amounts allowable under subsection (a) (1) (A) as cash remuneration paid during the 2-year period ending on the date such individual left the position as salary or other compensation for personal services actually rendered by such individual.

"(2) Definition: As used in this subsection, the term 'Armed Forces' means the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this act.

LITHUANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Under the domination of Communist Russia, there still exists the yearning of centuries for freedom. To be a free people has been the age-old aspiration of the Lithuanians. For a few years, between the two World Wars, liberty was enjoyed and cherished. Then came the Soviet occupation and with it came the loss of freedom and misery to the people of Lithuania.

Several hundred thousands paid the price of loss of their lives. Victims were tortured; suffered from planned starvation, and finally were exiled to prison or slave labor camps. Husbands were separated from their wives and children; sent to different Siberian camps; and the children reared in complete contradiction to their cultural and religious backgrounds.

Behind the iron curtain, Lithuania cannot publicly proclaim its constant yearning for liberty. Soviet oppression has taken care of that. But the people in that unfortunate country keep on praying for the day of deliverance. They

maintain a heroic underground capable of spreading intelligent American truth.

Here in America, the Lithuanians keep alive the spirit of their national aspirations.

May these aspirations some day become a reality.

That is the universal hope of Americans who believe in freedom and in the independence of nations to govern themselves.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the thirty-third anniversary of the national independence of Lithuania.

We find, however, that instead of enjoying that independence which was earned through great sacrifice, this brave, liberty-loving people are struggling in the throes of oppression and aggression.

It is high time that this Nation take a firm stand in defense of a people who have by force of arms lost that freedom for which we have pledged support. I urge the Congress and the Department of State to take appropriate action to bring to an end this reign of terror and oppression.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans of Rockford, Ill., and my reply to these splendid people:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT A MASS MEETING OF THE LITHUANIAN-AMERICANS IN ROCKFORD, ILL., HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LOCAL BRANCH OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC., ON THE 11TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 1951, TO COMMEMORATE THE THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Whereas Lithuania, the land of our ancestors, has been and still is unlawfully occupied by the Soviet military and police forces; and

Whereas, after having usurped the sovereign and inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people, the Soviet rulers are applying ever harsher methods of oppression and outright extermination of the indigenous population of that country by mass deportation, imprisonment, and execution; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to alien domination and are determined to regain their freedom and sovereignty; and

Whereas because of their manifest and unmistakable anti-Communist attitude, the Lithuanian people, backed by their kinsmen in this country, represent a reliable link in the defense chain which is presently being forged by the free nations against the Communist aggression: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, in joining our countrymen in the grief caused by the acts of aggression and injustice of the Soviet Union, voice an emphatic protest against the terrorist activities of the Soviets in Lithuania and especially against the crime of genocide being perpetrated by the Soviet Government, and pledge all possible support to the efforts of the Lithuanian people to reestablish their independent and democratic republic; be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to the Government of the United States with the request to include the liberation of Lithuania and other countries enslaved by Soviet Russia into the program of the American foreign policy and to use a proper occasion for a public restatement of the views of the Government on the necessity to restore the independence of these countries; be it finally

Resolved, That we, Lithuanian-Americans, reaffirming our loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge our wholehearted support of the administration in its efforts to resist the Communist forces of aggression and achieve an international peace founded on principles of freedom and justice.

STEVE KELIOTIS,

Chairman.

PAUL A. DELTUVA,

Secretary.

ROCKFORD, ILL., February 11, 1951.

FEBRUARY 14, 1951.

PAUL A. DELTUVA,

Secretary, Rockford Branch,

Lithuanian-American Council, Inc.,
Rockford, Ill.

MY DEAR MR. DELTUVA: I acknowledge receipt of the resolution adopted at the mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans on February 11 with respect to the direful situation confronting the people of your homeland.

The contents of this resolution, setting forth in convincing detail the brutal aggression practiced upon your people, strike in me a responsive chord for I have long been interested in the devotion to freedom and abhorrence of injustice that through these many years has so outstandingly characterized the people of Lithuania.

I can understand how the injustices being presently imposed on your homeland by brute force bear more heavily on your hearts at this anniversary of national independence for, while you good people here enjoy as American citizens the freedoms denied to those yet in Lithuania, you would be less than human did you not do everything in your power to alleviate the deplorable conditions surrounding them and affecting their very existence.

Your resolution but intensifies my earnest desire to be helpful in every possible way. To this end I can assure you and those sponsoring this resolution that I shall press earnestly and persistently for a clear-cut statement of policy by our Department of State in harmony with the objectives so forcefully set out in your resolution and, further, shall urge affirmative action by the State Department to make such policy statement effective.

Sincerely yours,

LEO E. ALLEN,

Member of Congress.

IN HONOR OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania was one of the first victims of the last World War. In June 1940 it was occupied by Soviet Union forces. In July 1941, Nazi troops expelled the Red army and ruled over the country until August 1944, when the Russians came back and incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union. And since Moscow did not succeed in changing the Lithuanians into Bolsheviks, thousands of them were

killed, expelled, deported. All the progress made in two decades of independence in every phase of life—economic, financial, commercial, educational—was destroyed by the teachers of a new way of felicity—communism.

American-Lithuanians, so much more fortunate than their brothers who live under Communist terror, are aware of Lithuania's tragedy. They know that today the members of the Lithuanian underground movement, risking their lives to fight the Russians in Lithuania, are in the same camp as American boys trying to hold back Communist aggression in Korea. Their fight is the fight of all free nations for freedom and democracy.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we think of all these thousands of people who died for their country, and we look forward to seeing again a free and prosperous Lithuania.

FOOD FOR INDIA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, today a group of us from the Committee on Foreign Affairs is introducing a bill to start action toward getting relief in the form of surplus wheat to more than 10,000,000 people in India who otherwise are likely to starve in the next few months due to famine resulting from earthquake, floods, and drought. No one has been more opposed than I to what I believe to be the unrealistic and unwise attitude of the Indian Government on the question of Communist aggression in Asia, which, unless checked in Korea and China, will, I fear, conquer India too. But our differences with the Indian Government on policy have no relation to American concern for the suffering of the starving Indian people. I believe we should make available within the reasonable limits of our capacities such wheat as full investigation makes clear India does not have the ability to purchase.

We should do it, first, because they are human beings in need; and secondly, because these particular human beings happen to live in a very vital spot in today's world. Communism makes headway by promising people whatever it is they need. Although it never yet has delivered on the big promises, you cannot blame needy people for following the false guides if they see nowhere else to turn. Our American way is not promises, but performance. This is a case where what our hearts prompt us to do coincides with what our heads tell us is in our own long-term interest and in the interest of peace and world security.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

THE COTTON SITUATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, during the last war in conference with the Quartermaster General and other high officials, I was told that cotton ranked third in the importance of war materials. First comes explosives; then the various kinds of metals, and then cotton. In that connection I have just received a resolution passed yesterday by the general assembly of my State, which reads as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT AND UNITED STATES OFFICIALS TO REMOVE THE ORDER FROM THE OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION AFFECTING COTTON ISSUED JANUARY 25, 1951

Whereas cotton is one of the basic industries of this Nation; and

Whereas cotton has long been the basis of South Carolina's economic life and the growing and processing reaches into every phase of the life of the citizens of South Carolina and the Nation; and

Whereas the United States of America is in a critical period and cotton is essential to the national defense effort; and

Whereas at the present time cotton is in temporary short supply and the cotton farmers and producers of South Carolina and the Nation have been asked to produce more than 16,000,000 bales of cotton as part of the national defense effort which is a 60-percent increase in production; and

Whereas due to the recent Federal regulations, as contained in the order from the Office of Price Stabilization issued January 25, 1951, free trade and free flow of this commodity is at a complete standstill and conditions have become chaotic adversely affecting the farmers, cotton merchants, manufacturers, ginners, warehousemen, bankers, transportation systems and directly, or indirectly, all phases of normal business: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the President of the United States and the proper governmental agencies, including the United States Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Stabilization, are requested to immediately remove the present unworkable order pertaining to cotton in order to permit the resumption of normal distribution and processing of raw cotton; to assure the cotton farmer that the 16,000,000 bales he has been asked to produce by our Government will move readily as in the past; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the senate immediately transmit copies of the resolution to the President of the United States; the United States Secretary of Agriculture, Charles S. Brannan; the Administrator of the Office of Price Stabilization, Michael DiSalle; and to the South Carolina Members of Congress.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have this date introduced a new old-age pension bill, which is similar to the one I introduced in the Eighty-first Congress. Substantially, the only change in the bill is that the amount has been increased from \$60 per month to \$100 per month.

This change in the amount was made after consultations with a number of Members of the House of Representatives and with many people interested in a good old-age pension program, including the American Pension Committee, Inc., and the General Welfare Federation, Inc. It seems to be the consensus of opinion of those who are most interested and most familiar with this proposed legislation that by reason of the present high cost of living and by reason of the fact that even under the present old-age assistance program some States are paying now amounts near this sum—the State of Colorado, as I understand it, is now paying, under the old-age assistance program, to those qualified for assistance on some occasions the sum of \$90 per month and probably an average of \$75 or \$80 per month—that this raised amount is more nearly in keeping with what would be a just and fair pension allowance at the present time.

We who are interested in this program fully realize that this is a time of peril for our great country, and fully realize also that the welfare of our armed services, including, of course, our heroic troops in Korea and the protection of our beloved country from its enemies, should be our first and primary concern at this time. However, we also feel that one of the things for which our boys are fighting and dying is the welfare of their fathers and mothers and homes. We feel that we would be derelict in our duty if we should fail, on our part, to give all security possible to their loved ones for whom they are making such tremendous sacrifices.

It was my personal experience to fight in a number of the bloodiest battles in World War I, and I believe that I am in a position to know, first-hand, just what is in the mind of the combat soldier on the battlefield, and I believe that I know what he thinks primarily of the welfare of his country and of his father and mother, and his loved ones generally.

I am sure that a great many are familiar with the bill we introduced last Congress, but in order to inform those who might not be acquainted with it, and for the RECORD, I wish to state that in substance the bill provides for a direct, Federal old-age pension, at the rate of \$100 per month to all qualified individuals. A person would be a qualified individual who is 60 years of age or over, and is a citizen of the United States, providing his gross income is less than the minimum amount with respect to which a Federal income-tax return is required to be filed.

