

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Elizabeth Georgia Mixson, XXXX
 Ada Miriam Simpson, XXXX
 Genevieve Marian Smith, XXXX
 Welma Grace Wiehe, XXXX
 Theresa Anne Wilson, XXXX
 Kathryn Grace Witter, XXXX

To be majors

Helen Mae Abramaska, XXXX
 Carrie Elizabeth Barrett, XXXX
 Irene Caroline Blochberger, XXXX
 Elizabeth Louise Breitung, XXXX
 Mary Katherine Cuppy, XXXX
 Eileen Fitzgerald, XXXX
 Kathryn Dollason Hannigan, XXXX
 Margaret Harper, XXXX
 Lucy Evelyn Jacobson, XXXX
 Georgia Elizabeth Lessley, XXXX
 Elizabeth Ella Mettelle, XXXX
 Helen Elizabeth Miller, XXXX
 Laura M. Mosley, XXXX
 Dorothy Jane Odell, XXXX
 Bertha Estelle Pollard, XXXX
 Miriam Claire Schaupp, XXXX
 Vera Fern Shaw, XXXX
 Hazel Irene Snowden, XXXX
 Dorothy A. Tessen, XXXX
 Nora M. Tobin, XXXX

To be captains

Imogene Anderson, XXXX
 Dorothy Evelyn Baltzo, XXXX
 Phyllis Doris Barsh, XXXX
 Goldie Leonia Bodson, XXXX
 Edith Josephine Bonnet, XXXX
 Nelle Bradshaw, XXXX
 Mary Norma Brandon, XXXX
 Glenna Mae Briley, XXXX
 Ann Catherine Browning, XXXX
 Edna Marie Browning, XXXX
 Roberta Broyles, XXXX
 Catharine Aline Burgmeier, XXXX
 Ruth Bustraan, XXXX
 Lacadia Mary Clarke, XXXX
 Marie Cole, XXXX
 Mildred Pierce Coleman, XXXX
 Kathleen Marie Dean, XXXX
 Glenice Hilda Dearborn, XXXX
 Helen Juanita Donnelly, XXXX
 Barbara Elizabeth Earle, XXXX
 Claudia Lou Fore, XXXX
 Willie Clay Gilliam, XXXX
 Dale Arrie Hawkins, XXXX
 Barbara Mae Hogan, XXXX
 Jane Montgomery Irving, XXXX
 Helen Claire Jansen, XXXX
 Mary Elizabeth Keefe, XXXX
 Thelma Jeannette Kiltz, XXXX
 Jean Barbara Koziol, XXXX
 Orva Ruth Kunkel, XXXX
 Grace Josephine Mach, XXXX
 Mary Magdalene Matlavage, XXXX
 Annie Belle Maynard, XXXX
 Helen Anna McCloskey, XXXX
 Margaret Lucille McDow, XXXX
 Agnes McMahon, XXXX
 Hazel Moore Meeks, XXXX
 Catherine Alice Merat, XXXX
 Pattie Gibbs Morris, XXXX
 Emma Eleanor Ozuna, XXXX
 Susie Winifred Page, XXXX
 Mary Ann Petrick, XXXX
 Martha Anne Puckett, XXXX
 Carolyn Bergeron Rahm, XXXX
 Helen Joan Rakita, XXXX
 Lucille Leona Resler, XXXX
 Elizabeth Catherine Richard, XXXX
 Bernadine Mary Rosenbaum, XXXX
 Grace Lucille Sears, XXXX
 Frieda Seidman, XXXX
 Jacqueline Blackmer Sharpe, XXXX
 Lilamae Smith, XXXX
 Ruth Elizabeth Smith, XXXX
 Virginia Louise Smith, XXXX
 Agatha Bertha Spaeth, XXXX
 Sylvia Mildred Stilven, XXXX
 Faye Rita Sullivan, XXXX
 Sara Allen Tapp, XXXX
 Bernadine Rosenbaum Temple, XXXX
 Virginia Maxine Tolar, XXXX

Bernice Eulalia Tyo, XXXX
 Johanna Helen White, XXXX
 Jeraldine York, XXXX
 Thelma Mary Zeller, XXXX

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be major

Helen Rita Sheehan, XXXX

To be captains

Mildred Jane Anderson, XXXX
 Myrtle May Bates, XXXX
 Marcel Binning, XXXX
 Anna Theresa DeNegri, XXXX
 Jean Marguerite Hawkins, XXXX
 Fuchsia Lucille Johnson, XXXX
 Mary Lipscomb, XXXX
 Althea LaRaut Luttrell, XXXX
 Leila Frances Miller, XXXX
 Inez Moffitt, XXXX
 Elizabeth Marie Nachod, XXXX
 Jennie Farnsworth Quam, XXXX
 Margaret Eileen Radke, XXXX
 Mada Steele, XXXX
 Annabel Watkins, XXXX

To be first lieutenant

Lottie Vera Blanton, XXXX

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) have been examined for physical fitness and found physically qualified for promotion. All others are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Marvin Luther Adams, XXXX
 John David Allis, XXXX
 Albert Mellen Avery, Jr., XXXX
 Richard Absalom Bailey, XXXX
 William Edward Bartholdt, XXXX
 Peter Ben Bennett, XXXX
 Bent Egon Berner, XXXX
 William Archie Blackburn, XXXX
 Karl Heinz Borcheller, XXXX
 Robert Eugene Bundy, XXXX
 Gerald Clayton Burch, XXXX
 Martin Joseph Burke, Jr., XXXX
 Sherman Kennedy Burke, XXXX
 Hugh Walton Bush, Jr., XXXX
 Raymond Lee Call, XXXX
 Herbert Truman Casey, Jr., XXXX
 X Herbert Jefferson W. Childress, Jr., XXXX
 Frank William Clayton, XXXX
 X Archie Ernest Conn, Jr., XXXX
 Roger Atkinson Corrington, XXXX
 Kenneth Lemuel Cowan, XXXX
 Floyd Greig Craft, XXXX
 William Holmer Crane, XXXX
 John Dewhurst Cunningham, XXXX
 Galen Laverne Curry, XXXX
 David Nicholas Dalton, XXXX
 Ralph Joseph Davis, XXXX
 X Leonard Pete Dileanis, XXXX
 Bernard Joseph Dolan, Jr., XXXX
 Richard Edward Donahue, XXXX
 Harry Anthony Dragotta, XXXX
 Warren Stewart Ducote, XXXX
 James Robert Duncan, XXXX
 Eugene Charles Egg, XXXX
 Robert Lee Ely, Jr., XXXX
 Rudolph Anthony Fallon, XXXX
 Walter Carl Franzen, XXXX
 Benedict Louis Freund, XXXX
 Joseph Mitchell Gay, Jr., XXXX
 Joseph Grezaffi, XXXX
 James Alexander Grimsley, Jr., XXXX
 Roy Arthur Hagen, XXXX
 John Davis Hale, Jr., XXXX
 Walter R. Harrison, Jr., XXXX
 John Edward Jessup, Jr., XXXX
 Philip Everett Karl, Jr., XXXX
 Pierre Patrick Kirby, XXXX
 John Henry Klein, Jr., XXXX
 Kenneth Mortner Kone, XXXX
 Frederick Charles Krause, XXXX
 Joseph Henry London, XXXX
 Frank Phillip Lovett, Jr., XXXX
 James Robert Lukens, XXXX
 Donald LeClear Lynes, XXXX

Merritt Porter Martin, XXXX
 Frank Alfred Merigold, XXXX
 X Walter Paul Meyer, XXXX
 Henry Donald Mitman, XXXX
 Russell Eugene Moore, XXXX
 William Lade Mundie, XXXX
 Dorward Weston Ogden, Jr., XXXX
 Tillman Clinton Oliver, XXXX
 Brian Boru O'Neill, XXXX
 Jack Grover Penick, XXXX
 Richard Arnold Perkins, Jr., XXXX
 Hobert Henry Porter, XXXX
 Jacob Ancile Randolph, Jr., XXXX
 John William Reynolds, XXXX
 X Howard Fred Robinson, XXXX
 Charles Girard Ross, XXXX
 Wadie Jerome Rountree, XXXX
 Jay Vincent Russell, Jr., XXXX
 Craig Carleton Scott, XXXX
 Dwain Lewis Scott, XXXX
 Robert Wharton Shidler, XXXX
 Milton Max Silverstein, XXXX
 Martin John Slominski, XXXX
 Charles David Smith, Jr., XXXX
 Homer Duggins Smith, Jr., XXXX
 Richard Tarlton Smock, XXXX
 Americo W. Spigarelli, XXXX
 Roderick Alexander Stamey, Jr., XXXX
 Charles Beman Stevenson, XXXX
 Virgil Mansel Stone, XXXX
 Leslie J. Swope, XXXX
 John Kefauver Tate, XXXX
 Wesley Elmer Thomas, XXXX
 Hiram Speed Tye, XXXX
 Joseph Raymond Ulatoski, XXXX
 Perry Wilson Wales, XXXX
 Fred Mallett Walker, Jr., XXXX
 Homer Lee Walker, XXXX
 Donald Christopher Wells, XXXX
 William Monitor Whitesel, XXXX
 Charles Burton Wild, Jr., XXXX
 William Vernon Young, XXXX

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 15, 1951:

POSTMASTER

Norbert F. Kalkowski to be postmaster at Ashton in the State of Nebraska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 Rev. Bruce Hays Price, D. D., LL. D., First Baptist Church, Newport News, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and merciful God, in the spirit of gratitude we praise Thee for the material blessings Thou hast showered upon this, our great Nation. But more than this, we praise Thee for the spiritual blessings we have received, and the freedom we enjoy in this "land of the free and the home of the brave."

We pray that our people may be bound together by cords of love through an understanding and an appreciation of each other. And may we always place the welfare of all our citizens above party, creed, and race. Guard our country from enemies abroad, and from those at home who would sell their birthright for a "mess of pottage." Our Heavenly Father, let Thy protecting arm be around those who defend us in our armed services. Give comfort to our homes in which the family circles have been broken during these anxious days.

Most Holy One, bless all those who are in places of leadership and authority among us. May they look to Thee in

order that they may be prepared to meet their dangerous responsibilities in these troubled times.

We long for the hour when justice, righteousness, and peace shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. Dear God, let Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

We humbly pray in the name of the Prince of Peace, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 136. An act allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer; and

H. R. 2339. An act to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a resolution (H. Res. 163) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1951, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 99, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$50,000, including expenditures for the employment of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House may I say that the subcommittee on accounts had not taken action on this matter until the full committee met on yesterday; but a majority of all of the members that have been called in reference to this matter have agreed to reporting this resolution at this time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL—1952

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1952.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD reserved all points of order on the bill.

SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS IN UPPER MIDWEST STATES WILL CAUSE LARGE GRAIN SPOILAGE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. 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. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission to force a return from the East of tens of thousands of boxcars to owner railroads in the upper Midwest States, it is estimated that approximately 50,000,000 bushels of high moisture corn, wheat, and other grains will be rendered unfit for human or livestock consumption when warmer weather comes this spring. There is a nationwide demand for livestock feed, but boxcars in sufficient number are not available to move the grain from the area. This grain must be used before spoilage occurs.

Up to 50 percent of the boxcars owned by certain upper Midwest railroads are now being used by eastern railroads. The ICC has the authority to order a return of these boxcars to move midwestern grain. Failure of the ICC to take immediate action to order a return of the boxcars to ownership railroads will be disastrous.

Grain storage elevators are filled to capacity, and in the Dakotas and Montana, wheat from last year's crop is still on the ground. All of the stored grain should be moved to provide storage space for the 1951 crop.

At least 40,000 boxcars will be needed in the next 3 weeks in the upper Midwest States to move the grain and prevent spoilage. During the past 3 weeks this area received only 7,350 boxcars.

The responsibility for a return of the boxcars to midwestern owner railroads during the present emergency is up to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I insist that the Commission must take prompt action to provide a return of these boxcars from eastern points for the moving of this grain before it spoils.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommit-

tee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may sit during today's session of the House.

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

There was no objection.

METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1498) to provide compensation for duty voluntarily performed on their days off by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "for each vacancy existing in the authorized personnel strength" and insert "For each day a vacancy exists in the personnel strength for which funds are appropriated by applicable appropriation acts current in any fiscal year."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment adopted by the Senate is purely a clarifying amendment recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia and was drawn up so that the operation would be on a day-to-day basis rather than on a weekly or monthly basis.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include matters of correspondence.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from Minnesota who has addressed the House on the boxcar shortage in the Northwest. At the present time a tremendous amount of grain is left in the State of Montana, and we do not have boxcars to take care of our harvested crop. The grain in the Montana storehouses has been paid for, with the price based on the old freight rate. Now we have the ICC allowing the railroads to increase their freight rates even though this grain which cannot be moved due to lack of boxcars was bought under the old freight rate. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that something must be done not only to forestall the imposition of these increased freight rates by the western railroads on the grain operators but also

to do something to get the boxcars on the lines to which they belong.