We wish to do all that we can to further the progress of this bill and hope that the proper committee to which it will be referred will give us hearings on it, in the reasonably near future, and that same will be reported out for consideration of the House some time during this session of Congress.

We believe that this bill, or legislation similar thereto, is necessary if justice is to be accorded to our elder citizens who are most in need of a program of this kind. We do not find fault with those groups who now have adequate pension and retirement programs, but we are

most anxious that those who do not have such adequate pensions and retirement benefits, be accorded same.

WHEAT FOR INDIA

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am interested in the resolution which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has introduced relative to giving wheat to India. I hope when the hearings are held before the Foreign Affairs Committee that that committee will make every effort to determine whether or not the Prime Minister of India has been playing power politics with Pakistan, and whether or not he has made every effort to treat Pakistan in the same way that he suggests we treat Communist China.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes, I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think I stated in my remarks that I favored giving only such aid as investigation demonstrates is beyond the capacity of the Indian Government to procure for its people.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I appreciate that, and I am sure the gentleman means that. I hope the investigation will be exhaustive enough to bring out some of these things that are in the minds of many of the Members. By this, Mr. Speaker, I mean I would like to know why Mr. Nehru bitterly attacks the United States for what he calls our intervention and imperialism in Korea and at the same time has had troops on the border of Pakistan for many months and has tried to strangle that country economically. In the meantime, he has brought his own people to the verge of starvation and now asks the United States to save them from that starvation while he continues his aggression against his neighbor. Certainly, this will bear a great deal of investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent republic.

On this date in 1918, this small Baltic nation proclaimed to the world her ability to engage in a program of self-democratic government and spiritual progress.

The modern history of Lithuania, however, as an independent nation was ruthlessly terminated by the forceful invasion and atrocious subjugation of the Republic by the overwhelming military forces of the Soviet Union.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were the first of the small nations democratically erected after the First World War to feel the brunt of Soviet aggression.

Since that time most of the Slavic nations, particularly Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Albania have been joined in the horrible fate visited upon the Baltic nations. About a year ago this time, reliable reports from underground sources indicated that all phases of life were growing steadily worse in Lithuania under the relentless fury of the Soviet program of enslavement.

Significantly, the program of Communist persecution has been aimed primarily at the extinction of religion in Lithuania.

Before the Soviet conquest, the population of Lithuania was predominantly Roman Catholic. Over 80 percent of the people professed this faith with the balance being distributed among the Protestant, Jewish, and Orthodox religions.

Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Army occupied Lithuania, the Catholic clergy has been killed or transported to Siberia, monastic orders have been exterminated, parishes have been abolished, Catholic universities and seminaries have been extinguished. The religious press has been silenced, and all endowed institutions of every description under religious auspices have been confiscated.

Under a vicious, cruel, and bloody program, the moral, social, political, economic, cultural, and military life of Lithuania has been absorbed by a collective Communist regime which has been dictated by the Soviet masters in the Kremlin.

Cries from the people of Lithuania in their crucifixion have reached us feebly from behind the iron curtain.

The terrible tragedy visited upon this small nation serves as a grim reminder that the great sacrifices of two World Wars will have been hopeless offerings if Lithuania and the other Slavic nations are not rescued from the grip of Soviet imperialism.

Everlastingly to our credit, this Nation has never recognized the absorption of Lithuania and her neighboring states into the land mass of the Soviet Union.

This refusal to recognize the conquest of Lithuania serves as a continual condemnation of, and protest against, the unlawful occupation of that noble little country by Russian military might. It serves also as a continual protest against the commitment of atrocities against the people and the democratic institutions of Lithuania.

Realizing for the moment that practical steps are perhaps impossible, nevertheless this continued protest is made and reiterated on anniversaries like to-

day's so that the people of Lithuania and Americans of Lithuanian descent may know that our Nation shall never depart from the principle of self-determination for small nations.

On behalf of the suffering people in that tiny land on the Baltic Sea, I express the fervent hope that our foreign policy will continue to include a protest against the conquest of Lithuania and that, in the near future, it may become articulate enough to include a strong demand that the Soviet Union liberate Lithuania from the strangle hold of communism so that it may once again arise as a free and independent nation on the Baltic shores.

SAVE YOUR SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills today which are intended to aid in the stabilization of our monetary system, by creating additional incentives to the holders of Government bonds to retain their investments therein. There are presently outstanding in E bonds approximately \$35,000,000,000 which will mature over the next 10 years. The House adopted and passed a bill which facilitates the holders of those bonds retaining their investments and continuing to receive the same rate of interest thereon. That should be sufficient inducement to the average citizen, who not only believes in thrift but who also recognizes his obligation in these trying times to contribute what he can to prevent undue inflation. Many of these people, however, will cash their bonds because of fear instilled in them by irresponsible talk about runaway inflation which will depreciate the value of their bonds the longer they hold them.

The first of the bills referred to by me provides for a waiver of income tax on the earnings on E bonds, provided they are held for an additional 10-year period. The bill does not make it mandatory that any of the bonds be held for that length of time. The option will still be with the holder to cash them in any time he may desire to do so. If he cashes them in within the second 10-year period he will simply have to pay his income tax thereon. If he holds the bonds the full 10-year period he will save the tax. In view of the fact that we must increase the tax rate in the years ahead the bill also provides that the bond holder if he must cash them in and lose the tax waiver benefits will have the choice of paying at the rate then prevailing or at the rate prevailing on the date when he could originally have cashed his bonds, giving him the advantage of whichever is the lower rate.

This should provide a real inducement to the E bond holder to continue his savings in these bonds, giving him a return higher than he can otherwise get. Financiers and economists tell us

that for every dollar of currency released into the stream of trade, we actually increase the monetary supply six times. If the \$35,000,000,000 of E bonds were all cashed in over the next 10 years at the rate of about three and one-half billion dollars a year, we would increase the monetary supply of the country by \$21,000,000,000 a year. The taxable earnings represented by this \$35,000,000,000 of E bonds will total \$8,750,000,000 for the next 10 years. Assuming that none of the E bond holders had paid any income tax for any part of those earnings and estimating that the holders of those bonds will pay on income tax equal to 25 percent of those earnings during the next 10 years, the maximum tax the Government can receive out of those E bond earnings will average \$218,750,000 per year. That sum is indeed small compared to the total tax receipts that we contemplate the Government must collect during each of the next 10 years. If it accomplishes the purpose of keeping out of circulation only \$3,500,000,000 a year, it is money worth spending. Actually it will keep out of circulation over \$21,000,000,000 during each of the next 10 years.

The second of the bills I have introduced today is intended to accomplish the same purpose with reference to government securities other than the E bonds, but in a different manner. There are some \$23,000,000,000 of Government securities outstanding presently in addition to the E bonds. In order to induce the holders of those bonds to continue their investments therein for an additional 10 year period, my second bill permits the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a premium of an additional one-half of 1 percent of the face amount of the bond to the holders thereof who continue their investments therein for an additional 10-year period. In making that proposal I want it distinctly understood that I am in complete accord with the President and with the Secretary of the Treasury in their position that to increase the interest rate on Government securities at this time would be wrong and bad for all of the reasons set forth by them. I am in complete disagreement with those members of the Federal Reserve System and of its Open Market Committee who take a contrary view. To increase the interest rate on Government securities would unnecessarily increase the cost of Government and at the same time prove highly inflationary, adding that much more money periodically to the financial stream. If the bankers who are advocating a higher interest rate on Government securities were honest and frank with us they would tell us that the only reason for advocating higher interest rates on Government securities is to increase bank profits. Regardless of the motives, however, that prompt their recommendation the fact is that an unhealthy atmosphere has been created in the financial markets of the country and I believe some incentive must be created so that the holders of those \$23,000,000,000 in Government securities will continue their investments therein. I believe my second bill accomplishes that by providing for the payment of a premium

of one-half of 1 percent to those who continue to hold their securities for an additional 10-year period. My second bill also gives the Secretary of the Treasury authority which will strengthen the long term bond market. Long term securities other than the E bonds carry a higher rate of interest than short term securities. As presently issued, however, many Government bonds intended to be issued as long term securities with an interest rate of 2½ percent can be disposed of by the holder thereof at any time after acquisition thereof, the holder receiving interest at the fixed rate from date of purchase to date of transfer. The result is that long term securities can be traded in as short term securities at the long term rate. My bill permits the Secretary of the Treasury to stop that practice by providing that bonds which are redeemed by the Government or acquired by the Federal Reserve Bank before maturity shall be so redeemed or acquired at a lesser rate of interest depending upon the length of time the security has actually been held by the original holder. The result I am sure will be that most of the owners of these long term securities will hold them until maturity.

REFERENCE OF BILL AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

JOHN RANKIN, THE SCOTCHMAN, AND THE LADY'S HAT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some friends of mine have informed me that they heard over the radio that JOHN RANKIN, a Member of Congress from Mississippi, had been seen wearing a woman's hat over in the Capitol and had passed it to other Members of the House who also put it on.

He had evidently been listening to the Voice of America, because that is about as near as they come to telling the facts.

What happened was that, not a Member of this Congress, but a Scotchman by the name of John Rankin, a member of the British Parliament, the other day, rose to speak. The Chair refused to recognize him because he did not have on a hat. He reached over and took a hat off the head of one of the lady members and proceeded to make

his speech. Other members then followed suit and put on the same hat in order to gain recognition.

I just did not want the public to get me mixed up with my Scotch namesake who resorted to that method of getting himself recognized in the British Parliament.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

MEDICAL CARE OF VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, letters are pouring in to Members from all over the country, I believe, regarding the kind of care the veterans are receiving as a result of the cuts in the field offices, cuts in the hospitals. I visited three hospitals, one Army hospital and two Veterans' Administration hospitals within the last week. They are very much overcrowded, not only with nervous and mental cases but also a serious situation is created when there is a shortage of beds, and a shortage of attendants. At Cushing General Hospital there were practically no attendants for the badly paralyzed men.

The Army has issued a call for some 400 doctors and they have asked for over 300 nurses. I think the time is past due when there should be a survey of the whole situation of Veterans' Administration facilities and the medical attention available to them. It is very much needed. On Monday I shall introduce the following resolution calling for such a survey. I hope it will be adopted:

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete survey of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliary centers and other like facilities, including the construction, operation, and personnel administration of such facilities.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the first session of the present Congress the results of its survey, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the first session of the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

VETERAN VICTIMS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are all in full accord with the statement of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] that we must look after and care for our veterans. That is a debt we owe.