GENERAL MILLS, INC.,
Great Falls, Mont., March 9, 1951.
Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We would like to join in with the others in our business who are requesting that you please contact the ICC and do everything possible to convince the ICC that to allow a freight increase on such a short notice of 1, 2, or 3 days would be placing a very heavy burden upon the growers and merchandisers of grain.

As you know, we have a tremendous amount of grain left in the State of Montana; in fact, the amount left in the State is almost as great as the total crop harvested the previous year. The grain that we have in our warehouses we have paid for, basing our price on the old freight rate. If this proposed freight-rate increase should come upon us very suddenly, we will be forced to sell our grain in the terminal markets on the new rate basis, and consequently take quite a penalty on every bushel of wheat that we have on our hands. However, if there were to be a longer waiting period before this freight increase went into effect, it would give us here in Montana a chance to move some of our grain out before the increase goes into effect. I know that you are well aware of the difficulty in doing this because of the boxcar shortage, but right now that would appear to be a problem that we are going to have with us for a long time.

We will certainly appreciate any influence or pressure that you can assert on the ICC to impress upon them the importance of this delayed freight increase to the people of Montana.

Very truly yours,

GENERAL MILLS, INC.
T. R. SCULLY.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., March 14, 1951.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

We vigorously protest freight increase granted on 15 days' notice. We own million bushels wheat bought on basis of freight rates in effect before advance. Have been practically without cars for loading for the last 4 months and freight rate advance without providing adequate time for a clearance of stocks of wheat on hand owned simply means a profit for the railroads to which they are not entitled for the reason that had they furnished adequate equipment this wheat would have moved to terminals as it has in previous years. Effective date of freight increase should be extended until railroads have cleaned up previous accumulations of wheat by adequate boxcar supply.

P. R. TRIGG,
President, Montana Flour Mills Co.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., March 14, 1951.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Is it true ICC released order railroads increase freight rate 2 percent western territory and 2 percent between territories or 4 percent to us to be made effective 15 days? We, our producers, and grain trade protest this as unjust discrimination against our higher freight-rate territory. Advise collect if protest would now do any good. Boxcars still unavailable here. Suggest somebody attempt to equalize this economy so our State gets break.

GREELY ELEVATOR CO.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., March 14, 1951.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

The ICC has granted an increase in freight rates. We have 1,000,000 bushels of grain on hand bought on Minneapolis market less freight. Railroads have not furnished equipment to enable us to move this wheat at the present rate. We will now be penalized on the basis of the new rate. Urge you to do everything possible to postpone the increase on grains until the railroads furnish equipment and we are able to move this grain.

TOM MCCABE,
Montana Flour Mills Co.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., March 15, 1951.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

We vigorously protest freight increase granted on 15 days' notice. We own million bushels wheat bought on basis of freight rates in effect before advance. Have been practically without cars for loading for the last 4 months and freight rate advance without providing adequate time for a clearance of stocks of wheat on hand owned, simply means a profit for the railroads to which they are not entitled for the reason that had they furnished adequate equipment this wheat would have moved to terminals as it has in previous years. Effective date of freight increase should be extended until railroads have cleaned up previous accumulations of wheat by adequate boxcar supply.

ROBERT HUSS,
Manager, Montana Elevator Co.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA

MR. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

MR. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand three snapshots of Soviet propaganda in the Soviet sector of Berlin. These pictures were taken last November by a friend and constituent. I only wish it were possible to have them reprinted in the RECORD for all to see. I have them with me and I shall be glad to show them to Members.

Two of them are apparently two sides of a sign at the border of the eastern sector. One side, announcing that one is entering into the Soviet sector of Berlin, contains a legend which is translated into "Beginning of democratic sector of Berlin." The reverse side legend is translated into "Ending of democratic sector of Berlin."

A third snapshot is of a sign inside the Soviet sector, which says "Americans, go home."

My friend wrote me:

I do not know if you have ever visited Berlin, however, the difference between our sector and theirs is like day and night. In contrast to our area, they are not doing any reconstruction, the few stores in existence have very little merchandise, the people are poorly clothed, there are long queues for food items, very few bicycles or automobiles, etc.

A tour of their sector impresses one again of what a truly wonderful system of life and government that we, as American citizens, possess.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people running our Voice of America program are placing great emphasis on this difference between the two sectors. I hope Members will bear in mind the subtle propaganda of the Russians when we vote on appropriations for the Voice. This is an area where we cannot economize.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

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

GUARDING THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today a house concurrent resolution adopted by the Texas Legislature. It, in effect, says:

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America and the President be respectfully petitioned and requested to immediately provide an adequate system of defense, including detection devices and aircraft of the latest and most effective type and design to properly guard the State of Texas, particularly the area or belt thereof 100 miles wide along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico from the Sabine River to the Rio Grande.

I call particular attention to the 100-mile belt referred to because that belt is adjacent to the tidelands that the Federal Government has stolen from the State of Texas, and it occurs to me that since the Federal Government has stolen these tidelands from Texas, it should certainly be its obligation to defend them as requested in this resolution. And while defenses are being prepared in this respect, I might further suggest that such defenses be set up on behalf of Texas, not only against alien enemy attacks, but against further encroachments by the Federal Government.

House Concurrent Resolution 33

Whereas this Nation is engaged in the mighty task of preparing for defense against aggressor nations wearing the yoke of communism; and

Whereas the State of Texas produces, refines, and processes a large percentage of the crude petroleum, natural gas, and other minerals vital to the defense of the Western Hemisphere, and manufactures vast amounts of chemicals, synthetic rubber and its components, magnesium, aluminum, paper, and thousands of other products and eight manufactures essential to the preservation of the principles of Americanism and the American way of life; and

Whereas proper and adequate devices and equipment to guard these weapons in the arsenal of defense are of great national and international importance; and

Whereas the need for the development and maintenance of a system for detecting and repelling any threat of attack in order to insure the continued availability of these resources for use in holding aggressor nations

in check to prevent full-scale war is extremely urgent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the Senate of Texas concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America and the President be respectfully petitioned and requested to immediately provide an adequate system of defense, including detection devices and aircraft of the latest and most effective type and design to properly guard the State of Texas, particularly the area or belt thereof 100 miles wide along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico from the Sabine River to the Rio Grande; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives, each member of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of Texas, and the Secretary of Defense.

BEN RAMSEY,

President of the Senate.

REUBEN E. SENTERPITT,

Speaker of the House.

ARMED SERVICES REGULATIONS

Mr. ELLIOTT. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to what I consider to be a most inhumane practice on the part of the military, namely, that of refusing to return soldiers from overseas to attend the funeral or burial of a loved one when the military situation will justify as much.

I realize, of course, that it is not possible to return the soldier in every instance. He might be so situated that he could not be flown or otherwise transported back. But, in many, many cases, the military could return him without injury to the service.

As I understand the rules, the military will return a soldier or airman where there is a serious illness of a loved one, or where it is necessary for the soldier to return in order to help settle the estate of the deceased. But there is no consideration for the serviceman who has a death in his family if there are no complications in the estate. His trip home for the funeral is ruled out.

But, Mr. Speaker, an attempt to explain such rules to a father who wants a son to be returned for the burial of the son's mother is most difficult, and the rules themselves, under such circumstances, do not make sense to the aggrieved family.

Among others, I have in mind a specific case in which an attempt was made to secure the return of a soldier from a hospital in Tokyo where he was recuperating from a wound received in Korea. The request for his return was filed during the lifetime of the soldier's mother. The military turned the request down, I assume because it did not specifically state that the mother would soon die of the illness she then had.

A few days later, the mother did die, and the request for the son's return was

again made, and again refused by the military.

Now this particular soldier, as I have said, was recuperating from a wound he had received in Korea. The cast, binding up his foot, had been removed. He was able to walk and leave the hospital. With the transportation available between this country and Japan he might well have been brought back for his mother's funeral. This was his second war; he was an overseas veteran of World War II.

It seems, that out of the least bit of consideration for humanity, this soldier who has fought twice on the battlefield for his country, might have been allowed to come home to his family in their hour of grief.

Therefore, when it is in the realm of possibility, and this specific case clearly was, why should a soldier be deprived of the right of returning home for the funeral of someone in his immediate family.

If the proposal seems insignificant, then ponder a moment the effects of the situation on the soldier's morale, which is such a vital component of a good soldier's make-up.

I am today introducing a bill to provide for the return of these servicemen from overseas in the event of a death in their immediate family when the military situation will justify it and transportation is available.

I hope the Armed Services Committee of the House will carefully consider this bill and report it favorably to the House, and that the House will pass it.

Today, more than ever before, in this seemingly endless battle, we need the high morale of our servicemen and the good will of their families. The passage of this bill is important at this time.

NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOLS

Mr. BAILEY. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the express purpose of calling the attention of my colleagues to a report of the Advisory Council to the Federal Commissioner of Education, which is the result of a recent survey indicating that the needs of American schools for the next 10 years for facilities alone will reach the tremendous sum of \$14,000,000,000.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, of the problems facing our Nation today. My only thought and my only purpose in making this 1-minute speech this morning is to appeal to my colleagues that we do not forget the greatest asset in America, our boys and girls.

MEMBERS QUALIFYING TO VOTE IN THE HOUSE

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, yesterday when Members were qualifying to vote on H. R. 142, and whether or not they qualified would have made no difference in the result, because there were not 218 affirmative votes on the floor, I made an inquiry as to the qualifications which must be met before a Member was entitled to vote. My understanding is that the Speaker at that time said that that question had not been raised in 38 years.

I do not find anything in the Record about that this morning, neither my inquiry nor the reply of the Speaker. I want to say here and now that I, myself, raised that question more than once during the last 10 years, and I intend to raise it hereafter. One reason is that when our guests sitting in the gallery see Members that come in and qualify, sometimes they then inquire as to what the qualifications are. That situation raises a question as to whether we should continue the rule or whether it should be observed. I did not, it is not my purpose to question the veracity of any Member. But it will not add to the respect in which the House should be held if Members come in in groups, each announce he was present, listening, but did not hear his name called.

One in the gallery might get the idea too many of us were inattentive, are hard of hearing.

Yesterday after that point was raised a Member of this House came to me and asked what a Member must do or how he might qualify. I told him, and he then said that he was down in the restaurant eating, and that had he known the rule he would not have qualified, and he asked if he should not correct the Record.

The votes of those who qualified did not affect the result, for there were not at the time a constitutional majority, that is, 218 aye votes, available.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KEATING. 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. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important elements in the maintenance of high morale among Armed Forces personnel is a well regulated and fair promotion system. Officers and enlisted men alike very properly have ambition to achieve higher rank. Just as a proper system encourages high morale, likewise there is nothing which quicker destroys that morale than a feeling that promotions come about on some basis other than merit.

I am extremely anxious not to do an injustice to anyone. The promotion list which the President has sent up to Congress for confirmation may be entirely

in order. Prominent on it, however, appears the name of the President's personal physician, Brig. Gen. Wallace H. Graham, whom he seeks to make a major general.

It seems pertinent to point out that the head of the entire Medical Service of the Army, the Surgeon General, holds the rank of major general. Perhaps it is necessary to have another major general in the Medical Service, but certainly that question should be canvassed.

It is my sincere hope that the Committee on Armed Services of the other body, in scrutinizing this promotion list, will carefully examine two questions.

The first is the manner in which the list was prepared. Did the recommendation for the promotion of General Graham come from the Defense Department in the first instance, or was another list sent to the White House which omitted his name, and then the list returned to the Defense Department, after which a second one was sent up, including his name?

The second, and perhaps more important question is the connection which General Graham had with speculation in the commodity exchanges in late 1947 and 1948.

It will be remembered that in early October of 1947, the President went on the radio and explained to the American people that the reason why food prices were so high, was the speculation which was being carried on in the commodity markets. He denounced gambling on the grain exchanges and the greed of speculators.

Following that, through congressional action, the Agriculture Department was finally compelled to make public the names of these traders. On this list was included the name of General Graham, as one who had been active in trading in the commodity markets.

On January 13, 1948, he appeared before a subcommittee of the other body and submitted a long statement. He admitted the transactions, but said that a broker had made all the arrangements for him and that he did not fully comprehend the significance of what he was doing.

He gave his net profit in the transactions for the year 1947 as \$6,165.25, a tidy sum, but not a significant figure compared to the profits of some of the other administration insiders whose names appeared on the same list.