Once more it is my privilege to suggest that while we look after the veterans and do everything we can for them, we should do a little something about the foreign policy of this country which, war after war, gives us an ever larger crop of veterans. Unless we change our foreign policy soon there will be none but veterans in this country—called upon to support each other.

How would it be if for once we tried to do something about keeping some of our men from being killed, becoming veterans in wars which profit us nothing?

If we would vote as enthusiastically to keep out of war—for legislation to prevent war as we do for aid to veterans, some day there would be no veterans.

GEN. HOYT S. VANDENBERG

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, has prepared a very important article which appears in this week's Saturday Evening Post. I want to commend the reading of that article to every Member of the House and the Senate as it contains information which I am sure will be valuable to all in whatever decisions have to be made.

There is one point in the article, however, which I desire to clarify a little bit for the newer Members because we here who were Members of the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses are all aware of the situation. He speaks of the inability of the Air Force to develop a proper tactical air force because of lack of appropriations. Every Member of this body should know that the House of Representatives appropriated more money in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses for the construction of aircraft than was requested by the President and the Budget Bureau and that that money was impounded on orders of the President and, therefore, not spent. That should be pointed out in connection with this article because it certainly is not the fault of the House of Representatives that the United States Air Force and the naval air arm are not further along today toward the capacity to fight which we thought back in 1948 and still think they ought to have.

INDIA EMERGENCY FOOD AID ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan group in the House and in the Senate is today introducing the India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951, to authorize 2,000,000 long tons of food grains for India and seeking appropriations for a million tons in this fiscal year. Speaking personally, I consider this one of the most important foreign-affairs measures we are likely to have before us in this Congress. It is intended to relieve a critical food situation in India during this year threatening starvation directly to an estimated 13,000,000 people, and affecting the rations of the 125,000,000 people of India now down to 9 ounces of food grains per day per person. It follows the traditional pattern of our relations with friendly peoples in utilizing our surplus to relieve distress.

It is a measure likely to contribute very materially to the stability and peace of the whole Far East, a critical famine in India paralleling that of 1943 could rock the governmental structure of that new and free nation to its foundations. In that sense there is a real analogy between this aid program and our programs to prevent disease and unrest in overseas areas in which we have had direct governmental responsibility.

Finally, there is no better demonstration anywhere that we mean what we say when we speak of freedom than would be this aid to India, for the position of the Government of India on condemning the Communist Chinese as aggressors in Korea has been directly opposed to ours in the United Nations, and to my own and that of Members generally. Yet, despite our complete disagreement on that point, we would not be denying to India the food aid she so urgently needs. A more convincing demonstration that democracy does not imply retaliation for disagreement, so typical of communism, could hardly be found.

Appended hereto is the text of the House bill and the statement issued by the sponsors in connection with its introduction:

A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951."

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to promote the foreign policy and the national interest of the United States and the cause of world peace by providing during the calendar year 1951 emergency food relief assistance to the people of India out of surplus grains available in the United States, in order to prevent starvation brought about by famine conditions in India.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not in excess of \$190,000,000 for the purpose of this act, including necessary administrative expenses, of which not in excess of one-half shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and the balance shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952: *Provided, however,* That with respect to the procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this act the

Secretary of Agriculture shall certify that such agricultural commodity is available in excess of the domestic requirements, stockpiling, and existing commitments: *And provided further,* That the assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, droughts, and other natural disasters suffered by India in 1950.

SEC. 4. No assistance under authority of this act shall be made available nor shall any funds appropriated hereunder be expended until an agreement is entered into between India and the United States containing the following undertakings, and any others the President may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this act, on the part of India:

(a) To distribute the relief supplies made available under this act, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, among the people of India without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief.

(b) To give full and continuous publicity in India to the assistance furnished by the United States.

(c) To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in India of commodities and other assistance made available under authority of this act.

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of India equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of India from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder, this account to be utilized as may be agreed upon by the United States and the Government of India for the benefit of the people of India in programs to improve and increase food production and distribution.

(e) To take all appropriate measures to reduce its needs for assistance; to encourage increased production and distribution of foodstuffs within India; and to lessen the danger of similar future emergencies.

(f) To make available to the Government of the United States local currency in amounts required by it to meet its local currency, administrative, and operating expenses in India in connection with assistance supplied under this act.

SEC. 5. Local currency made available to the United States by the Government of India under the provisions of the agreement required by section 4 may be used for local currency, administrative, and operating expenses in India in connection with assistance provided by this act without charge against appropriated funds.

SEC. 6. Assistance provided under this act shall be provided under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, applicable to and consistent with the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. All or any portion of the funds made available under authority of this act may be transferred by the President to any department or agency of the executive branch of the Government, to be expended for the purpose of this act. Funds so transferred may be expended under the authority of any provisions of law, not inconsistent with this act, applicable to the departments or agencies concerned, except that funds so transferred shall not be commingled with other funds of such departments or agencies and shall be accounted for separately.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to section 3 of this act, to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$50,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act in such manner, at such time, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on

advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purpose of this act.

SEC. 9. All or any part of the assistance provided hereunder shall be promptly terminated by the President (a) whenever he determines that (1) India is not complying with the undertakings in the agreement entered into under section 4 of this act, or is diverting from the purpose of this act assistance provided hereunder; or (2) because of changed conditions, continuance of assistance is unnecessary, or no longer consistent with the national interest or the foreign policy of the United States; or, (b) whenever the Congress by concurrent resolution finds termination is desirable. Termination of assistance to India under this section shall include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under this act and not yet delivered.

A bipartisan group today introduced in the House of Representatives the India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951. The group includes the following members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs: Representatives FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, Ohio; THURMOND CHATHAM, Democrat, North Carolina; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, Pennsylvania; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Republican, Massachusetts; J. K. JAVITS, Republican-Liberal, New York; WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, Minnesota; EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, New York; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, Pennsylvania; ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, Connecticut; and the following other Members of the House: Representatives EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York; and ROY W. WIER, Democrat, Minnesota.

In connection with the introduction of the bill, the sponsors stated: "We have introduced this bill because of our firm belief that a favorable response by the United States to the request of the Government of India for help in an acute emergency food shortage with dire threat of famine is in the best interests of the traditional policy of friendship and good will between the people of the United States and the people of India. Unless we act promptly, there is grave danger that about 13,000,000 people of India will be directly affected by famine conditions. We shall do our utmost to see that the aid is granted and in time.

"We consider the need to avoid starvation in India entirely separate from all political considerations. There are no political strings and no reservations of a political character attached to the bill we are introducing. We do not want our desire to help the suffering people of India, within the reasonable limits of our capacity, to be regarded as in any sense lessening our opposition to the apparent views of the Government of India with respect to the Communist aggression in Korea. On the other hand, our firm opposition to this apparent position on the part of the Government of India does not lessen in the least our desire to help relieve the acute food shortage in India.

"Our bill calls for an authorization of \$190,000,000, the estimated amount of the cost of the 2,000,000 long tons of grain needed without shipping costs (which we understand are to be provided by the Government of India), one-half to be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the balance during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. We have provided for the authorization in this way in response to the Presidential message which recommends appropriation for 1,000,000 tons of grain at this time and then a survey of the situation to see what else is needed. Our bill also calls for administration of this aid program by the ECA.

"In summary, we urge this food aid on the basis of the relationship between people and people, those of the United States and those of India, in the hope that the deep sympathy which it expresses will further fortify the bonds of friendship between the two peoples and give further support and encouragement to the new free nation of India."

HOW LONG ARE WE GOING TO APPEASE THOSE WHO SEEK TO DESTROY US?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had to say I am wondering if the time will ever come when we shall cease to appease those who are seeking to destroy us.

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks as this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my happy privilege to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. The anniversary of this birth of freedom in the Baltic Republic is celebrated each year throughout the world on February 16. It is an anniversary the world must not forget—it is a warning to aggressors and a challenge to the free. Lithuania is waiting not only with patience but with confidence that the independence declared on February 16, 1918, and enjoyed until 1940, shall again be hers. As Shakespeare wrote: "For though usurpers sway the rule awhile, yet heavens are just, and time suppresseth wrongs."

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a sturdy, gallant, and resolute people who have made many significant contributions to the cause of human justice and freedom. I am keenly aware that many weighty matters of great national and international importance are awaiting your earnest attention, but it would be inexcusable if we did not pause, however, briefly to pay heartfelt tribute to a sister republic and to bestow on that republic the honor and acclaim which it so richly deserves.

Lithuania is a small country. It is essentially an agricultural country, the soil claiming more than 75 percent of a population of approximately 3,000,000. The independence of Lithuania was recognized by most of the great powers in 1918, and by Russia in the Treaty of Moscow. The Lithuanians have had firsthand experience with Bolshevik ruthlessness in that turbulent period. They survived it, they triumphed over it. They succeeded in forming their own representative government. They succeeded magnificently in carrying on their day-to-day affairs with courage and dignity despite their close and highly dangerous geographical proximity to the sinister Soviet tyranny.

During the chaotic period following World War I, the Lithuanians suffered the loss of Vilna, their historic capital. Two decades later the Nazis robbed them of Memel, their chief port. Shortly after World War II, the Soviet Government demanded the right to establish military, naval, and air bases in Lithuania. The country was quickly reduced to a state of vassalage and then occupied completely. Lithuania was among the first victims of insatiable Soviet aggression. The history of free Lithuania is unfortunately a short history and a sad one. It is the tragic yet inspiring history of a devout and freedom-loving people trying very hard to carry on their honorable and peaceful pursuits despite the constant threat and menace of unscrupulous and predatory neighbors.

We grieve for the resolute and heroic Catholic nation, because at this moment in history it is temporarily enslaved. Yet we glory in its past achievements and in the fierce and undying determination of its unconquerable people to regain at whatever cost and sacrifice their former liberty and independence.

The Lithuanians are one with us and with all the people of the free world in their wholehearted dedication to the great principles and ideals of democratic freedom. They are one with us in sharing that glorious Christian culture which nurtured Europe through many bleak and stormy centuries and which, please God, is surely to triumph over the menacing forces of oppression and tyranny.

We are therefore proud to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day, and to express the sincere hope that Lithuania may soon resume its honored place and position among the free nations of the world. We hope that soon the white knight may ride again, freely as of yore, and the yellow, green, and red banner may again wave unhindered to symbolize Lithuania's ripened harvests of grain, her green forests, and the patriot blood which has not yet ceased to flow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, may I inquire what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Consent Calendar will be called and on Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called. There is no other business for the rest of the week. I do not want, by this statement, to bind myself that there will not be any, but I have none to announce to the House. I want to frankly advise the House that I know of none now that is likely to come up next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman will give us 24 hours' notice, I take it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely. I will give all the advance notice possible. Insofar as I am able now, so that the Members may be guided to some extent in their actions, I will state I know of nothing that is likely to come up next

week. I know of no bill to be reported out of committee, but if there should be, we could wait until the week after next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat diffident, somewhat reluctant, to come before you this morning, but I feel that the international situation, the international crisis which we find ourselves in today, warrants some sound, honest thinking on this subject. I honestly believe that there is not a more patriotic group of Americans anywhere in this country than the 435 Members of this House. I am convinced that there is not a man or woman here who would not give his or her life to solve this great international crisis we are in today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] and those who signed his declaration of policy on yesterday. I wish to compliment them for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and to the attention of the people of this country. Also I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], my leader, for participating in that debate, because I believe that this great international crisis today can only be solved right here in this House through the duly elected Representatives of the people of this country. The people of America are the ones who will pay the bill. The people of America are the ones who will do the dying. So, I would like to see this House and the other body have more of a voice in shaping the foreign policy of our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I come before you today representing a people who are international-minded and have been for many years, back to the days when Charles Pinckney and Thomas Pinckney were ambassadors abroad during the time of the Revolution, and after. Since that time South Carolina has also greatly assisted this country in formulating our foreign policy. It is my honor to represent the district once represented by that famous Secretary of State and Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun. I represent part of the district recently represented by James F. Byrnes, our great Secretary of State. Some of our contemporary leaders, in addition to Mr. Byrnes, from my great State well versed in foreign affairs are Mr. Bernard Baruch, and the Honorable John R.

Peurifoy, presently Ambassador to Greece.

I speak to you today humbly, and with a sincere feeling of my own shortcomings and inabilities. I hope you will bear in mind that I do not claim to be an expert on foreign or military affairs. I only come to you as a representative of the grass roots of America. The only qualification I have for speaking on foreign and military policy is the fact that I served in Europe for 20 months as an enlisted man; all the way from the coast of Normandy to within 100 miles of Berlin. I studied the topography, the characteristics of the people, and the stamina of those people to resist aggression; therefore I feel qualified, at least to a certain extent, to come before you today.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have you recall with me this morning the speech I made from this floor on May 7, 1947. It is practically the same speech in substance that I am going to make to you in a few minutes.

For that speech, as you will recall, I was listed as the No. 1 enemy of communism and a warmonger by Vishinsky on September 18 of that year at Lake Success, N. Y., heading a list of distinguished Americans.

Many Congressmen asked me the question then, right here, why they picked me, a freshman Member of this body, to label as a warmonger and attack constantly in the press of Russia. The answer to me was obvious. I advocated in that speech the one force that Russia feared more than any other force on earth, that is an invincible Air Force. I am still advocating that great offensive, defensive, and peace force today. I was again viciously attacked by the Russian press on several occasions that year when I suggested that some of the Marshall plan funds be used instead for the building of this Air Force.

It is my understanding that a great controversy is now raging within the Pentagon over the respective merits of sea power, land power, and the Air Force. Out of this controversy will come a policy that will lead us to peace, victory, or to extermination. It is our duty, as Representatives of the American people, to help unite all of these factions, as well as the American people, on a foreign and military strategy that will preserve this Nation for generations to come.

There is likewise a great debate raging over this Nation between the forces of semi-isolationism and of internationalism. This debate, in reality, has been going on since William Jennings Bryan resigned as Secretary of State in 1916 in protest over measures which he said would lead to American participation in a foreign war. This debate was carried on with great fervor by President Wilson, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Hiram Johnson. Again it flared in the late 1930's between Roosevelt, Wheeler, Lindbergh, and many others. And again today this controversy is becoming intensely heated between such leaders as Hoover, Taft, Dewey, and the present administration.

I want to say right here that I am taking advantage of our President's offer of constructive criticism, made during his

great speech here on this floor. I think this question should be worked out now. I am accepting his kind offer. Also, I believe in unity, but I think we should unite on a policy that will save America, save its men, save its money, and not wind up in the destruction of American democracy, our economy, and our great country.

I am offering a plan to this Congress and to this country which is not isolationist, nor is it the policy of wasting our money and manpower in a thousand areas over the world. It is a compromise plan upon which all of us can unite and which, I believe, has the backing of the majority of the American people today. This plan is to build the greatest strategic and defensive air command in world history, an overwhelming striking force based on the continent of North America itself, ready at all times to lay waste the industrial potential of Soviet Russia. Once this air force is built, it will be an easy matter to serve notice on the masters in the Kremlin that we will not tolerate aggression anywhere in the world; that the moment their satellites and stooges invade a freedom-loving people our bombers will instantly wing their way to the heart of the Communist dynasty in Russia itself. We have tried extending the hand of comradeship and brotherly love. This policy has failed. Now is the time for cold realism. We cannot bribe with money the ragging morale of democratic peoples. We cannot bolster their spirit with a few divisions of ground troops.

However, I am not in favor of offering any protection to people who are not willing to fight for their own existence.

I think one policy today which might lead this Nation to disaster is the one of balanced armed forces. I believe that some of our strategists are living in the past. I believe they have forgotten that the records of military history show that Napoleon Bonaparte was a lieutenant general at 27 years. Alexander the Great conquered the world before he was 33 years of age.

Hannibal was commander in chief of an army in Spain at the age of 25. They were young men with imagination, looking to the future, and they are recognized today as the three greatest military geniuses in the history of the world. Under our present system you cannot be a lieutenant general in the American land Army at the age of 27. You cannot be an admiral in the Navy at that age. You might possibly be a brigadier general in the Air Force at the age of 30. So I am not going along with this antique semimilitary dictatorship. My fellow countrymen, let me say this: We need to analyze our situation today. We need to plan for a given, definite course. We need a foreign policy—frankly I do not know what our foreign policy is today, and I do not believe anyone else does either, because we have no clear-cut policy. But I would like to see a foreign policy adopted as to where we are going to go and what we are going to do, and then plan our three branches of the military services accordingly.

From all indications I believe that the present military policy of the United

States is too big a gamble. It can lead to disaster. That policy is akin to political expediency, one of carefully apportioning the funds for national defense equally between the Army, Navy, and the Air Force. This is a policy designed to get along with all the people at all times. It may lead to national disaster. We cannot simultaneously maintain the largest land army, the greatest air force, and the mightiest navy on earth. This policy can eventually bankrupt America and will not furnish the security freedom-loving peoples everywhere so earnestly desire. Already this policy of pouring money all over the world and, at the same time, building up balanced forces has carried America a long way toward a military dictatorship. We are losing our freedom under a false program of trying to preserve it. This policy cannot defend simultaneously Europe, all of Asia, Africa, South America, and the many islands against the overwhelming land superiority of the Eurasian Continent. America's military defense today, which also is the defense of democracy everywhere, should be composed of a land army with emphasis on airborne troops that can be sent to any area of the Western Hemisphere on a moment's notice; highly trained, mobile, super troops; young men with every training advantage that can be rushed overnight to Alaska, Greenland, or any other area directly affecting the security of the Western World. These troops should be based in North America proper and in our island possessions. This land force should consist of a powerful national guard, of a reserve composed of practically every able-bodied American citizen, ready to be called out to patrol the Nation in case of bombing and to do rescue work. Our Navy should be given sufficient strength to remain in surface command of the seven seas, with emphasis on destroyers, light carriers, submarines, and light, fast, and highly maneuverable vessels. Our Air Force should be built and maintained at a level far exceeding that of the combined air forces of the world. Once this Air Force reaches the point where it is sufficiently strong to seriously threaten Russian industry then we should immediately adopt a strong foreign policy. We could then tell Russia bluntly that we will not permit the invasion of any free nations anywhere in the world. We should then, at once, recognize the complete independence of Western Germany, accept her as our equal in the western bloc of nations, and give her the green light to build whatever army necessary to defend herself; immediately accept Spain as an equal partner. We should guarantee these nations and the rest of Europe that the minute they are attacked our Air Force will strike Russia. We should also recognize Japan as completely independent and call on her for a land army of several million men and make her the same promise of air support.

You know, I am shocked and surprised to see some Members of the House of Representatives who think we have to maintain bases in Europe in order to bomb Russia. We have planes today that can take off from the continental United States, bomb Moscow, and return

without refueling, flying at a height of more than 8 miles and at speeds in excess of 400 miles per hour. The only reason Russia today has not already moved into Western Europe is because of their fear of retaliation over the North Pole, which retaliation would pierce the industrial heart of this giant octopus reaching its tentacles out over the Eurasian Continent.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we cannot build a larger land army than Russia in Europe. That is a very desperate gamble trying to match the great hordes of the Red army man for man on the continent of Europe. Suppose we lose that gamble. We have billions of dollars tied up in such a big land army. Suppose it is defeated. That will open the United States to attack.

I am convinced, along with a large part of the American people, that we cannot win a big land war in Europe or in China or in Siberia. In considering this proposal we should go back first to Napoleon's invasion of Russia. Napoleon for months accumulated vast stores of supplies, wagon trains, artillery, and equipment the like of which the world had never before seen, on the very borders of Russia. The attack began June 23, 1812, with over 600,000 crack soldiers. Napoleon reached Moscow in the fall of that year, but was swallowed up by the vastness of that country, by incessant attacks on his lines and supplies, and finally by the bitter Russian winter. He finally fled back into France with less than 100,000 of this magnificent attacking force. Hitler invaded Russia June 22, 1941, 129 years later, less one day. At the time of Hitler's attack the Soviet Union had a population of less than 200,000,000. Hitler and his direct allies held sway over 242,500,000 people. At this time Germany and her allies produced more than 50,000,000 tons of steel annually, compared to the Russian output of approximately 19,000,000 tons annually. The Nazi army was composed of veteran troops, numbered in the millions, with everything to be desired in the way of tanks, artillery, and equipment beyond imagination. She bordered on Russia itself and started the invasion on a 2,000-mile front. In December of that year Guderian of Von Bock's Nazi army was turned back 13 miles from downtown Moscow. The attack was started with nearly 200 divisions. Hitler's army eventually met the fate of Napoleon's.