General Graham contended that he had never obtained any inside information to assist him in his transactions. He said that when the President made his radio speech, he immediately got out of wheat. It developed, however, that he at once went into cotton and lard. His explanation was that he thought the President was only talking about wheat and was only condemning speculation in that particular commodity. He seemed not to realize that cotton and lard and other products were also "commodities."

The President's reaction to General Graham's explanation was typical. Despite his earlier castigation of those who trafficked in commodities, he said that General Graham had not violated any

law. Probably that is true. This is the same reaction which the President voiced when recent revelations were made regarding the RFC transactions of White House cronies.

The professional qualifications of General Graham may be of the highest. I am completely without knowledge regarding that subject. There might be a question raised whether anyone who is designated to hold the rank of major general in any branch of the service ought to know what a commodity is.

Certainly it seems in order to request that the Armed Services Committee of the other body conduct a proper hearing, at which this aspirant for another star be invited to appear to justify this promotion. Other officers and enlisted men in the armed services on duty both in this country and overseas will expect no less.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 4 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to have his special order of today follow that of the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. GAMBLE. 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. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill providing for the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by June 30, 1951, and the winding up of its affairs. I hope action may be taken promptly as I, like many others, believe it has outlived its usefulness.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the fact that Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, was expected to release a directive tomorrow, Friday, March 16, which, in my opinion, would be most devastating to the morale of members of our Foreign Service. My remarks on the subject may be found on page 2436 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14.

In carefully reading the debates in the House and Senate, and particularly the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on H. R. 3559, Eighty-first session, which eventually became Public Law 73, I do not believe in fairness to the testimony that Dean Acheson has a right to bring about an amalgamation of the State Department and the Foreign Service without first submitting the plan to the Congress.

The men in the State Department who have been pushing this amalgamation very strenuously have taken the attitude that Public Law 73 gives them the authority to put this integration into effect without submitting it to the Congress. The provision under which they proposed to bypass the Congress is what I termed in my remarks of yesterday as a "sneaker."

Let me read you the testimony which Mr. John Peurifoy gave before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 27, 1949 in connection with H. R. 3559, which became Public Law 73:

Mrs. DOUGLAS. You have two separate people who work overseas; one under civil service and one—

Mr. PEURIFOY. No. Almost all overseas are Foreign Service. In Washington you have two sets.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I see. So the amalgamation would take place here?

Mr. PEURIFOY. That is correct. On point 2, which Mr. Vorys talked about—the so-called amalgamation of the two into one service—but I am not sure that is the right thing to do. I do not propose to move into this by a stroke of a pen. We propose to establish a small group of people as a committee to take a look at it. I am very much interested in seeing that the career principle is protected.

If we blanket in the State Department employees, I want to know what employees are going to go into the Foreign Affairs Service, and how would they get in? Those are questions that have to be answered. I do not have the answers. I think this is a process that will take 3 or 4 or 5 years.

There is another factor. I think the other agencies in Washington, and the Civil Service Commission, probably would object very much to establishing the State Department as a separate agency operating under a special legislation which may give its employees higher salaries or allowances when they serve abroad. I am not sure at all it is the right thing to do, but the Hoover Commission did make that recommendation. This is a long-range matter, this so-called amalgamation, and it cannot be done abruptly, overnight.

It was not brought out yesterday as the Secretary did not get to mention this, but I can tell you, sir, the Secretary agrees with every word I just said. This cannot be done until it has been thoroughly explored, and it is a long-range thing.

Mr. MERROW. Would this piece of legislation carry the power to effect that?

Mr. PEURIFOY. No, sir. I would have to come to Congress and ask for authorization to do that."

Mr. Speaker, that is the testimony of Mr. John E. Peurifoy, who was then Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, and a man who is probably more responsible than anyone else for drawing the chart to bring about the amalgamation—or perhaps I should more properly say—the emasculation of the Foreign Service.

Yesterday, and again today, I attempted to obtain permission to appear before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] is chairman, and the subcommittee of the Department of State, of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] is chairman, in order to apprise them of what has been taking place. Unfortunately, both of these men were out of town. Confronted with the situation of not being able to obtain a hearing on such short notice, I sent the following telegram to Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and to Col. Carlisle Humelsine, Deputy Under Secretary of State:

Respectfully request you withhold issuance of amalgamation State Department and Foreign Service personnel directive proposed for release March 16 until congressional committees have opportunity to study effects. Please advise.

I was very gratified to receive a telegram from Colonel Humelsine which I interpret to mean that the directive to bring about the so-called amalgamation will be withheld until Congress can pass on the merits of the program. Colonel Humelsine's message as follows:

In reply to your telegrams to Secretary and me. As I advised you in previous conversation, Department does not and never did have any intention of releasing any material on personnel subject until consultation held with appropriate committees of House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as all plans on reorganization are submitted to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, it is my interpretation and understanding that this plan of reorganization of the State Department and our Foreign Service will be submitted to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in both Houses of Congress. I shall ask the chairman of these committees to permit me to testify at the hearings as a witness.

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

AIR FORCE CADETS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, unless the Air Force lowers its requirements of 2 years of college for an air cadet, we are going to create a caste system in the Armed Forces which will be a serious thing as it affects our national defense. We will also jeopardize the building up of the greatest Air Force the world has ever seen.

During World War II I fought to see that the bars were let down so that thousands of young men who did not have the money to go to college would be able to become air cadets and fighter pilots. There is no reason why, if a young man possess alertness, intelligence, and vigilance and a quick, keen eye that he cannot become an Air Force cadet. There is no reason in the world why the

bars should be up so that the great majority of young men who aspire to be Air Force pilots cannot qualify. I think the bars should be let down immediately.

Why deprive any young American of realizing his fondest dream, that of being a fighter pilot and serving his country in the way he most prefers, just because he does not have a higher education out of books?

Therefore, I insist upon immediate consideration of H. R. 1777, directing the Secretary of Defense to accept candidates for training as aviation cadets regardless of whether or not they possess college credits.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. HARVEY. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months we have been receiving many discouraging reports from the Korean war. I have a statement here which is part of a letter I received from a young man who is a trans-Pacific flier, and as such is in very close touch with the situation in the Far East. He is a very trusted friend of mine, and for that reason I am not going to give his name. He says:

Looks as if all my trips for a while will be to the Far East. Went as far as Singapore this last trip. Things look better in Asia now than they have in the past 2 years. The Chinese are very much surprised that a small handful of poorly trained Americans have kicked the life out of the best field army that China had.

TAFT SAYS IRELAND PROFITING BY THE AMERICAN AID PROGRAM

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 want to read a bulletin which came over the wire just a few minutes ago. I have no unfavorable comment about it, but with the approach of St. Patrick's Day I thought the Members might be interested. It states:

NEW YORK.—William H. Taft, of Ohio, flew home today from Ireland, where he is an ECA staff member and said the American aid program is boosting the Irish standard of living. Taft arrived at LaGuardia Airport en route to Chicago where he will make a St. Patrick's Day speech before the Irish Fellowship Club.

I thought you also might like to know that he is the son of a very prominent Ohio member of the other branch of Congress.

DEFENSE HOUSING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the two most vital defense projects under way in the United States today are located at Savannah River, S. C., and Paducah, Ky. There, with maximum speed and the highest sense of urgency, we are constructing new atomic energy facilities necessary to prevent war and essential to the preservation of the United States and the free world. The bill which the House declined to act on yesterday, the Defense Housing Act, Mr. Speaker, bears directly upon these two atomic projects. What action we eventually take in the House can determine whether the Savannah River and Paducah construction effort will go forward at top speed or whether it will lag behind and falter to the peril of the United States.

It will come as no surprise to the Members of this House to hear me say that the Soviet Union now possesses some atomic bombs. The Soviet Union possesses atomic reactors. The Soviet Union has plunged into the atomic energy business with great resources and hard-driving determination. They mean to challenge our lead in the atomic energy field. Nothing must be permitted to prevent us from keeping that lead and increasing it.

This summer, 6,000 construction workers will be needed at Savannah River, and a year and a half later this number will increase to 36,000. At Paducah, Ky., the need for construction workers is even more immediate—10,000 by the summer of this year. You cannot build atomic plants without many thousands of construction personnel, and you cannot secure the construction personnel unless they are housed—unless they have a place to live. It is here that the bill we should have considered yesterday impacts so directly and heavily upon national defense.

Let me urge the membership of the House to set aside partisan politics and concentrate on our national security. I hope the House will promptly reconsider its unfortunate action of yesterday.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 19

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to ask the distinguished majority leader as to the program for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday, the Consent Calendar will be called, and I understand there are 18 bills on the Consent Calendar.

If a rule is reported out making in order the 90-day extension of the Rent Control Act that also will be called up on Monday. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and I have agreed that if there should be a roll call it will go over until Tuesday. This, of course, could only be done by unanimous consent, but I imagine nobody will object; nobody ever has; but should there be a

roll call on it, although I know of no desire on the part of anyone to have a roll call, it will go over until Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is simply a 90-day extension of the act in order that the Congress may have a chance to study its renewal.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. If it does not come up on Monday then it will come up some day next week.

Tuesday: The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday. I understand there are 46 bills on the Private Calendar.

The Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill will come up on Tuesday.

Wednesday and Thursday are undetermined.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I think it is in order to make a statement with reference to the draft bill, as all Members are deeply concerned about it and wish to know when it will be called up. The Armed Services Committee will finish consideration of that bill this afternoon. I will promptly report it to the House and ask for a rule. I am hoping the rule may be granted before we take the Easter recess and that the bill will be made in order for consideration on April 3. So I want to assure the membership that there will be no effort on the part of the Armed Services Committee to present the bill before April 3 for general debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman inform the House as to what his request will be for general debate under the rule?

Mr. VINSON. I will consult with the minority members of the committee. Running through my own mind I would say at least 3 days' general debate. If that is not enough we will ask for a longer time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That would mean we could not finish general debate until Friday after we come back and, therefore, we would start to read the bill for amendment the following week?

Mr. VINSON. I think the sensible thing to do is to try to adopt the rule before the Easter recess, then have it understood that the rule will become effective on April 3 with the chairman calling the bill up.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means try to have the Rules Committee report out a rule, not for the House to adopt the rule?

Mr. VINSON. I am hoping that the House can adopt the rule before the Easter recess.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think that might be a little difficult, not that there would be any opposition to the consideration of the rule. I do believe it would be of great benefit if we did not have that rule come up next week.

Mr. VINSON. I think the membership can understand that it will not be called up for debate until after the recess.

Mr. McCORMACK. In line with this colloquy which is very informative to the House, I may say that of course the bill

will not come up until after the Easter recess, and that includes also the rule. In other words, when the rule comes up for consideration there will be continuity of debate if the rule is adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not think any great length of time will be consumed in adopting the rule when we come back because, after all, we know we have to deal with the subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. Wednesday and Thursday of next week is undetermined. I have no knowledge of what length of time will be agreed upon for general debate for the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill; but assuming that either Wednesday or Thursday or both of those days are open I know of no legislation that will come up on those days. Certainly I would not permit anything that might be of a controversial nature to come up. It is my opinion that after disposition by the House of the rent control extension bill and the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill there will be no other legislation programed and none considered except that which may be screened by the leadership to come up by the unanimous-consent procedure. In other words, there will be no further program.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman and I sincerely hope he will have a very nice celebration in his district.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. March 17, as we all know, is a very important day. It is St. Patrick's birthday, a saint who has wielded the greatest influence possible for countless of centuries and will for countless of centuries on the mind and spirit of human beings. The spiritual influence that we all know which came from him is tremendous, it is constructive, and it is of great value, not only to the generations of the past but to the present generation and to future generations.

In connection with the celebration, it is the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the evacuation of Boston by the British. Dorchester Heights, which is located in my district, was fortified by Washington and the Continental Army. While that was a bloodless battle, it was one of the most important events of the Revolutionary War because it was the first time that the Continental forces up to that time had obtained a victory over the British. It electrified the people of the then 13 Colonies. It increased and strengthened their morale for resistance and is considered by historians as one of the most important events that happened not only in the history of our own country, but in the history of all time.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman coming from the South, and Dorchester Heights being located in South Boston, I know he will make a contribution that will occupy a fitting place in the Record.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. One incident that attracted the youths' attention to the 17th of March, when I was a boy, was when Bob Fitzsimmons knocked out Jim Corbett, and became the world's champion boxer on March 17, 1897.

Mr. McCORMACK. With all due respect to the gentleman from Mississippi, he overlooks other important events that happened on that date. Three other important events took place: One, the birth of St. Patrick; second, the evacuation of Boston by the British; and, third, the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt were married years ago on that date.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report in connection with House Joint Resolution 196, extension of rent control.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in behalf of the housewives in my district and all the other housewives in the country. Today is income-tax day—a day that tries women's souls. We are not complaining about paying our proper share of the cost of government. We are proud to be citizens of the United States and to carry out the responsibilities that go with citizenship.

But we are also wives and mothers, and we have obligations to our families. We must feed and clothe our children. We must see that they receive medical attention and good educations. We must perform the scores of other duties that are part of managing a household.

But today, Mr. Speaker, the women of America are finding it more and more difficult to live up to their responsibilities to their families. They are being squeezed between inflation on one side and taxes on the other. They are suffering and their children are suffering. Many of the every-day necessities of life have been priced beyond the reach of the average housewife. Yes, I mean that many mothers are unable to buy the milk, the meat, the fresh vegetables, and many other foods their children need. That is because today's dollar is a 50-cent dollar. It is half money and half water. And everybody knows what water will buy—plenty of nothing.

I often think back to the days following World War I, when a housewife knew that a dollar was worth a dollar. In those days a housewife could almost fill her larder with a \$5 bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I will be most happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. If I could have some help to lift this basket on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I have a particular and peculiar personal interest in the 1919 basket, so heavy that one woman could not carry it home, with what a \$5 bill could buy. My interest is personal and compelling now as then, because 1919 was the day and the date on which I started housekeeping. Had we not been able to buy that much for \$5 there would have been no new home and no house-keeping.

May I just point out briefly what that basket contains: A can of beans, a can of peas, 5 pounds of flour, a pound of butter, a pound of prunes, a dozen eggs, a pound of coffee, a loaf of bread, 2 quarts of milk, a can of corn, 5 pounds of potatoes, 2 pounds of sugar, and 3 pounds of steak.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois for this splendid contribution.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am most happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana, who will also need a great deal of help to lift her basket.

Mrs. HARDEN. Would the gentlewoman care to see what a \$5 bill would buy 10 years later, in 1929?

Mrs. BOLTON. Indeed; yes.

Mrs. HARDEN. My basket contains all of the items mentioned by the gentlewoman from Illinois, and also includes a pound of bacon and a box of gumdrops. I shudder to think what this basket of food would cost today.

Mrs. BOLTON. I do, indeed, thank the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Ohio yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. Indeed; yes. I yield with great pleasure to the gentlewoman from Michigan, who is a good, strong, husky gal who can lift her basket, the biggest one of the lot.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, by a strange coincidence I, too, have brought a basket to the floor of the House. It shows what the housewife could have bought in 1939 for \$5. It contains all of the items that have heretofore been mentioned plus three other items: A head of lettuce, a pound of green string beans, and a jar of peanut butter. It is quite an array of groceries, is it not? It makes my mouth water. I am just as hungry as I can be right this minute.

Mrs. BOLTON. We thank the gentlewoman very much for this reminder of happier days.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. With sorrow I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have absolutely no trouble in carrying my basket. This is what \$5 in 1951 will purchase: I have here one dozen eggs, 3 pounds of steak—I still have that—2 quarts of milk, and 1 pound of butter. If these prices go on, this pound of butter will soon be a pound

of oleomargarine, and I think some of my colleagues know how I feel on that.

Today is income-tax day, a day that the housewives of America observe by carrying home these half-empty market baskets.

We are not asking for anything extraordinary. We do not expect platinum minks or vacations in Miami, but we would like to be able to feed our families properly and wholesomely, as we did in these days that we have gone back to so briefly, and that we do look back to with a certain amount of nostalgia.

Last October personal income taxes went up on an average of 13 percent. That was a pay cut. But the whole answer of this administration to all these higher prices and higher taxes is a pay cut and yet another pay cut.

In the past year alone we had many disguised pay cuts besides the one I have just mentioned, and then we are told that we have price control, yet the cost of living has gone up 8 percent since the start of the Korean war. We are supposed again, I say, to have price control, yet Mr. DiSalle, the so-called Price Stabilizer, says prices will go up another 5 percent by early summer.

One of my colleagues who was sitting beside us when we brought in these baskets said, "You had better hurry with this program or prices will be up so far that you will have to change that 1951 basket again;" and I think that is very true.

The real tragedy is that the condition I have described has been brought on largely by the policies of the Truman administration. This administration has deliberately sponsored inflation. It has refused to cut nonessential spending. It has encouraged a huge expansion in the volume of credit in the banking system. This administration has been feeding the fires of inflation while it has been going through the motions of treating the symptoms through so-called price control.

We, the women of America, want our market basket to look like the one of 1929 or 1939. Then we will go back to a situation where we will be able to take care of our families as they have a right to be taken care of, and not have this ridiculously great expense for this small amount of high protein food.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from New York and her four colleagues of the fair sex, of whom we are most proud, for offering this very graphic illustration of what has been happening to the value of the dollar. In my opinion, the preservation of the value of the dollar is one of the most important considerations before the country at this time. Certainly these illustrations should indicate to anyone just what is happening to us. It shows what is happening to the earnings and savings of all the people who have bought life insurance and who have paid on social security and who have bought bonds, both Government bonds and other bonds. It shows what is hap-

pening to people whose investments and savings are represented in dollar value. Certainly this presentation should indicate to all of us the absolute necessity of doing everything we can to keep the cost of Government within reasonable bounds.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the lady yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In response to the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] I call attention to the fact that nothing is being done to check the inflation of the currency. That is what is bringing about this advance in prices. On January 1, 1919, we had \$5,951,368,126 in circulation. I am quoting the figures given in the official records of the Treasury Department. Today we have—or did have on January 31, 1951—\$27,480,000,000 in circulation, of which \$22,811,000,000 were Federal Reserve notes. On January 1, 1919, we had only \$2,630,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes out. There is where inflation is taking place, or, I should say, being promoted. The Federal Reserve banks have inflated the amount of Federal Reserve notes in circulation by about \$20,000,000,000 since January 1, 1919.

It is time the Committee on Banking and Currency got busy and brought in a bill to stabilize the currency within certain limits. If that is not done, this country will probably be wrecked sooner or later, as a result.

Prices in a free economy are governed by two things: The volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation.

Fixing prices, without stabilizing the currency, will merely drive goods into the black market and probably bring on a financial catastrophe from which this country might never recover.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I commend the gentlewoman and her colleagues for the very fine demonstration that they have made. I would suggest that the masculine Members of the House give a demonstration of what is happening to the price of clothing.

Mr. RANKIN. The men pay the bills, I can assure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentlewoman, and I want to thank her also for letting us take this time ahead of her, because I am afraid if we had waited much longer some of this New Deal milk might have curdled.

Mr. RANKIN. May I also congratulate you ladies for bringing this so forcibly before the Congress because it turns the spotlight on the real trouble, and that is the inflation of the currency through the Federal Reserve System.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Again I thank the gentleman, he has given us the real reason why our \$5 only purchases this little basket of groceries, which I am so easily swinging around on my arm.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. RHODES. In 1932, we can all recall that \$5 would have purchased a big basketful of groceries, but then it was very difficult for the people to get the \$5.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That is also true, but may I point out, too, that under the OPA \$5 would purchase a big basketful of groceries, but you could not purchase them. You see there are two sides to every question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EVACUATION DAY AT BOSTON

Mr. PHILBIN. 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. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, next Saturday afternoon in South Boston there will be enough Irishmen gathered, of sterling American patriotism and persuasion, to fight and settle almost any war. The occasion will be festive, but the spirit animating the gathering will be sincere and serious. Make no doubt that these good Americans of Irish extraction will have a very fine purpose in mind.

On March 17 the good Americans of Boston will celebrate a dual holiday—the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the date the British evacuated Boston and the birthday of the great immortal Irish patriot and spiritual leader, St. Patrick. It will be recognized, therefore, that the day will be given to patriotic and religious observances even as men, women, and children of all ages and all races join with their Irish brethren in hailing the great St. Patrick and commemorating the departure of the British from Boston. I venture to state that there is no place in the whole world where noteworthy American patriotism and honest religious fervor combine more sincerely and lustily to acknowledge and celebrate truly significant historic events.

The occasion affords us another opportunity to appraise our present circumstances in the world. The patriots who drove the British from Boston were believers in individual freedom just as followers of St. Patrick are champions of the independence and dignity of man. Neither one of these groups ever compromised the ideals of democracy nor were they ever willing to submit to the lash of dictatorship and the tyranny of the totalitarian way of life. These people were not willing to put the burden of defending the Nation upon 18-year-old youths and they were unalteringly opposed to regimenting permanently their educational, family, and social institutions in order to provide for the common defense.

We are told that things have changed. But human nature has not changed and the universal concept of freedom has not changed. The urgency of protecting our free way of life, they did so much to shape, has not changed. We can profit greatly by their example of devo-

tion to fundamental truths. If we recapture the rectitude, the zeal, the stern devotion of the New England Yankee to genuine democratic principles, if we can embrace the passionate loyalty of Irishmen of all generations to the tenets of human liberty, the integrity and safety of the Nation will be guaranteed.

The Nation will act wisely in this crisis, if it will but turn for guidance and direction to the ideals of St. Patrick and the principles of the early American founders.

March 17 is in truth a great day for the Irish. It symbolizes the triumphs of that great race over the forces of barbarism and ignorance and retrogression. It commemorates the name of an unselfish man, an unsurpassed spiritual leader, who led a valiant people into the ways of Christianity, progress, and peace. It marks a striking victory over sordid materialism, the exaltation of the human spirit, and the liberation of the human soul from the bondage of godlessness.

Take them together, the ideals of St. Patrick and the principles of the early patriots, follow them inflexibly in this crisis, cling to them tenaciously, in the time to come, hold fast to the truths they illustrate, and we need have no fear of Russia, totalitarianism, regimentation, or dictatorship. If we but exert the will to embrace and follow these precepts without equivocation and without compromise, America will overcome all obstacles, all threats to its freedom, and all schemes against its security.

Let us rejoice in the great deliverer, St. Patrick, whose birthday is synonymous with one of the stirring events that led to American independence. If we, of this generation, catch his spirit and the spirit of the early American patriots, we will be inspired and strengthened to preserve our great heritage of freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE NEW AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in taking this time today to address you on American foreign policy, I am completely sensitive of the fact I do not come before you as one who professes to know all of the answers to the important issues on which so much now depends. The many years I have served my country, however, together with the years of my continuous service in Congress, during the whole of which I have been particularly interested in our relations with the rest of the world, appears to warrant this expression of my views. As most of you know, I served on the Foreign Affairs Committee for many years.

A number of the great issues of American foreign policy have occurred during the period of my association with Congress. Many of the great decisions have been made during this time. On different occasions I have seen the United States of America standing at the crossroads, trying to determine the right way to go. Every time we have faced a great decision of foreign policy, involving the

future existence of our country, many urged a certain path as the only way. Others just as forcefully said that way is wrong but this is the right road. Still others, urged the Nation to follow their advice and their recommendations. All were sincere, wise, and loyal statesmen. In the end and as we now look back on those great decisions, it appears that America chose the right way. Certainly this is evidence of the integrity, wisdom, and courage of the Members of Congress in times past, who had the responsibility of charting the right course for the Nation. Just as in those fateful times, I believe this Congress will reach the right conclusions regarding issues of the moment, and will guide the destiny of our country so well, that in the sunshine of future peace, the Members who will be here then, as well as the people they represent, will approve our decisions and respect our courage and statesmanship.

America was enjoying peace and prosperity in the beautiful spring of 1913 when my husband and I came to Washington for the opening session of the Sixty-third Congress. The Taft administration was just closing and the Wilson administration just beginning. No Member of the present United States Senate was a Member of the Senate then, and only five Members of the House, in this Eighty-second Congress, were Members at that time. They are in the order of seniority, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, our distinguished Speaker who has served in this high office longer than any other American, the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the distinguished dean of the delegation from the State of Michigan. Washington was a beautiful city in that early spring. No world wars had taken place. There were no temporary war buildings then interfering with the wide vistas. Once in a while, Members then had a little time for horse-back riding or a game of golf. It was both thrilling and a high honor to be in Congress. I think it still is.

Peaceful America, in a peaceful world was not to be the way of destiny for long, however. One quiet dawn in early July of 1914, a little over a year later, the German Kaiser, in his high pointed steel helmet, astride his spirited horse rode across the Belgium frontier. When the German Army invaded Belgium that eventful day, little did anyone in the peaceful cities, villages, and farms of America comprehend the full meaning and realize this was the beginning of a challenge to their freedom which they would have to gallantly meet 3 years later. Little did the husky young men of America, sense that in less than 3 years they would be storming the trenches of that German Army in far off France and Belgium. As one New England Yankee said: "Why we don't need to worry about that war, it's t'other side of Portland."