It is interesting to note that in 1941, contrary to American public opinion whipped up by the American propagandist, that no American equipment of any consequence had reached the Russian front. The German invasion started in June. The American-Russian lend-lease bill passed Congress 2 months later, in August. Before any of this equipment could reach the Russian troops they had stopped the German Army cold on the 2,000-mile front.

Less than 4 years later the Russian Army had ground their way into Berlin and to all of south central Europe. The bulk of German manpower and equipment was left behind in the bitter defeat on the frozen Steppes of the Soviet Union. The Russian Army had steadily

grown greater until at the close of the war it was at the zenith of its power. To give the world full warning that there would be no complacency and no let-up on the part of Russia to maintain and increase the efficiency of this army, Marshal George K. Zhukov, Russia's greatest general, declared on the 24th of June 1945, on Red Square in Moscow:

After 4 years of savage battles, we have entered a period of peaceful growth. The Soviet state has emerged ever more mighty from the grim struggle which we waged, and the Red army has become the most modern and powerful army in the world. But for us Soviet peoples it is unseemly to become conceited—or complacent. In the future too we must strengthen the economic power of our country, unceasingly perfect our military skill, study the rich experiences of the fatherland war, and develop our military science.

With Zhukov's words in mind today, 6 years later, and with China, Manchuria, Tibet, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and parts of Austria added to Soviet might it is safe to assume that Russia today has a much more powerful land army than all of the rest of the land armies of the world combined. I am shocked, along with many other Americans, to see our military strategists apparently planning to challenge this might on the continent of Europe. It seems they are planning the next war on the military concepts of World Wars I and II. It seems that for sentimental reasons they want to go "back to Tipperary." Their ears seem to be tuned to that World War I song, Over There. They appear to be thinking in terms of another Maginot Line. They, above all people, should know that Western Europe cannot be held in terms of pure defense. Such a European army in order to escape being pushed into the channel must advance and seize all of Russia before an ultimate victory. This cannot be done, certainly not while, at the same time, we are trying to defend Korea, Japan, Indochina, Iran, India, and a hundred other places.

The question is immediately asked, Should we abandon Europe to her fate? In the first place, Russia would not advance into Western Europe in the face of overwhelming air power based in North America, ready to strike over the North Pole at the heart of her industrial potential. If Russia did advance and occupied Western Europe, extending her armies to the Atlantic, she would be more vulnerable than ever. It is extremely doubtful that the Russian armies would remain in Western Europe or India or any other far-flung battle lines while their loved ones were being destroyed in an atomic blitz at home. It is interesting at this juncture to recall Robert E. Lee's great army at Richmond. It was not defeated as much by Grant as by General Sherman, who, in the heart of the Confederacy, was destroying its railroads, food supplies, foundries, and munitions factories; threatening the women and children and causing Lee's veterans to desert by the thousands. Lee's army collapsed because Sherman pierced the Confederate heart. The Russian Government, with its armies in foreign countries hundreds of miles from home, would be

embarrassed by the destruction of its cities and industry and would be faced with revolution in the homeland. No government could maintain control over its people at home or its far-away armies under an overwhelming air attack, particularly when that government had sent its armies away for the purpose of aggression. While the Russian armies are away our Air Force will be our General Sherman to render those armies impotent.

How do we propose to stay in Western Europe with a big land army on defense—just purely Maginot-line thinking? Of all people, our military strategists should know that in order to win we must advance and hit the heart of the enemy and occupy the country. In this day it simply cannot be done. Therefore, it is too big a gamble to risk.

I do not want to abandon Europe. I do not think we should abandon any freedom-loving people anywhere in the world, particularly after spending so many billions of dollars and so much blood; but the question is, How are we going to save them? With a great Air Force based in North America, ready to strike over no man's land—the North Pole—where no gorgeous supercarriers can sail, where no battleships can prow, where no foot soldiers can exist—the temperature 30,000 feet above the North Pole is the same as the temperature 30,000 feet over the Equator. That is the no man's land of world war III. Alaska is more important to security of the United States than Europe. Let us not be misled by this European land army talk.

Did you know that the United States today already borders Soviet Russia? A Russian foot soldier can walk in the wintertime on Russian soil across the Bering Sea into our Territory, Alaska. I was told by a high-ranking general that they could take Alaska in 48 hours. They could lay air landing strips in another 48 hours, and could bomb every city in the United States in a few days more. Oh, gentlemen, let us put first things first. Let us adopt a sensible policy.

Did you know that no great leader of past world history has ever based his military concepts entirely on the textbooks of the past? Alexander the Great and his father, Philip of Macedonia, developed the great Greek phalanx, and with only 35,000 men he was able to defeat the Persian host of a million men.

Go to the Bible. David did not go out there to fight man to man with the giant Goliath. He just could not do it. He used his ingenuity. He used his skill, and he won. Napoleon Bonaparte, when called upon by the government to defend the government buildings against a mob, did something new. He massed his artillery around the directory. Thirty thousand bodies of the mob lay dead in the streets the next morning without ever having made contact with the foot soldiers surrounding the government buildings.

Great nations of the past have concentrated on one single overwhelming instrumentality of war. The Roman legion was for 500 years the most feared power on the face of this earth. It was

a peace force; no nation, no people dared challenge the might of Rome for nearly 500 years, the greatest era of peace the world has ever known. Turn with me back to the year 1500 when Great Britain, a dot on the map of the world, just a little nation, a little island, laid the basis for world power. They did not go out and try to match the land powers of the world. Great Britain was headed by smart men, who meeting in London, said: "We cannot match the continental powers of Europe, but we will build the greatest navy the world has ever known." In the next 400 years they spent more money on their navy than on their government and army combined; and Britannia ruled the waves for 400 years, the second greatest era of peace the world has ever known.

My fellow countrymen, listen. Lieutenant General Koller, of the German Air Force, after surveying the indescribable horror of what American air power had heaped in his country, with 80 percent of its industry incapacitated and the will power of his people destroyed by air raids, made this very significant statement after the war:

We are decimated, defeated, and eliminated from world competition.

General Koller continued:

The nation that controls the air will control the sea lanes of the world, will control the continents of the world. It will be interesting to watch from the sidelines the game of power politics.

The nation that controls the air will control this world and dominate this world for the next hundred years.

He meant, of course, that the only nation that could do that was America. He also doubted, Mr. Speaker, that we would do it, because he was a student of our past international policy.

I hear over and over again some of the military strategists of the last two World Wars, who are still in power and who are now planning for a third war, say that the next war will be won or lost over the dead bodies of the American foot soldiers. Neither the dead bodies of the foot soldiers nor rifles in their hands can defend the helpless women and children of America from a hail of death falling from jet planes 40,000 or 50,000 feet above rain, snow, sleet, and fog. The people of Kansas City, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Denver, and Omaha cannot be protected by gorgeous super aircraft carriers in the far-away Atlantic or Pacific. The only force that can protect central United States from the fate of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is American air power. Out of the frozen North where no land armies can exist and where no aircraft carriers and no battleships can sail, will come death to American industry and her people if we neglect our Air Force. The North Pole is no man's land and the only power that can travel this no man's land is our fighters and bombers seeking the heart of an unscrupulous enemy.

Foot soldiers cannot deliver the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, or even TNT into the heart of Russia. Neither can carriers or battleships. The only force that can bring war to the heart of Russia is the American Air Force. Balanced forces are a terrible gamble, at the best.

Big land armies in Europe are a great gamble. But in building a powerful Air Force and relying principally on it for defense and offense we make no gamble at all. With overwhelming air superiority we cannot be invaded across the Atlantic or the Pacific, whereas if the land gamble fails we might be open to immediate attack and possibly invasion. The greatest defense America has today against submarines is the American strategic air command. The battle against submarines is won most effectively by bombing the places where submarines are made, that is Port Arthur, Vladivostok, Murmansk, Leningrad, and the other Baltic seaports. Likewise, Russia's greatest defense against our land armies on a thousand fronts across the seven seas will be the bombing of our shipyards, harbors, embarkation centers, and factories supplying those distant armies.

In this great controversy now going on in the Pentagon, about land troops versus air power, the question of Korea is constantly injected. It is my observation that in this House and elsewhere the advocates of victory over the dead bodies of our foot soldiers are pointing to Korea with glee. Korea, more than any other place or any other experience, confirms my belief in the immediate need for overwhelming air power. In the first place, I do not believe any sane military man would entertain even the thought that North Korea would have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel had we possessed a thousand B-36's and B-50's, based in California, Hawaii, Alaska, and over the islands of the Pacific, loaded with the atomic bomb, or even with TNT. If we had possessed such an air force prior to the Korean invasion and had warned North Korea never to cross the thirty-eighth parallel, there would have been another consultation between the North Korean leaders and the Kremlin. They would never have crossed into South Korea under the threat of having every village in North Korea wiped off the face of the earth in one raid. No amount of persuasion could have ever encouraged them to move against such a threat. North Korea and the Kremlin knew only too well that our 70 group Air Force had been cut to a few groups of modern up-to-date planes. The Far Eastern Air Command had been decreased until it was almost nonexistent. Since the outbreak of the war it has been limited in that it has not been allowed to bomb the sources from which armies and materials have come. But for the little air power that was available, our forces in the early stages of the Korean war would have been pushed into the sea, and the present strange withdrawal of the Communist forces, with their overwhelming manpower, is due mainly to the incessant pounding they are taking from the air.

Air power is peace power. We are playing Russia's game in Korea today; we are playing it almost as perfectly, Mr. Speaker, as if Russia herself had directed it. She is lulling us to sleep; she is making us think that world war III can be won by balanced forces, just like we are trying to put into Korea, and we are falling for it. Russia is not going to let the cat out of the sack at this

stage of the game; they are going to wait until we have our forces stretched thin, until we are weakened economically, until we have our men on a thousand battlefields and battleships. Then she will strike out over the mist of the North Pole to Alaska and New York.