In 1917, the war came to America. Our country had been very patient with Germany and tried every way to avoid being involved, just as the peace-hopeful America of today is very patient with

Communist Russia. In this connection I respectfully request you to give very close attention to the following language:

Mr. Chairman, whatever the verdict of history may be, I am satisfied that it will acquit this Government and the American people of the charge that they acted with rashness or precipitation. As I review in my own mind the dastardly career of this enemy (Germany), in its relation with the United States, I confess myself amazed at the moderation and forbearance of the United States. I doubt if there ever has been in the history of the world a case where so much patience has been exhibited by one nation toward another.

The United States today is doing the inevitable thing. It is taking up arms against the pirate and the desperado of nations which is running amuck. It is because we are lovers of peace that we are forced to take this step. Only thus can an enduring peace be achieved. Mr. Chairman, in entering upon this conflict we are fighting the battle of democracy against autocracy, of liberty against despotism, of freedom against enslavement, of civilization against barbarism.

These words were spoken in the well of this House on April 5, 1917, by my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable John Jacob Rogers. They were carefully considered then and are as applicable to the present crisis as they were on that historic day 34 years ago. If he were here, he would have said them again. I am proud I have the honor to say them for him.

We have been patient with Communist Russia. We are still willing to take any honorable step that will evolve a lasting peace. We here in America have closed no doors. We have not constructed an iron curtain. But the rulers in the Kremlin have. They have placed so many obstacles in the path of peace that we are reaching a point of fatigue in hurdling over them. The hurdle race is now over.

Then came Hitler and his Nazi conquest of Western Europe. Very few Americans doubted the challenge to their freedom when Hitler marched into Austria and Poland. Many hoped America would not be brought in and urged against our being involved, but Pearl Harbor ended those hopes. America again chose the right road and met the challenge and ground to defeat those aggressors who were determined to end the free way of life in the world.

Again I shall appreciate your attention to the following language:

I love America, and I want America and all that America stands for to prevail. To prevail we must strive against war and its total devastation. To prevail we must build our defenses so strong that we are not dependent on any other country. To prevail we must have faith and confidence in our own defenses and in our own Government. To prevail we must value freedom more than things mortal. To prevail we must keep the Stars and Stripes at the top of the mast. To prevail we must march forward as a Nation, united and unafraid.

The words you have just listened to are mine. I said them in a speech on the floor of this House in the early afternoon of March 11, 1941. Hitler then was at the peak of his march to conquer the free world, just as Stalin is at his peak in

his attempt to conquer and communize the world today. These words of mine were true then. They are just as true this very afternoon.

KOREA

There is not anything to be gained at this time by any mention of the blunders of foreign policy which preceded the invasion of Korea last June. They are well known. I have outlined them on other occasions. I do believe the situation which led to the Communist invasion of South Korea could have been prevented. Korea is a tragedy. In smoldering ruins today, Korea represents a bloody monument to blunder and stupidity.

We are now committed in this no-man's land to the important job of securing a satisfactory conclusion. Every effort must be made to bring this about. The United Nations must face realities. It is impossible to win any conflict in these times, unless the enemy's sources of supplies are destroyed. To deny this military axiom or necessity, to the forces of the United Nations is the same as ordering them to march into the valley of death. No army and no soldier should be forced to fight with their hands tied behind their back. I fully comprehend there are important matters to consider in this problem. The fact is, however, thousands of lives hinge on this decision. The lives of thousands of American soldiers and marines must be given every possible protection. Their lives are not expendable. Their lives are just as valuable as yours and mine. Already the refusal to permit the bombing and destroying of the supply bases of the enemy has cost heavily in American casualties. This situation cannot continue. If it is the judgment of General MacArthur and General Ridgway that these bases must be destroyed, then they should receive orders to proceed from the United Nations. This is primarily a military decision, not a political one. Battles must not be lost and victories dissipated by academic political arguments, and the luxury of international politics, 7,000 miles away. If this power is not to be given by the United Nations, then they are fully and completely responsible to find a better solution.

American soldiers and marines and sailors and airmen have fought heroically and valiantly in Korea. I have seen many of these men in the military hospitals. I have talked with them and intend to fight with all my energy, to see that they are cared for adequately and properly. I respect them and respect their families for their spirit and determination. Many of the men in these hospitals today are there because of a failure of a close coordination of our foreign policy under the Department of State with our military policy under the Department of Defense.

In our military hospitals are many men, the victims, not of enemy gunfire but of subzero freezing weather. Twenty-five and thirty degrees below zero is severely cold weather, however, this winter is not the first in Korea for these subfreezing temperatures. These winters are common in Korea. These temperatures occur every year. The re-

sponsible officers in the Pentagon did not know this, however, for there was no subzero clothing and equipment for our men in Korea, except that which was collected together at the last minute and sent over. Some of this was usable and some was not, however at best it was inadequate and insufficient. As a result many of our men were frozen. Because of this failure to have the proper clothing for this severe freezing temperature, they are losing their hands and feet, their arms and legs. Some of them are quadruple amputees. What a horrible tragedy—a tragedy which need not have occurred.

Those officers responsible in the Pentagon had 5 months to prepare for this severe winter after the Communist invasion of Korea last June. They failed. Because they failed, hundreds and hundreds of men must finish out their lives greatly handicapped. There are hundreds and hundreds who did not survive the bitter cold. Their lives already are finished. In my long experience, extending through World Wars I and II, I have never known a more tragic malfeasance of duty. The responsible officers certainly should be relieved and certainly they have conclusively shown they are not qualified for any military promotions to higher rank and more responsible duties. These perilous times require alert, quick-thinking, quick-acting officers, not any suffering from the mental and physical sluggishness caused by Pentagon fever.

At this time, I believe there should be a careful reexamination of the objective of the United Nations in regard to Korea. It should be determined whether this objective is of sufficient merit and necessity to require the men, equipment, and man-hours necessary for its successful accomplishment. Strong conclusions should be resolved to support this decision. Men are beginning to question why they are ordered to risk their lives in Korea. Some of them were told last week by General Ridgway, that there was no geographical objective, but that the purpose of his offensive was to kill the most Communists at the least cost. Is it possible that any intelligent American soldier would have received any satisfaction or inspiration from this statement of objective? It seems to me, the responsible officials in the United Nations should define the objective in Korea, and those charged with conducting military operations should keep their eyes on the targets. Korea is no little political game for the men involved. It is total war for them. It is serious business. Is this business necessary? If it is, then it should be successfully concluded as quickly as possible by bringing to bear all of the might and power necessary to destroy the enemy.

USE OF CHINESE NATIONALIST TROOPS TO SUPPORT OPERATIONS IN KOREA

Since the invasion of South Korea last June by the Communist forces of North Korea many prominent officials in the United States and member countries of the United Nations have recommended the employment of the Chinese Nationalist armies, now stationed on the island of Formosa, to support the operations of

the troops of the United Nations engaged in the Korean campaign. After the Chinese Communist armies of Mao Tse-tung came to the support of the North Korean Communists, unofficially as volunteers, many statesmen strongly urged the use of the Chinese Nationalist forces. As a result of this contention many citizens of the United States, particularly mothers and fathers of sons either in Korea or eligible to go, were in agreement. It is very understandable for all of us to be in favor of a course of action which might relieve the strain, tension, and responsibility of our own American troops. Many of us held the view that some member countries of the United Nations did not contribute their full share. Since Nationalist China was a member of the United Nations, it appeared reasonable and just to use the Chinese Nationalist troops under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek. This was particularly a widely held conclusion after the Chinese Communists came into the war in Korea. The employment of the Nationalist troops was even more strongly urged after the United Nations officially named Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

Unfortunately the use of the Chinese Nationalist armies involved some very complicated problems. They were both military and political. As usual there were and still are emphatic differences of opinion regarding the correct solution on the part of those officials having the responsibility of making the decisions. No specific decision actually ever has been officially announced together with the analysis and reasons to back it up by any responsible representative or official of the United Nations or any of the member countries, including the United States. As a result the American people are confused and cannot comprehend this situation. I believe the mothers and fathers of our country are entitled to some explanation. I shall state my views in accord with the best information I can obtain.

THE MILITARY PROBLEM

If the Nationalist armies were to be employed there is a question as to whether they should be used on the mainland of China in establishing a second front or used in Korea in direct association with the forces of the United Nations. If a second front were established the Chinese Communist forces under Mao Tse-tung, would be divided. This would relieve the pressure on the troops of the United Nations in Korea, which, of course, would be beneficial.

In order to establish a second front, however, the Chinese Nationalist armies would require a large amount of military equipment. This only could be supplied by the United States. Also, the Nationalist armies together with their equipment would have to be transported to the Chinese mainland. Again, this could be accomplished only by the United States Navy, together with the Marine Corps. To do this would involve a large amphibious operation. Such an amphibious operation would be an act of aggression against Communist China, would constitute an act of war and could very easily directly involve the United

States in a state of war with Communist China. This in turn probably would cause Russia to come to the support of Communist China. In this eventuality world war III would be under way. American power would be divided. This is the trap in which the men in the Kremlin would like to see the United States caught. We must never let this happen. In an all-out war with Communist China many times the number of American troops would be required than are now engaged in Korea. Furthermore, such a war would be foolish and stupid because in a genuine sense the Chinese people are friendly and want to be on friendly terms with America. Absolutely nothing could be gained for America in such a contest. Many of our troops would be lost. The gain, if any, would be in favor of Communist Russia. This we must not permit.

The use of Chinese Nationalist troops in Korea in support of the forces of the United Nations, also presents complications. Here again it would be necessary to equip them and transport them from the island of Formosa to Korea. After they were there it would be extremely difficult for the United Nations forces to determine who was friend and who was foe, since the Chinese Communist forces, the enemy, and the Chinese Nationalist forces, the friend, are after all Chinese, and look somewhat alike. It would be risky business, to know who to trust. Furthermore, in view of the importance of Formosa to the United States, perhaps there is more to be gained from keeping a large number of the Chinese Nationalist forces there, to defend it from an invasion of the Chinese Communist armies of Mao Tse-tung.

THE POLITICAL PROBLEM

As is the case generally, in an area of tension the political considerations are closely associated with the military situation. From the viewpoint of general relations between China and America, there is not anything to be gained from permitting these relations to deteriorate. No step should be taken by our country which would cause the Chinese people to turn against us. True, America is opposed to the domination and control of China by communism, particularly in view of the fact the Communist sweep across China was assisted and directed by Russia. The Chinese Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung, is subject to dictation from Moscow. The proud Chinese people unquestionably resent this control. Unless there are large compensations of benefit to the Chinese people, coming from Russia, as a result of this control or in order to keep it, the Communist grip on China may be broken on the rocks of economic necessity. The Chinese people may rise against communism and the Communist leaders, even though this is difficult to do, once communism with its brutal methods has fastened its hold on a nation.

There is no doubt that a great amount of dissatisfaction exists in China. Communism is not able to make good its promises. These promises are of no value to hungry people. As a result communism no longer has the appeal to the people it once enjoyed. In view

of this fact it would be tragic folly for the United States to commit an act which the Chinese people would interpret as unfriendly and intended to cause harm. Such an act might very well be involved in any effort on the part of the United States to transport and establish the Chinese Nationalist Armies on the mainland. It is argued that it does not make any difference whether you fight Chinese Communists in Korea or on the mainland of China. There is a difference, however. In Korea the Chinese Communists are "volunteers." They are fighting in another country. On the Chinese mainland the Chinese Communists would be fighting on their own soil. Instead of committing any act which might turn the Chinese people against the United States, the policy of America should be directed toward winning the Chinese people away from communism. Experts on China are confident this can be accomplished. Also, it is not to be overlooked that if communism is weakened in China, its appeal in other countries of Asia may be dissipated.

IN THE PATHWAY OF COMMUNISM THERE ARE MANY THORNS

Based on an examination of the situation from a military and political viewpoint there appear to be sound reasons for not employing the Chinese Nationalist troops to support the operations of the United Nations forces in Korea. Certainly, the United States has not anything to gain from becoming officially and directly involved in a conflict with the Chinese Communist armies. If this should occur on any greater scale than it is in Korea, on the so-called volunteer basis, many more American troops would be required. This is unwise certainly at this time and in view of the critical situation in Europe and other areas. We must not overlook the fact that communism is an ideology and must be met on the psychological as well as the military front. The burden on the people of the United States would be increased rather than decreased by the employment of the Chinese Nationalist armies. Also their use would be, in the end a detriment rather than a benefit to the United Nations troops now fighting in Korea.

THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM

We have now reached the decision to meet the challenge of Russian communism to the free world. Russian communism is a strong enemy. This is the enemy we saved from devastating defeat only a few years ago. This enemy is difficult because he works from within to corrupt the minds and souls of men and nations. His agents are in every allied country trying to defeat us from within. He is constantly trying to sabotage our ideals of government as well as the Government itself. Through labor disputes and strikes he is trying to upset our industrial power. Through his efforts in other areas of the world as well as in every State in our country he is trying to ruin our economic life and cause a collapse of our system of private enterprise. In meetings everywhere in the world he is planning, organizing, and working to be ready to strike at the

proper time. Secret meetings are held by Communist organizations in every large city in America. Secret meetings are held right here in Washington almost within the shadow of the Capitol. America is divided into areas and districts and each one of these is under the jurisdiction of one of these organizations.