I have read in the newspapers recently about the great battleship *Missouri* bombarding the coast of North Korea. That battleship would last just a few minutes if Russia wanted to sink her. Do you remember the *Repulse*? Do you remember the *Prince of Wales*? Do you remember our battle fleet at Pearl Harbor?

This is indeed the time of decision. The only course open to the American people today is, in the words of Woodrow Wilson:

Presently America will be surprised to find herself growing old, when she will adopt a new regimen of life. She will have to husband her industry, concentrate her resources; she will have to trust her best, not her average, men—that will be the time of change.

Mr. Speaker, the great Russian bear has perfected its land army. It is ready to move for instant action. She has today variously estimated in numbers from 1,000 to 3,500 heavy bombers. She is only waiting now until that force gets to be of sufficient size and strength that she can cripple and paralyze the United States. Then, Mr. Speaker, their land army will move and America will be at the mercy of the Russian hammer and sickle; unless we prepare now.

Let us adopt a wise policy. Let us build the greatest air force the world has ever seen. Do you know that one B-36 costs \$3,500,000. Seventeen billion five hundred million dollars can build the adequate strategic air force we need. That is, 5,000 heavy bombers. That is only a small fraction of the money we propose to spend in Europe, that is only a small fraction of the relief money we have lost and given away since World War II. Air power is not only peace power, it is also economy power.

My plea today is to reassert your authority as Members of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. Let us give this country the kind of a foreign policy it needs.

I remember going to the State capital of Georgia, the capitol building of the State of my good friend and distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [EUGENE COX]. There on the monument of Benjamin H. Hill were his immortal words:

He who saves his country saves all things,
All things saved will bless him.
He who lets his country die lets all things die
and
All things dying curse him.

Let us not play the game of Russia. Let us not do exactly what she wants us to do.

How many casualties have we suffered in Korea? Fifty thousand. How many has Russia suffered? Zero. All right. Who is winning? Who is playing whose game?

Mr. Speaker, I am thinking about the democracy of this country. I want to preserve it because I am a young man. I want to enjoy it because I hope my life is not over yet. Yes, I would gladly give my life if I could solve the international

situation and I know you would, too. Let me plead with you again, let us put first things first.

Right here let me say that I dislike exceedingly to disagree with the so-called experts of our time. I have, however, somewhat lost faith in our experts as such. I recall that many of our strategists before Pearl Harbor said our Pacific fleet was invincible; that Japan could be brought to her knees in a matter of weeks. I remember that many experts said Hitler would not last through the winter of 1939 after his invasion of Poland; that his regime would collapse of internal unrest; that the French Maginot line would hold, and the Nazi hordes would never reach Paris; also, that when attacked by Hitler, Russia would not last 6 weeks; that American boys would never be sent to Europe; and that England would do the job. Also, I remember how some of the experts castigated Gen. Billy Mitchell and forced his retirement for his views about air power. I remember, too, how the experts practically guaranteed the American people that there would be no more war in our lifetime; that the United Nations would solve all of our international problems; that Uncle Joe Stalin was a great world benefactor, a believer in democracy, and that we could get along with "Uncle Joe."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the distinguished and able gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A year ago before Korea, they were saying that if the Communist army moved at 4 o'clock in the morning we would be ready at 5.

Mr. DORN. Exactly. Also, I remember many of the experts stating that the Communist rumblings in China were only an agrarian revolt. So, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I frankly no longer believe everything the experts tell the American people. It is interesting to note, however, at this juncture, that a few experts told the truth, but their warnings went unheeded. Outstanding among these were Gen. Billy Mitchell and Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

I think what we need in this country today is some common, old-fashioned horse sense. That is what we need. I only represent the grass roots of America, as many of you do, and it is for them that I am pleading today.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a proclamation issued by the Governor of the State of Indiana.)

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S FREEDOM

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the thirty-third anniversary of Lithuania's freedom which was inaugurated on February 16, 1918, by a declaration of independence creating the free Republic of Lithuania.

On that date the patriotic spirit of all Lithuanians, and of peoples of Lithu-

anian descent, was at its zenith. Every freedom-loving person throughout the world, regardless of nationality, was happy to learn that the Lithuanian nation was again embarking upon what they hoped would be a long period of independence and freedom.

Lithuania is one of the old nations of the European continent. In 1795, when Russia first occupied Lithuania, a period of enslavement continued for a century and a quarter. During this time the patriotism and loyalty which is always alive in the hearts of Lithuanians, enabled its people to constantly carry on an incessant fight against the conquering tyrant who temporarily controlled the government. The opportunity came on February 16, 1918, when Lithuania unshackled the tyrant's irons and declared its independence by establishing the Lithuanian Republic. Soviet Russia at that time renounced all rights to the territory of Lithuania and recognized the nation as a free and independent state.

Free Lithuania immediately proceeded to make progress as a nation and soon was acknowledged as one of the most progressive, cultured, and industrious nations in Europe. The year 1940 again brought disappointment, sorrow, and grief to this young nation when it was occupied by Russia for the second time. The territory of Lithuania was desecrated by the Nazis and the Soviets for the next few years, when in 1944, the Russians again occupied this country and this usurpation has continued to the present day. Over a million of its people have been murdered or taken prisoner and the Soviet Union is continuing its domination and liquidation of the leaders and people of Lithuania. Deportations, arrests, and humiliations have been inflicted by the Communists, and the Lithuanian people are constantly in fear of the dictator's slave-labor camps, within and beyond its borders.

The United States and other free nations continue to recognize the free and independent nation of Lithuania and disregard the usurpers and dictators now holding the country under temporary control. It is my earnest hope that the steps taken by the United Nations when Soviet aggression and infiltration broke out in South Korea, will prove to eventually bring about the halt of the expanding dictator, Stalin, and his desire to conquer the world. The free and democratic countries in the world must stand shoulder to shoulder in this fight. America has learned through experience that aggression and slavery anywhere on the globe is a constant threat to our own liberty and the liberty of all free nations. If our free nations continue this fight, Stalin and his Soviet dictatorship will eventually be destroyed by insurrection from within or defeated by forces from without. That day will eventually come, and let us hope it will be soon.

When that day arrives, Lithuania will again take its place among the free and independent nations of the world, with the rededication of another declaration of independence, the same as they did 33 years ago tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, will mark the thirty-third anniversary of Lithuanian independence. In addition to the remarks which I delivered on the floor of the House commemorating this occasion, I wish to hereby submit a proclamation issued by Henry F. Schricker, Governor of the State of Indiana, setting out a redeclaration of Indiana citizens, hoping that Lithuania will soon be unshackled from the conqueror and resume its rightful position as a free self-governing independent nation.

President Albert G. Vinick, of East Chicago, Ind., conveys on behalf of the American Lithuanian Council, identical sentiments as set out in the following proclamation:

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis.

PROCLAMATION FOR REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA
DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1951

To All to Whom These Presents May Come,
Greeting:

Whereas the 16th day of February 1951 will mark the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas on that day the citizens of the State of Indiana who are of Lithuanian origin or descent will convene in various communities throughout the State to commemorate that occasion and to join their countrymen in the grief of a liberty-loving nation caused by the aggression and acts of injustice of the Soviet Union which took over Lithuania by force of arms, usurped the sovereign and inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people and proceeded with the extermination of them by mass deportation, imprisonment, and execution; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign occupation and oppression and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which has always been recognized by the Government of the United States of America; and

Whereas because of their unmistakable attitude toward communism struggling for world domination, the Lithuanian people, together with a million Americans of Lithuanian descent, represent an important force in the present fight of free nations against the Communist aggression; and

Whereas the residents of the State of Indiana feel deep sympathy for the gallant people of Lithuania and of other countries, presently enslaved by the Kremlin imperialism;

Now, therefore, I, Henry F. Schricker, the Governor of the State of Indiana, proclaim and designate February 16, 1951, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the State of Indiana and commend all interested groups, organizations, and individuals to appropriately observe the occasion, encouraging the Lithuanian people and wishing that they soon attain their goal of freedom and independence which they so ardently desire and cherish, and to which they have every right.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 4th day of February 1951.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor of Indiana.
LELAND L. SMITH,
Secretary of State.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a radio broadcast.)

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the day that the Americans entered World War II Winston Churchill, speaking of that day, said, "That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass." You will recall that before our men entered World War II Mr. Churchill said, and I quote: "Just give us the tools and we will finish the job." That is, Britain would carry on and win the war. Perhaps at the time he made the latter statement he actually believed it. Nevertheless, from the beginning—all the time—he was working, maneuvering, to get us into war. He succeeded. The war was won and from that day to this we have been aiding Britain. Apparently, that same thing is happening again. It is easy to agree, as do most of the American people, with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. He served here before. We all know that he is sincere, that he is patriotic, that his words come from his heart, and, moreover, are based upon the experience in the last war which entitles him to speak, not for the politicians or, if you prefer, the statesmen, not for the military experts, the generals, or the admirals, but for the men who in every war do the actual fighting.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the day which I have been looking forward to for a long, long time. A day when those in the House, who know very well, who for months have known what their people wanted, when those who are paid to come here and represent their people at long, long last spoke out, in opposition to the policy which we are following which will destroy us.

I notice the morning paper quoted Justice Douglas of the United States Supreme Court as saying that if we continued to follow our present foreign policy it would only lead to our destruction. That policy which was condemned by Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy, our former Ambassador to England. The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOHN F. KENNEDY, who after a 5-week trip in Europe made the statement which I will now read as a part of my remarks.

Said our colleague:

ISSUES IN THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

I have just returned from a 5-week trip through Europe. My purpose in making this trip grew out of my realization that the most important task that would face this country and its Government during the next few months would be the question of our relationship to Western Europe in the face of the growing threat of Soviet expansion. Upon the correct solution of that problem hangs the fate of millions of American lives—indeed, the very survival of the Nation may hinge upon it.

I spent my time in three countries—England, France, and Italy—who are the chief European members of the North Atlantic Pact, and in three countries—West Germany, Yugoslavia, and Spain—who are not members of that alliance but whose problems, whose loyalties, and whose capacities are tied into the question of the defense of Western Europe.

This issue of whether and how Western Europe can be defended, with or without American aid, depends, as everyone agrees—and as General Eisenhower only a few days ago told us—on the existence in these countries of a will to resist—a determination to build up within them singly and collectively forces that, together with such aid as we may supply them, have a reasonable chance of dealing with the threatened aggression from the east. In trying to analyze the quality of their determination, I talked with men of every level—with French and German generals, with prime ministers and cabinet members, with our ambassadors, our high commissioner in Germany, with political leaders, with Tito, and with the man in the street. The problem of European morale is, however, not merely what men say. It is also what men do. It is the capacity of their industry to devote significant portions to war purposes and still produce enough for basic and essential needs. It is their attitude toward manpower and its conscription, toward controls, toward taxes. It is their willingness to make sacrifices, to face deprivation, even to starve in defense of freedom. These are the things without which armies destined for victory cannot be built, and we must find them without ourselves, as well as within others, if we would defend ourselves and our allies and those who might become our allies.

England is, perhaps, the easiest country to analyze. There is a will to resist in England but at the same time a deep spiritual and physical weariness over the thought of war. Victory did not bring an end to the privation that England's people had endured during the war. Instead, it deepened it. Only in the last year, has England with her efforts and our aid begun to see some solution to her overshadowing dollar problem and to hope again to regain some relief from her self-imposed austerity. Now the shadow of another war, further privation, queues and more queues, face her. It would be too much to expect her people to accept such a prospect with any degree of enthusiasm. There is definite resentment against our Korean policy, partly because she thinks it a waste and diversion of valuable resources which might be devoted to Europe, but more because in bringing us into armed conflict with Red China we have both endangered her precarious position in the Orient and enhanced the possibility of all-out war with Communist Russia. To me, the people were less eager than the Government to take those preliminary steps toward the mobilization of resources and manpower that the will to resist demands.

War weariness, of course, characterizes all Europe. But the problem of France has additional complications. France knows that she will have to bear the lion's share of the manpower necessary for the creation of a Western European force and that her soil together with Germany will probably again be the battleground of any such conflict. She looks longingly to German manpower for assistance and relief from her burden, but at the same time she is unwilling to pay the price that Germany demands for rearming. Jules Moch, France's Minister of War, assured me that time would prove France was right on the issue of not rearming Germany if she insisted upon a national army, and Bidault, the former Prime Minister, echoed this thought. In addition, he expressed the general European fear that rearmament of Germany might incite Russian aggression. General Billotte, De Gaulle's military aide, was in a more aggressive mood. He feared the 5,000,000 Communists in France, their opposition and their neutralism, their power of sabotage. He and De Gaulle, too, he said, would take stern measures to destroy the party were they to come into power, as he thought they would in 6 months. He criticized the present Government and its war effort as weak. As against the 20 divisions by the beginning of

1953 that the Minister of War spoke about, Billotte would have 40 divisions in the field in 1952 and a goal of 75. The Germans, too, he thought, should be brought in even on terms of independence from western control.

France gives me a sense of division and confusion, of hesitation and doubt. Her own economy gives little sense of being attuned toward a war effort. The control of materials and the diversion of production into military channels has not really begun nor is it even being adequately planned. The tax structure, where only 15 percent of the tax receipts come from direct taxation with the balance derived from hidden taxes, seems to slant away from bringing home to the public the burdens that a defense effort must entail. Wages are low and prices high, and no adequate price control exists. A prevalent criticism of France's Government is that it is unable to get through to working people, whereas the Communists succeed in doing so.

In Germany skepticism of the rearmament effort was rife. The German generals I talked with had a more realistic and less fearsome appreciation of Russian military power. They had met the Russian armies in the field and felt they knew them and their weaknesses. At the same time, they are distrustful of France's military strength. The picture of the French rout in 1940 was still vivid in their minds. Politically, everyone insisted that a necessary condition of German rearmament was that Germany must have something to fight for. A consciousness of what happens to a battleground in modern war, such as the devastation that today is Korea, was widespread and there was little desire on the part of the Germans to risk that tragedy unless, as Kurt Schumacher, the head of the Socialist Party and the strongest of Germany's political figures, said, they were assured a West Germany free of Allied control and, secondly, a substantial screen of American troops to shield Germany while she rearmed herself. Even given these two conditions, the army that Germany would be willing to build, must be her own army, officered by her own men, not brigades incorporated into some other force, and that would take months, if not years, to develop.

I could not convince myself that we and this newly formed cause of ours were particularly popular in Germany. They had no love for communism, but in their eyes our measures had been responsible for the disgrace of the German army. We had been preaching the evils of militarism, destroyed their war industries and were still doing so, when at the same time we seem to be urging their rearmament. As a popular joke in Germany these days goes, two Americans leave on a plane from New York, one has a mission to disarm Germany, the other's mission is to urge Germany to rearm; Germany cannot do both.

The recuperation that Germany has shown, however, is extraordinary. Steel, pig iron, coal production have climbed by leaps and bounds. Her national income has almost reached that of England. Her important industrial production and her strategic position in the middle of Europe makes her incorporation into a Western European defense system imperative.

Italy, though a member of the North Atlantic alliance, finds her position precarious. She has achieved some economic recovery despite the difficult burden on her of exporting sufficient to pay for the 60 percent of her food that she must import. Her slim recovery, however, is precious to her people and there is a fear of endangering it by assuming the heavy burdens of rearmament. The peace treaty still limits Italy to an armed force of 175,000 men as well as in the production of war materials and, as such, operates as a deterrent upon her desire to rearm herself. Nevertheless, she has far to go today to fill her allowable army quota.

The nine divisions that are her present goal are not expected to serve outside the

country, and the probable area of invasion north of Trieste, the Italians are under obligation not to fortify. The widely expressed concern is that the burden of rearmament will so lower the scale of living that it will fan the Communist parties of the north, so strong in those industrial areas, to make difficult and even to stop her productive effort.

In Yugoslavia I had the opportunity of talking with Marshal Tito and his Minister of Foreign Affairs. The marshal answered the questions I put to him with directness. Czechoslovakia in 1938 made her mistake, he said, in not fighting instead of accepting the partial dismemberment forced on her at Munich. If she had resisted with arms, she would have forced England and France to come in on her side. If attacked, he said, we will fight long enough to bring the West in on our side, for a retreat by us in the north opens the road to Italy while our defeat imperils both Greece and Turkey. In case of attack, our need, he continued, will not be men but equipment—jet planes, tanks, bazookas, and heavy artillery. But America, and he paid respect to her military power, has not yet exhausted the possibilities of an amicable arrangement with Russia. Moreover, America is wasting her strength in Korea. The strategic area today as always, he concluded, is in Europe and not in Asia.

Marshal Tito seemed to have substantially weathered the Russian-Communist forces that initially opposed him in Yugoslavia. The vast majority of the Communists in Yugoslavia had been young and new members and had fought with him in the war, and he had thus succeeded in swinging their allegiance away from Moscow to him. But Yugoslavia is still a sparse and grim country, with recovery slowed by drought, the essential inefficiency of the Communist system, and the absence of Marshall funds. Its people, however, are determined to fight.

Spain again is a picture of poverty but of an army willing to fight. It lacks, however, almost everything needed for modern war. It has no real air force, few trucks, an inadequate rail system, and no antitank weapons. It needs officers conversant with our standards, our specifications, our training, and equipment to boot. The big question mark is whether Western Europe will permit it or invite it to join in the common effort of defense. In England I found distrust and distaste for Franco's help and doubt of its efficacy. In France, Bidault confided these doubts. Bringing Spain in, he said, might give the impression that our line of defense is in the Pyrenees and not on the Rhine and that would be fatal to France and her effort. But there is manpower in Spain, determined and aggressive, but a woeful lack of arms.

The firmness and quality of Europe's will to resist is not an easy subject of analysis. Besides the war-weariness of her peoples, there are the conflicting political ambitions of her nations. There is the precariousness of her hard-won economic recovery that could be overthrown by the heavy drain of rearmament, while waiting for just such an opportunity are the millions of disloyal Communists within her own borders. There is strength, great strength outside the nations of the North Atlantic Pact that still remains unharnessed and, as in the case of Yugoslavia, may be picked off singly before Western Europe can bring itself to a decision. There is Germany, about which there must be some meeting of minds. And although a line of defense for Western Europe must be far east of the Pyrenees, Spain as a base for operations, as a source of power, and because of its strategic position straddling the Mediterranean, can no longer be ignored.

The assessment of Western Europe's potentialities is a necessary condition for shaping the extent and nature of the aid we can and should supply. That program from this country's standpoint cannot be the product

of one man's thought or that of a small group. It is this Nation acting through the Congress and the Executive that must fashion that program and coordinate in with our own defense. To do that we must not be afraid of facts or seek to gloss them over by a veneer of trustful but mistaken understanding. If we are to share, we should know the nature of the venture that we are being asked to undertake, what our partners say they will do, and what they actually do or have done. Mutual aid to be successful demands both aid and mutuality. Its conditions should be stipulated at least in broad outline and, if the spirit of mutuality is to endure, those conditions should be met. At the moment, no permanent assessment of the picture can be made and even a tentative one is full of doubt and darkness. In the countries of Western Europe dwell over 200,000,000 people. It has enormous productive powers that can be of immense value to us and can be tragically harmful in the hands of Red Russia. Productive power is the basis of military power, and because of that it is discouraging to an American observer to see the limitations on Europe's rearmament effort. Neither industrial power nor manpower are military assets unless they are efficiently mobilized.

If Europe is to be saved, Europe must commence to make sacrifices sufficient for that purpose and commensurate with the danger that threatens to engulf her peoples. The plain and brutal fact today is that Europe is not making these sacrifices. Except for Yugoslavia and Spain, her military budgets in terms of their proportion of the national income are far below those we propose for ourselves. Her draft of manpower is less severe than what we suggest should govern us here. The nations of the North Atlantic Pact still lack any systems for the control of strategic materials. This effort today is clearly not enough. It is important that Western Europe be saved, but we cannot do so ourselves or pay a price that will endanger our own survival. We cannot link our whole fate to what is presently a desperate gamble. We can and will survive despite Europe, but with her it will be that much easier. But Europe must know, as we are again learning to know, that freedom is born and held only by deep sacrifice.