Already the seat of communism, the Kremlin in Moscow, is actively engaged in war with the free world. Korea, Indochina, Malaya, Tibet, Formosa, the countries of the Middle East, Western Germany and all of Europe are seriously threatened. In fact, Russia is at war with all of the non-Communist countries of the United Nations. In every free nation, Russia is boring from within, attempting to upset their established form of government. Every possible means is being employed to force the nations of the free world into economic collapse. In this way the leaders of the Kremlin, Stalin and company, hope to force the free world to capitulate to communism without the employment of a single Russian division or the firing of a single shot.

Just as the United States successfully met the challenge of the Kaiser in World War I, and Hitler in World War II, I am confident our country will lead the way in meeting the challenge of Communist Russia. Every loyal American, both in official life and in private enterprise is in agreement that the menace of Russian communism must be abolished. I believe this is the view of free people everywhere. We are determined as to our objectives. We know we are in accord and that these objectives must be successfully accomplished. As long as Russian communism is allowed to flourish and spread there can be no peace in the world. Our constant hope and desire is for a world at peace and we intend to remove the obstacles standing in the path of its achievement.

THE UNITED STATES HAS BEEN PATIENT

The United States and the rest of the free world has been very patient with Russia. We have stood by while Russia has formulated plans to control the entire world, through the spread of international communism working from within in nations. Already some of these plans have been executed. Assisted by disloyal and traitorous citizens within countries, Russia has absorbed control of over half the world. We have stood by, while Stalin has accomplished more with his pen and its poison propaganda than Hitler expected to accomplish with his military might. We have stood by, while Stalin and his politburo have forced every possible strain on our economic system, hoping they could cause it to collapse. We have stood by, while certain leadership within our own Government tacitly subscribed to the Communist doctrine, and allowed this great country of ours to disarm and cut our military services to the point of national disaster. How can these men stand before the American people now and request the support and confidence required of a unified Nation in a unified task in a unified free world? Our people have been patient. Our country has been patient indeed, not only regarding the march of communism over great na-

tions and proud peoples, but also with its penetration into our own Nation.

The standing by—be-patient policy, which actually was no policy—has now ended. Almost lulled into a disastrous sleep, America has awakened at a late hour. Time, precious time, now is so precious. The great American eagle has spread his mighty wings, stretched its great talons, looked all about him and has steeled his eye to the mighty challenge ahead. The free world again feels its sinews strengthen, as America has decided to take the leadership, in rolling back communism from the enslaved areas into the land of Russia. No longer will the power and might and force of America permit communism to capture, absorb, and enslave nations just because they are weak. No longer will the United States of America and her allies in freedom permit communism to coexist with freedom as a basis of government. A world half slave and half free cannot exist in this atomic age. The free world is determined now to achieve peace, a real peace, no longer threatened and upset by foolish, power-hungry Communists making pawns of great nations and proud peoples. Our purpose now is to establish in this world a company of nations associated together in cooperation, understanding, and peace, living in freedom with rules of conduct established of free people, by free people, and for free people. It is God's will that mankind shall be free, and through the collective action of free men and women over the whole earth, freedom will be established.

COLLECTIVE OPERATION

Many times in recent months we have heard those of faint heart and lacking in courage state, with the emphasis of authority, that collective operation between nations is finished. In my opinion these skeptics are wrong. Collective cooperation on an international basis is just getting started. The entire concept is young, growing the first roots in the old League of Nations and now maintaining life in the United Nations. It is still immature. It is still growing. It is still to flower. As time passes the forces of science, economics, and the human spirit will bring the nations of the world closer together. Collective operation will then begin to mature. The objective of real peace cannot be secured in any other way. It is then and only then that the dormant talents of a free world may develop a magnificence of being, far superior to the life we struggle with in these times. The step we are now taking as a nation may well be the most significant event in our constantly unfolding foreign policy. It may well be that those of us here now are making the most significant decisions of any Americans in any time. It is a responsibility carried in the heart as well as in the mind. Our task weighs heavily, affects us all, and is quietly sobering. It commands our honesty, and our devotion to our country.

THE NEW FOREIGN POLICY

There is little disagreement regarding this new decision of foreign policy. All over the country people are anxious for a lasting peace and are ready to meet the

challenge of communism to obtain this peace. This positive decision is applauded not only by the whole of America, not only by the whole free world, but also by the nations in slavery chained to Communist Russia. These people now have hopes these terribly heavy chains will be broken. These people also want something different from what they are burdened with. They want peace too. Although there is but little difference of opinion regarding the basic principle of our new foreign policy, there is a healthy difference of viewpoint particularly here in our own country, relating to the right method of operation in order to successfully accomplish its desired objective of permanent peace. This difference could be disastrous. If the wrong method is followed we might fail. If too much time is consumed in reaching a decision we can fail even though we finally make the right decision. Time is precious. Our chance of success short of war, or if war should occur, depends now on how fast we can move, how fast our allies can get ready and how fast and completely we can work and cooperate together. Free civilization cannot afford the luxury of an extended great debate. We must act if the dangers of war and defeat, one or both, are to be averted. In times of national emergency decisions must be made quickly. Indecision reaps defeat.

The United States is a large country with widely separated interests and activities. Extending from one great ocean to the other, life along the Atlantic coastline is somewhat different from life on the Pacific side, while both areas are different from the life in the great Middle and Southern States. It is quite understandable then, that there should be an honest difference of opinion as to the method we should employ to accomplish our objectives of foreign policy. In order to comprehend this difference, I think it is important to consider this problem from the widely held concept that America is secure from any attack by an enemy.

THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY FROM ATTACK

Here in America we have been very fortunate in not having experienced a concentrated attack by an enemy under modern conditions of warfare. The last time an enemy soldier stepped on American soil was during the War of 1812, almost 140 years ago. Since this time, the American people have felt secure in our great island continent. The wide oceans, completely controlled by British and American seapower, provided security for the United States and the Western Hemisphere for over 100 years.

This period ended with the close of the last war. The development of intercontinental aviation, very largely has erased the security provided by the great oceans. We are no longer secure from an enemy attack. The wide oceans have been narrowed down to less than 10 hours. Regardless of this fact however, there exists in the minds of many a belief, based perhaps on hope, that this great country is still secure from enemy attack. This is due largely to the fact most of the population living today was born and matured during the golden era of complete security. It is difficult for us

to comprehend the great realities of scientific advancement. It is difficult for us to comprehend how an enemy can leave his country in an airplane and within the short time of hours be across the great ocean, bombing and devastating our own country. Even today, in spite of this reality, there are many Americans who believe that no enemy or combination of enemies could successfully attack the mainland of the United States. Unfortunately these people are living and thinking in the days prior to World War II. These are the days prior to the intercontinental bomber. With the perfection of the high-altitude, long-distance airplane, no country in the world is safe from an air attack because of its geographic position.

There is not one single acre of American territory that cannot be reached by an enemy bomber, providing that bomber is able to get through the American defenses. Only a few days ago, we were told by the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, that in case of an enemy attack on the United States, at least 70 percent of the enemy's bombers would be successful in getting through our defenses, in spite of our radar screen, antiaircraft guns, interceptor planes, and the great fighting skill of our fighter pilots. This is shocking news. Think of it, seventy out of every one hundred planes of an enemy attack would get through to devastate our cities and our people. This is a very sobering hour. It requires hard accurate thinking.

With this fact in mind, it is important for us to give our attention now to the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb. Since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the people of America have felt a kind of nervous security, in the belief that only America possessed these most devastating weapons ever developed. But even this security now has diminished in the winds over the Siberian wastelands. We know that today, Russia possesses the atomic bomb and is manufacturing atomic explosives. The American people, however, still clinging to this hope of security from enemy attack, has been taking refuge in the fact that, oh well, even so, we here in America possess a great stockpile of atomic bombs and weapons. Russia is behind us in atomic development, security hoping Americans say, and Russia can never catch up to America in view of our great industrial power.

This is a dangerous and frightful fallacy. It is true American industrial power is far superior to industrial operations in Russia, but this fact does not preclude the fact that Russia also might have a stockpile of atomic weapons. One of the cardinal principles of warfare is never to underestimate the capabilities of the enemy. To do so can only end in disaster.

In view of modern developments of warfare it appears now that America is no longer secure from an enemy attack. Although the hour is late, it is extremely important we fully realize this fact from a military viewpoint and as a matured Nation. We cannot just sit back and view the situation as hopeless. We must act. We must make decisions.

We must keep alert to every situation. We must cooperate and work together as never before. Truly, we must be one for all and all for one.

This difference of viewpoint as to the method of operation to accomplish our objectives is indeed understandable. The lateness of the hour, however, calls for a decision. There is distinguished leadership on both sides. Concerning this question, I believe everyone is motivated by high ideals, patriotism, and a deep desire to recommend a course they consider best for the country to follow. These men are too broad, too unselfish, too brilliant to allow personal factors to dominate. Certainly in the consideration of an issue as important as this one is to our country, to the cause of freedom and to the generations following, no one worthy of leadership could permit political ambitions to be a factor involved in concluding the right decision. Statesmanship operates above the level of politics.

THE GENERAL QUESTION INVOLVED IN SENDING AMERICAN TROOPS TO EUROPE

This honest difference of method is focused on the general question of whether or not the United States should send troops to Europe for the purpose of holding Western Europe from passing into the hands of Communist Russia. This general subject has been divided into several issues which have been discussed in Nation-wide addresses to the American people by some of our most distinguished statesmen. Also, these issues have been considered very carefully in recent hearings before joint meetings of the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services. Sitting jointly, these committees concluded in a close decision to permit the President to send four divisions of troops to Europe, which was agreed to previously, but decided the President should come to the Senate or Congress for permission to send any more. These committees have decided to limit the power of the President regarding the ordering of troops. I do not believe the Senate or the Congress has the power to enforce this limitation.

As this question has come to the House for consideration, it is time to sum up and see just where we stand. These issues are most important. They reach every home and every individual in America. As they are decided so will be the future of the Nation and the future of civilization. They are as follows:

The first issue: Shall the United States send troops to Europe without any limitation? In answer to this question a distinguished group of American statesmen, including Members of the Senate and I presume Members of the House, headed by former President Hoover, strongly say "No." Another distinguished group of American statesmen, including Governor Dewey, General Eisenhower, Members of the Senate and, I presume Members of the House, answer an unqualified "Yes."

My conclusion regarding this issue is this, and I respectfully request you to follow me closely. I believe American military forces should be sent any place

in the world where the Joint Chiefs of Staff have concluded, in accord with their plans, such a place is the best area for the United States of America to meet the enemy in force for our own defense.

The limitation, if any, should be measured by the number of troops necessary to be kept at home, in accord with plans, for defense against attack emergencies. This limitation should be completely a subject of judgment for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is their responsibility under the Commander in Chief.

Many years are necessary to develop a first-class military officer. We provide the finest training in the world. By the time our officers reach top rank and occupy high-level policy-making positions, they are better qualified than any other officials of Government to make important military decisions. They are professional men. They are not politicians. They are trained to the job and sworn to the responsibility of protecting the country. They are worthy of our trust:

Along with strategy the crux of this issue is just where do you want the battleground. Remember this—devastation follows the area of battle. In order to win battles and victories there can be no limitation of troops, materials or equipment, except the limitation of the Nation's resources. In this war, if it should come and I hope it never will, where do you want the battleground? In Europe? Do you want it on the precious soil of the United States of America? Do you want to withdraw from Europe and wait until the enemy is ready to devastate our great cities? Remember the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, has informed us that out of every 100 enemy bombers attacking our country, 70 of them would get through. I think those 70 could do very serious damage. Seventy percent is a high average considering modern warfare. I know the officers of the Air Force have been doing some hard headed thinking on how that percentage can be reduced or eliminated. They believe that it is necessary for the Air Force to have many air bases in Europe and other places, strategically located, so that if the enemy should consider attacking America, he would know he would receive a blow 100 times greater than the one he would give. In this case the enemy might conclude it was wiser not to attack. Perhaps that 70 percent can be eliminated after all. But it can not be by just sitting down here at home and waiting. We must act or we will be acted against.

Where do you want this battleground, I ask? Where? Do you want it in Europe? Or do you prefer the picturesque rolling countryside of Ohio—or the fertile sweeps of the corn and wheat lands of Nebraska—or the rich green San Fernando Valley of California? Where do you want the battle to take place? This is the burning question. I think your conclusion must be the same as mine and that is to keep it as far away from our homeland and our homes as is possible. If this government makes the fatal mistake of interfering with military plans to the extent of placing a specific limitation on the use of our military forces

abroad, it is quite possible to experience disaster and find ourselves fighting on these battlefields here in our homeland. My answer to this question is therefore—no limitation.

The second issue: Does the President of the United States have the power to send our troops to Europe or any other country during a time of cold hostility in preparation for a possible outbreak of hot hostilities or actual combat warfare, without the express consent or approval of the Congress?

To this question the group headed by former President Hoover strongly say "No"; while the group including Governor Dewey and General Eisenhower holds the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, has the power now, and in times past has exercised this power.

Personally, I agree with this latter conclusion. There is no language in the Constitution limiting the power of the President acting as Commander in Chief, to order American military forces, anywhere in the world, to combat the enemy in the defense of the United States. It has been argued that the Constitution denies this power in peacetime for technically speaking there is no enemy of the country in time of peace. This view seems to have a basis for consideration, for certainly if the country is at peace there is no necessity for the Congress to raise and support military forces of the proportions required in times of hostilities and there is no need to send troops abroad for combat duties. This view does not apply in the present situation however, because the country is not at peace. In fact, it is being threatened by a cold, calculating, devilish enemy. It is true there has been no declaration of war. War does not commence in this way any more. A formal declaration of war is an obsolete act. In these times you do not tell your enemy you are going to engage him in war before you strike. To do so in this atomic age would be an invitation to disaster. In order to survive we must proceed in the only possible way. In these perilous times when there is a breakdown in the relation of nations, there is a period of cold hostilities during which hot warfare can break out at any moment. We are now in a period of cold hostilities with Communist Russia which can flame into a hot war in an instant. We are not at peace with Russia. Quasi-war already exists. We must prepare for any eventuality. Laws relating to peaceful relationships therefore are not applicable. In view of these conditions I confidently believe the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief has the power and the right to order troops to Europe without the consent of Congress. In fact, I believe the Commander in Chief has a duty to defend the United States against enemies anywhere in the world, not just on American territory. Certainly there is an element of judgment involved, however, I believe the judgment of the Nation's military leadership is sound and worthy of trust and confidence. In order to perform a duty one must be both able and in a position to perform.

The third issue: Does the ordering of American military forces by the Presi-

dent to a foreign country constitute an act, based upon a prior concluded agreement, between the United States and the said foreign country, of sufficient formality and significance, so as to be considered and interpreted as a treaty and therefore subject to the review and approval of the United States Senate as required by the Constitution?

Regarding this question the group headed by former President Hoover is of the opinion that this action on the part of the Chief Executive does represent an agreement of sufficient formality to constitute a treaty and, therefore, most definitely should be subject to the review and approval of the United States Senate. On the other hand, the group of Governor Dewey and General Eisenhower holds the view that such an agreement does not have the proportions of a formal treaty and, therefore, is not subject to the approval of the Senate.

In my opinion there is not the time in modern warfare for the luxury of minute consideration of the operational details of military plans of allied nations cooperating and working together in their common defense. A formal treaty deals with respective rights and duties over a specified period of time. Military plans and military operations are too uncertain to be the subject of a treaty in these times. Military situations and requirements change so rapidly it is most unwise to try to harness them to an inflexible agreement such as a treaty having the force of law. Military operations must be flexible at all times. Any agreements made in relation to these operations between countries must be of such a loose nature they can be changed momentarily to meet any emergency. It appears to me quite obvious, therefore, that agreements made with other countries regarding the movements of our respective troops and military forces do not constitute treaties and, therefore, are not subject to the approval or ratification of the United States Senate.

The fourth issue: Should Congress enact legislation expressly giving the President the power to order American military forces abroad?

Former President Hoover's group is emphatic in holding that the President does not have the power to send American military forces abroad, and that in order for the President to do this he must come to Congress for specific legislation expressly granting him this power. The view of the group of Governor Dewey and General Eisenhower and associates is that the President already has this power and consequently such legislation is unnecessary and superfluous. They are of the opinion such legislation by Congress would greatly complicate American military action.

There is no question at all in my mind that such legislation is completely unnecessary. The power to raise and support troops provided Congress with certain control. In my opinion this power does not extend to control over the ordering of military forces. The ordering of the military forces I believe is a duty of the Commander in Chief. Congress must not complicate military operations. I do believe, however, there is much to

be gained in respect, from our allies as well as a strengthening of confidence among the people here at home, from cooperation between the President and the leaders of Congress in regard to these tremendously important national and international issues. It is very true our free democratic system of government is government by politics but for my part I fail to see any room for politics in war and in the destiny of our fighting forces. For the advantages of unity and harmony I do think the President could consult with the leaders of Congress and keep them informed.

The fifth issue: Should Congress enact legislation expressly limiting the power of the President to send American military forces abroad to Europe or to any other country?

In answer to this question the group of President Hoover and associates strongly favor the enactment of such legislation. They believe the elected representatives of the people in Congress should be the ones to say whether or not American troops are to be ordered to foreign soil. In regard to this issue the group of Governor Dewey and General Eisenhower is emphatic in their answer that any limitation legislation might well be an invitation to disaster. Furthermore, our allies would fail to understand its whole purpose and would consider it from the viewpoint that we did not trust them. Cooperation cannot be encouraged in this way.

In regard to this issue, I shall make it clear in the beginning, I firmly believe in civilian control of the military, in accord with our constitutional system of government. Civilian control means just what it states, control by the people. I do not believe, however, that this civilian control extends to how, when, or where our fighting forces are to be deployed. This seems to me to be a decision for our military commanders. They are the best qualified to make the right decisions. If the Congress should enact restrictive or limiting legislation regarding the number of our fighting forces to be used in Europe, I believe such action would destroy allied morale and cooperation. It would seriously threaten our military leadership. It would act as a stimulant to Stalin & Co. to move in immediately while the moving was easy, to take over all of Europe.

At this moment, I remind you that the greatest single military operation in all history was the Normandy invasion in the thrilling dawn of a June morning in 1944. More troops, more ships, more airplanes, more equipment, more planning than ever before, made up this gigantic undertaking. Why was this necessary? Why, I say? I will tell you why. Because to win the war and crack Hitler's mighty military machine we had to gain a foothold in Western Europe. Today at this very hour, with our allies we have military control of Western Europe. We have more than a foothold. We have whole countries, friendly and trusted on our side. Let us not lose them with any foolish legislation.

These are the five issues in relation to this general question as to whether or not the United States should send troops to Europe. There are other closely re-

lated matters which must be decided. In my opinion, however, these five issues are of primary importance and should be settled immediately.

The whole national effort this new foreign policy requires to defeat the march of communism across the face of the earth is staggering. Its effect on the American people cuts deeply into my heart and soul. The economic upheaval, the increased cost of living, higher prices, higher taxes, scarcity of necessities and all of the added little rules of inconvenience make up a heavy load to carry. The interruption of peacetime activities, of education, of planning for the future, is difficult. The breaking up of homes is a great sacrifice. To be burdened with another war at this time, when everyone is just beginning to recover from the last one, seems more than this generation should be required to shoulder. It is unthinkable that this generation should have to suffer casualties of another war and all of the tragedies that flow from the science of destruction. It is unthinkable that our entire national effort must be concentrated on the methods and machines of destroying mankind rather than on the construction and development of a finer, more abundant civilization. I hate war. I have experienced so much of it and its horrors. Its tragedies chill me to the bone. If there is any way to avoid it I am very certain every Member of Congress and every official of Government would spend their entire strength and energy to find that way. As Americans, however, we have a priceless possession. We have a great country—a wonderful land and a free life. This is ours during our time and it is our solemn duty and inescapable duty to pass it on to the generation which follows. They must do the same if this priceless possession is to survive. We have no choice. Regardless of the cost to each of us we are certain of one fact, one responsibility, one duty. We will protect our country and our freedom from all enemies, from those within our country enjoying its rights and privileges at a time when they are attempting to destroy them, and from those outside, wherever they may be, seeking to destroy this land and this life, created by God.

FORMOSA—VALUE TO THE UNITED STATES

In a sense the value to America and the free world of the island of Formosa, off the coast of China is similar to the value of Western Europe to the whole Atlantic-Mediterranean community. This value is primarily military in nature. General MacArthur and other American military experts are of the opinion Formosa would be of great importance to the United States in case Communist Russia should decide to attack. In enemy hands Formosa would be of value as a great supply and air base and would be of tremendous value in interfering with allied plans and operations.

Some years prior to World War II, our military experts recommended the fortification of Guam. Japan opposed such action on the grounds it actually amounted to pointing a gun as a warning or as a threat to the Japanese on the

part of the United States. As most of you know the legislation for the fortification of Guam was defeated. I voted in favor of fortification regardless of the protestations of Japan. After Pearl Harbor occurred, if Guam had been fortified, the whole course of the Pacific war might have been different. Many lives lost might have been saved. In fact, if Guam had been fortified, even Pearl Harbor might not have taken place.

In World War II the island-to-island campaign in the Pacific is still very fresh in our memories. It was a very, very costly military operation, but regardless, had to be done if the United States was to win out over Japan. In any future conflict involving the Far East we do not want to be in a position of having to repeat the island-to-island operation. In these critical days I agree completely with General MacArthur in regard to Formosa. We should not permit it to fall into the hands of Mao Tse-tung and his Chinese Communist armies.

In order to prevent this from taking place, I believe it is necessary for the United States to provide some military equipment to the Chinese Nationalist forces under Chiang Kai-shek now stationed on Formosa. Certainly this is a valuable use of the Nationalist troops. It seems to me to be very wise also for the United States Navy to patrol the waters around Formosa in sufficient force to prevent an invasion of the island by the Communist forces. If Russia should open an attack in Europe or elsewhere, certainly Formosa would be of great military value in view of the fact all of China would be under enemy control. In the event of war, and again I say I hope it will not take place, but if it should, then I want Formosa on our side, the side of freedom, and not in the hands of the enemy.

WILL RUSSIA ATTACK IF UNITED STATES SENDS TROOPS TO EUROPE?

It is argued by many, some of whom are distinguished scholars of government, that the sending of unlimited numbers of troops and military forces to Europe will hasten the outbreak of hot hostilities or combat warfare. I cannot accept this conclusion. There is only one nation in the world at this time which can start a fighting war. That nation is Russia. The same forces which have prevented Russia from attacking in the past will continue to prevent the men in the Kremlin from attacking, if troops are sent to Europe.

Stockpiles of atom and hydrogen munitions represent part of these forces but not all by any means. The United States possesses others more devastating. If the men in the Kremlin, want to stay in the Kremlin, they will not be so foolish as to make an attack, regardless of the number of troops we choose to send to Europe. These men must learn that America is in this world and aims to stay.

CAN RUSSIAN LAND ARMIES DEFEAT THE ALLIES?

It is argued by some that regardless of the number of troops America sends to Europe the powerful Russian land army will annihilate them so the more we send the more casualties we will have. I cannot accept this defeatist conclusion. I do not believe there are any supermen,

I do not believe the Russian Army is invincible.

Battles and wars are not won by men alone. Divisions in large numbers are of little value unless they are supported by all of the necessities with which to conduct a modern war. These necessities are not now possessed by Russia. Furthermore, an army fighting on foreign soil is greatly handicapped, if it does not have the cooperation of the country in which it is operating. This was clearly demonstrated in the last war by the effective work of the underground organizations. In any conflict with the Russian Army, excepting in Russia proper, I have no fear of the result. The American soldier is the finest in the world. I have complete faith in our fighting forces and in our military arms. Russia knows that in any fight with America now there will be no lend-lease—no flow of equipment from the great arsenal of democracy.

STAY AT HOME AND PROTECT THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Some of our distinguished statesmen have forcefully argued that America should send no troops to Europe. They advise America to stay at home and defend the Western Hemisphere. In the first place, would it not be wonderful if the problem was this easy to solve? In reply to this unthinkable argument, I shall say as forcefully as I can, that this would result in our handing the whole of Europe to Stalin and company by telephone. The men of the Kremlin would just move in. As a result it would be impossible to hold the Mediterranean, the Middle East, and Africa. Russia would gain control of Turkey and Greece. Stalin and company would take over Iran and Iraq. The Communist hordes would sweep over Syria, Israel, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia. This would be a tragic loss to the Allies and to America. I want these countries on our side. I want them on the side of freedom and not relegated to the dark ages of slavery.