Our colleague speaks from experience, not from theory. He lost a brother on the eastern front. Commanding a PT boat in the South Pacific, which was blown in two by enemy fire, he, with 12 of his comrades, swam to a small island, from which they were later rescued after a message cut on a coconut was delivered by a native to the Dutch commander at New Guinea.

We know our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. We know he believes in America. We know his first thought is of the future of this country; that he sees through the eyes of the average man—not through brass-bound glasses—as one who served in the front lines—in the first wave bound for the beach.

Again he is one of us; perhaps, more accurately, one of the younger Members of the House. He is looking forward. He is looking to the future of the country.

He has told us, as I have just read to you, that neither France nor Germany—and that is easily understood—wanted us again to make their countries—France or Germany—the ring where we settled our fights.

As to whether or not this war—world war III—is our war, we have been told by reliable, accurate reporters that the

men on the streets in London, as well as some of the members of Parliament and the men on the street in Canada, have time and time again repeated the statement that this is America's war, not their war. Not England's war, not Canada's war, but the war of the United States of America. So I can understand why our colleague who has just left the well, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], having, as he stated, followed our military leaders from Normandy on through into Stassfurt, Germany—I can understand why he, being a young man, wants no more of it for his country. I give full weight to the statement he made when he said that if he could give his life to save this Republic he would do it without hesitation. He offered his life for the safety of his country once before. There is no reason to doubt that he would do it again. Our colleague is looking to the future of his country. He is looking at it as a young man. I speak from the other extreme, as an old, old man who has nothing more to lose in this world. Do you get the point? Nothing more to lose, no more than many others who have been saying for the last few years, "Let us fight them, let us lick them," when all who heard them never would be called to fight, never intended to take any chance at all with their own hide.

Of course, that does not apply to all who talk big about going to war, because some served before, but I have observed in the last 6 or 8 years that those who are most anxious to get us into war are the ones who will not be called to take any part in war.

That gets me to this letter:

NILES, MICH., February 11, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My husband is in Korea fighting for this country. He left behind two tiny babies and myself. He has been there 3 months and hasn't received even one letter, though I and the rest of the family write every single day and send one or two packages every week. Do you think it would be worth fighting for a country like this that doesn't seem to care what happens to our boys. Just because a bunch of big mouths up in Washington sit back on their thrones nice and safe where not a thing can harm them and say, "We the people want war." How do they know the people want war? Have they ever bothered to ask the people what they want? The people don't even seem to know what we're fighting for? Does anybody? The only sense we can make out of it is that Red China wants to join the UN but the UN doesn't want them because they are Communists. Isn't Russia a Communist? Yes, but she's in the UN. It just doesn't make sense. That's what we, the common people, make out of it. And our men are over there fighting for something like this. They should all tell Truman or whoever it is to go straight to hell and come home.

I suppose she means that that is what the men in Korea should do—but they would be shot if they did it. But I suppose she means that the men in Korea should come home.

Her letter reads further as follows:

All Mr. Truman, etc., can think of is raising taxes. If it was for the sake of our boys over there, we wouldn't mind being taxed to death but our boys don't even have warm enough clothes or any cigarettes. In fact they don't even get the things we send them. Some country over across the

pond that probably hasn't any intentions of ever paying back gets all our tax money to buy supplies probably to fight us with. Well, thanks for listening while I blew off a little steam. I feel much better now and hope this crisis will soon come to an end. Sincerely hoping so.

Here are a few other excerpts from letters which could be multiplied many, many times:

It is too late for us as a Nation to make any mistakes. In fact, I believe we have exceeded our quota some time back.

We would like to see the ones who are guilty of creating Korea forced to accept that responsibility. Anyone can see, if they will, that it has been one dumb thing after another that has created the present situation.

How cheerfully a few men seem able to sacrifice the lives of thousands.

I am bitterly opposed to the placing of any boy of a day under 21 years of age in combat. I cannot understand in any degree how anyone could even think of any 18-year-old draft. Of course, actual emergency could alter the case. In a studied action, such as the Korean War, it is horrible to murder off our boys as we are doing.

I would rather go than see a lad under 21 years go. It might take more of us and perhaps cost more money, but it would be cheaper for America in the end.

I have written this for your encouragement, because if there is one single thing I can do to help in the desperate situation we are in, I am ready to do it. There seems to be so little one can do, for America seems determined to seek self-destruction, in any way that appears.

You may consider that my voice is also the voice of many solid-thinking citizens.

That first letter comes from a wife with two small babies. And how many others are there who write you that way? I agree with my colleagues and with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], who told us that it is a hopeless task. It is a hopeless task—it is a task which if we keep at it as was stated yesterday by Mr. Justice Douglas, will not only destroy the freedom and liberty of our people, but will wreck our Republic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, revise and extend my remarks, and include a statement by former Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Sumner Welles, regarding Lithuania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1951, marks the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania which began its twentieth century existence as a sovereign political entity in 1918 after more than a century of foreign rule.

The resolute and persevering endeavors of the Republic of Lithuania to reestablish the country as a modern nation

were cut short in 1940 when the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics forcefully imposed a Communist administration on its small neighbor and incorporated it against its will into the Soviet Union. On June 14 of that year, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics delivered an ultimatum to Lithuania demanding the creation of a Lithuanian Government sympathetic to the Soviet Union. On the following day Soviet troops occupied Lithuania after which the country was subjected to the familiar Communist-type of election, with the result that the parliament thus formed petitioned on July 21 for incorporation into the U. S. S. R.

The attitude of the United States Government toward the incorporation of Lithuania, as well as of Estonia and Latvia, into the Soviet Union was expressed by Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles on July 23, 1940, in a statement to the press, which read as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE, THE HONORABLE SUMNER WELLES

During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independence and democratic form of government the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.

The adherence of the United States Government to the fundamental principles expressed at that time is indicated by the fact that this Government has not recognized the incorporation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of those countries in the United States.

The attitude of the United States Government toward Lithuania and the continuing active interest which this Government maintains in the welfare of the Lithuanian people are further indicated by the fact that Voice of America broadcasts in the Lithuanian language are being inaugurated on February 16, 1951. This broadcast, marking the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence in so significant a manner, will be the first of

a series of programs which will be beamed regularly to Lithuania in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the Lithuanians in this country and all over the world in trying to help Lithuania regain her freedom from communism and Russian domination. It is a hard time for the Lithuanians as they are battling against Communistic rule. We join with other freedom loving countries in extending good wishes to them in their fight for freedom and the protection of their people. The fact that the United States is greatly interested in them is shown by the Voice of America broadcasts beginning tomorrow to Lithuania in the Lithuanian language.

Good luck to the Lithuanians and may they very soon again be free.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and Mr. KLU-CZYNSKI asked and were given permission to extend their remarks on the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled "A Way Must Be Worked Out To Teach More Doctors."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Chief Justice Benjamin C. Hilliard, of the Supreme Court of Colorado.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. THORBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution commending his former colleague, Will M. Whittington.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the Lincoln Day address of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Founding the Government" by Col. Robert R. McCormick.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Fathoms and Feet, Acres and Tons: An Appraisal," notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$287.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one, with reference to the commemoration of Lithuanian inde-

pendence; and in the other, to include certain additional matter.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. RODINO) was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances, in each to include editorials.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LIND (at the request of Mr. WALTER), for an indefinite period, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

210. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend section 4164 of title 18, United States Code, relating to conditional release of Federal prisoners"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

211. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Mobile Harbor, Ala.; harbor for light-draft vessels at Fort Morgan, Baldwin County, Ala., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on February 17, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

212. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

213. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting recommendations for the enactment

of legislation amending section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

214. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting recommendations for the enactment, as part of the general criminal code, a fraud statute similar to the postal fraud statute (18 U. S. C. A., sec. 338), which would make a Federal offense the use of wire or radio communications to defraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

215. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting a copy of the financial audit for the year 1950, pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the congressional act of June 28, 1935; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers, House Report No. 119. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2678. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2679. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2680. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 2681. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of \$100 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2682. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2683. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to sub-

ence allowance to be paid to veterans pursuing apprentice or other training on the job; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2684. A bill to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 2685. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2686. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Holly River State Park to the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an incentive for employers to employ individuals liable for induction or call to active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 2688. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for certain individuals who have completed 30 years of service and attained the age of 60, minimum annuities equal to one-half of the average compensation received by them during their five highest years of earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCGUIRE:

H. R. 2689. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2690. A bill to provide for a 20-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 2691. A bill to provide for the grant of certain lands to the American Falls School District No. 381, American Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 2692. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2693. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2694. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2695. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2696. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2697. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2698. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2699. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2700. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2701. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the

Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 2702. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2703. A bill to provide for the waiver of income taxes on series E United States savings bonds and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2704. A bill to provide for the payment of premiums on savings bonds and savings certificates and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 2705. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2706. A bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 2707. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2708. A bill to encourage the protection of soil and water resources of the Nation by providing for cooperation with the States in the restoration of the surface of the lands on which strip mining operations are conducted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2709. A bill to aid in promoting employment opportunities for members of minority groups; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2710. A bill to permit the prosecution of lynching in Federal courts when the Governor or attorney general of the State concerned lacks authority to direct the prosecution in State courts, or such prosecution is impaired by his refusal to do so; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2711. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2712. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, 1861-65; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp to commemorate the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 136. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the operation of accident, health, and hospitalization insurance companies, associations, societies, and funds; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 137. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 136; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 2713. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2714. A bill for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNY:

H. R. 2715. A bill for the relief of Tullio Caporale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Kuni-gunde Beldie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Joseph Criss Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2718. A bill for the relief of Enrique M. Orpilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2719. A bill for the relief of Philip Fugh, Sarah Liu Fugh, and John Fugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 2720. A bill for the relief of Luigi Ginese Belluomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2721. A bill for the relief of Anastasio Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2722. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Shandeor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2723. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian M. Lanphear Collier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Ralph M. Madden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2725. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edna M. Cook, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2726. A bill for the relief of Daniel Lindsey Payne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2727. A bill for the relief of Archie A. Plante and Earl T. Creech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Aya Iyoda Kono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. Res. 138. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Annie L. Bourke; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

51. By Mr. MACHROWICZ: Petition of the Common Council, City of Detroit, Mich., favoring permanent rather than temporary defense housing during the present emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 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:

Our Father God, we come asking that Thou wilt refresh our souls and restore our faith as in all the bewilderment of the world's fiery strife our burdened