In losing Europe, America would lose the vital Ruhr industries to Russia, giving Stalin equality with the United States in the manufacture of steel. In losing the Middle East, Stalin would gain vast oil properties and reserves. In losing Africa, America would lose the vital uranium deposits of the Congo and other essential minerals. With Europe, Asia, and Africa under Russian control where would South America find the market for its great surpluses? Could the United States and Canada absorb them? Of course not. How could the Western Hemisphere work and cooperate together as a unit? It could not. As the result economic necessities would force a break up of Western Hemisphere unity. Ah, no, the failure to successfully hold Western Europe at this critical time means the failure to defeat communism. And the failure to roll communism back into the steppes of Russia means the end of freedom and the life we now hold so precious.

In the second place, in reply to this policy I remind those who urge this ineffectual isolationist doctrine, that we now have close to 200,000 troops in Europe. It appears that under this policy

to let Europe pass to Russia, the conclusion is that these men are expendable. Never. Never. I say. Never let it be determined for one moment that any American soldier, sailor, marine, or airman is expendable. No. Not one is expendable. On the contrary American fighting men will volunteer by the million or singly, just alone by himself to save one of his buddies. I repeat, no American is expendable. This is the roaring spirit that makes us great. We even bring back our dead from the grasp of the enemy. This doctrine is not worthy of American statesmanship.

I respectfully request those urging this—withdraw to the Western Hemisphere policy—to sit down in the quiet with their own conscience and honestly answer this one question. If your policy were adopted, are you prepared to accept personal responsibility if it should fail? You cannot face the answer and you know you cannot. I say to you, therefore, to face the facts squarely and honestly and stop this constant flow of "polifluff" to the American people. "Polifluff," I say is all that it is. A scintilla of windy reason blows it into oblivion. Science and the intercontinental bomber has ended isolationism forever.

THE VALUE OF EUROPE TO AMERICA

It is wise to sharpen this question right to the point. An examination of the fact conclusively proves the tremendous importance of Europe to America in this great crisis with Communist Russia.

According to geography: The countries of the Atlantic-Mediterranean community are in some cases around 3,000 miles closer to the vital targets in Russia than is North America. From the viewpoint of air bases Europe provides the opportunity to make a strategic air attack from all directions on almost any target within the Russian land mass. In addition the bases in Europe save time and fuel, both savings important in air warfare.

According to manpower: The population statistics are important from the consideration of total manpower resources. Russia and her satellites including China, have a total population of approximately 750,000,000. The United States together with the whole of North America and Western Europe has a total population in round numbers of about 510,000,000. This represents a ratio of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. If Western Europe should be lost to Russian domination and control the ratio would be about $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 1.

According to steel production: Steel is of the greatest importance to the conduct of war. A nation with great steel production capacity cannot be defeated by a country having a much smaller capacity. In this regard the figures show that the United States together with Europe, which includes the great Ruhr industries, produces about four times as much steel as Russia. On the other hand if Western Europe should come under the control of Russia, production would be almost equalized with the United States having but an inconsequential superiority. This must not happen.

According to coal production: Coal is also vital to warfare. It is vital to the production of steel. North America and Western Europe together mined approximately 1,000,000,000 tons of coal during the past year, while Russia and her satellites including China mined about 375,000,000 tons. In Western Europe almost 450,000,000 tons were mined. If the Western Europe production is added to that of North America, we would possess an overwhelming advantage of about 4 to 1. On the other hand if Russia had the advantage of the Western Europe production, the ratio would be about $1\frac{1}{2}$ tons to 1, in favor of Russia. We must not permit this to happen.

According to oil production: Oil is also of vital importance in warfare. Although Western Europe actually produces very little petroleum, if it should fall to Russia, Stalin would be in a position to take over the Middle East oil fields so largely developed by the United States, Great Britain, and France. In accomplishing this, Russia would be on even terms with the United States in oil production for war use. Although the United States would have a larger total production, domestic requirements consume much more of the American production than is the case in Russia. If Western Europe can be held in the Atlantic community and the Middle East oil production saved from the grasp of Russia, then we would possess an overwhelming advantage. We must not permit this advantage to pass to Russia. The control of Middle East oil by Stalin and company would constitute a staggering blow to the cause of freedom.

According to electric power production: The wheels of our great industries are kept turning by electric power. Modern industry requires electric power. Without it or until such time as atomic power is in use, industrial mass production would be at a standstill. In view of this fact electric-power production for industrial uses represents a measuring stick of a Nation's industrial capacity. According to the best figures available, Russia and her satellites including China produce about 110,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Western Europe produces about two hundred billion and the United States approximately 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. These figures clearly show that Russia would almost triple industrial capacity, if control of Western Europe were obtained. We must not permit this to take place.

According to vital minerals: The production of modern war equipment could not proceed without an abundant supply of certain vital minerals. Some of these are possessed in sufficient amount here in our own country. Most of them we must import from other parts of the world. Some of these minerals come from the countries of Western Europe or from territories under their control. Turkey supplies the United States with 35 percent of our chromite requirements. Sixteen percent of the tin ore used in American industry comes from Belgium and the Netherlands. A large percent of the uranium our country uses in the manufacture of atomic explosives and atomic power comes from the Belgian Congo. Considerable quantities of

cobalt and chromite also come from here. About 45 percent of our manganese so necessary in the manufacture of steel comes from areas in Africa, directly or indirectly controlled by countries of Western Europe. If the shipment of these minerals to the United States were stopped the successful defense of our country would be almost hopeless. With these minerals passing over to Russian control, the Communists in the Kremlin would have a tremendous advantage.

There are other considerations regarding the importance of Western Europe to America. Certainly, one of these is the bond of heritage and relationship. The large majority of Americans are of European descent and have family ties with some country in Europe. This brief inspection of the facts illustrates quite clearly, I believe, that isolationism is untenable.

Either Western Europe is of no importance to the cause of freedom and the defense of America or it is vital to our survival. I am positive the latter is right. If those urging the former are right, then General Marshall, General Eisenhower, General Bradley, Admiral Sherman, General Collins, and General Vandenberg are wrong. I am positive it is the other way around.

With all of Europe under the control and domination of Communist Russia and these vital necessities denied to America, our industrial superiority would end and fortress America, with the free way of life, could pass into history. Look into your soul. Can you, can any American, endorse a policy which might haul down from the mast our noble flag, the inspiring ensign of freedom?

SHOULD WE CONCENTRATE ON SEA AND AIR POWER?

It is also argued by some of our distinguished statesmen that we should concentrate our national effort on our sea and air arms, aid our allies with munitions, and hold most of our troops here at home, because it is impossible for the United States and Atlantic powers to defeat the Russian land armies with troops. I cannot subscribe to this doctrine because it is militarily unsound.

For many years I have been advocating a powerful Navy, made up of surface and submarine fleets, modernized to the hour, and powerful enough to give the United States undisputed control of the seas. In addition, I have urged time after time, the construction of great aircraft carriers and the building up of the naval air forces to such power, that we not only control the air over the seas but all land areas within the sea and bordering the sea necessary for our defense. The great oceans constitute seven-tenths of the earth's surface. The control of these great oceans must never be lost to the United States. Only a few weeks ago, this House authorized the construction of a large carrier, a year after the administration canceled the construction of the great carrier, the *United States*, at a loss of millions. Instead of authorizing 1 carrier, we should have authorized 12 to 15. Their construction should be underway this very minute. Leadership! leadership! Where, oh where, is the leadership?

Less than 1 year ago I urged the building of our Air Force up to the number of groups thought necessary by the Secretary of the Air Force and his chief of staff. I urged this, and advocated its necessity here in Congress and in public speeches all over the country. I did this while the administration was opposing the building up of the Air Force. I did this at the very time the Secretary of Defense was coming down here, before the two Armed Services Committees, insisting on cutting the fat off of the military services. They were already skin and bone. And this was less than 1 year ago. Why was not such tragic dribble challenged? The only man who did challenge it, the only man who placed the safety of his country above everything else, was scuttled. The only man who dared to fight for his service and for his country, who had the foresight and the courage to try to stop this scrapping of the Nation's defense, was Admiral Louis E. Denfeld. He should be wearing five stars today rather than some others. He dared to tell the truth, and he was fired. This is the tragic story of American leadership. It can very well be said that just as Lincoln saved the Union, Admiral Denfeld saved the Nation and perhaps the free world. Some day this grateful Nation will honor him, too.

The reason I believe it to be unsound military policy to concentrate our whole effort into sea and air power, to the exclusion of land power, is because I believe, and I am certain the military experts believe, the three principal military forces cannot be so separated in modern warfare. All three are integrated together into a cooperative team—a unified striking as well as defensive force. Each depends on the other. The operations in Korea completely illustrate the unity of our military forces and their dependence on each other. Of course, there are various percentages of concentration of each service in a particular area depending on the military requirements. These can change very quickly. It is to be remembered that only an army can occupy land areas and hold them from the enemy. To do so, however, the Army needs the complete cooperation of the other services. Those who are advocating air and sea power to the exclusion of land power—hence no need for troops to Europe—are not in accord with the thinking and recommendations of our military experts.

CAN SEA AND AIR POWER PREVENT WAR?

In my judgment I confidently believe it is possible for a combination of American sea and air power to prevent war. Consider if you will a large fleet of naval aircraft carriers having the tremendous advantage of mobility, moving about in the seas surrounding the enemy, with the modern naval air forces poised to strike at a moment's notice. Then consider the Air Force, with bases located in advantageously selected areas with her huge bombers ready to deliver atom and hydrogen bombs on the enemy. Consider if you will these two great striking forces working in complete cooperation in an air attack on the enemy, coming in all directions, from our sea and land bases and you can picture in your mind the

immensity of the blow. I think Stalin and his little Politburo, sitting in the Kremlin can visualize it too. If they should open combat hostilities the retaliation would be devastating. Knowing full well the meaning of this blow I doubt very much if they will open an attack. In this way a hot war might be prevented, although this is not the way to achieve a lasting peace. I believe the American people should understand completely that it is not the military policy of the United States and Atlantic nations to march on Moscow with land armies. Our policy must include the defense of Europe, however, because it is essential to our own defense and the final objective of a real and a lasting peace.

PSYCHOLOGICAL INFORMATION

In order to achieve a lasting peace communism must be defeated. It must be defeated on all fronts, military, economic, and spiritual. This is the new American foreign policy that has evolved not from planning, but from failure, necessity, and demand. We are determined to carry it through to victory. In our rearmament program, however, we must not overlook the minds and souls of men and what they believe to be their solution. Here is the most devastating weapon of all. Communism must be defeated as an ideology as well as a political method. History has informed us that it is almost impossible to defeat an idea with the sword.

Throughout the world today there are hundreds of millions of human beings who have turned to the concept of communism because they had reached the point of despair and had no other way to turn. Anything was worth trying, any straw worth grabbing, for they had reached the bottom. The devastation of war, the economics of overpopulation, and the failure of leadership all were a cause for this vacuum of hopelessness. Here is where the free world completely overlooked the opportunity to provide a new hope and a new life. Here is where the free world failed. Here is where the allies of freedom could have met the challenge of communism and defeated it without any gunfire and bloodshed. Here is where we failed to recognize that the soul and spirit of mankind is more powerful than any molded weapon of steel. It is unbelievable that any human being given an honest choice between freedom and communism would of his own free will choose communism. Since the end of the last war, over 800,000,000 people have been enslaved, stripped of their resources, and squeezed of their energy and wealth. These people have been sold the ideology of communism and accepted it because they had no other choice. The free world was not there and did not come forward with anything better.

THE FAR EAST

The free people of America have made heavy contribution to the people of China and the Far East. In time of great catastrophes resulting from typhoons, earthquakes, floods, and crop failures, the American people have gone to the rescue. The national effort of our country is also outstanding. In the ad-

vance of education, the combat of disease, the improvement of agriculture, industry, and the standard of living, America has a fine record in the Far East. No other nation has done so much. Russia has done nothing. We have failed, however, to inform the Chinese people of the many good deeds we have so unselfishly performed. The vicious propaganda of Communist Russia now has nullified our country's fine reputation and our good will has been turned to hatred.

In regard to communism, our country did not start soon enough in China. Due to the long war between China and Japan, the people of China were tired, weary, and suffering from the shortages of food and other necessities. Starvation was rampant. Into this vast vacuum the unorganized free world permitted organized communism to move in and sweep the country. Now we are fighting with gunfire and bloodshed to show Moscow we do not intend to permit it to engulf the whole continent of Asia. We are trying to accomplish with the sword what we should have accomplished with a superior job of selling the free way of life. Hungry people will follow any doctrine, any ideology, any issue, if it promises food and the necessities of life. It is difficult to nourish the spirit of a man wasting away in starvation. A world half starved and half fed cannot peacefully function in this age of plenty. Hungry people cannot eat freedom, but they can eat the fruits of freedom. Neither can they eat communism or its hollow promises.

EUROPE

In Europe our record is better. The Marshall plan prevented the development of a vacuum and stopped the march of communism. If it had not been for the Marshall plan, Europe today would be under communism. But do not be misled. In spite of the many constructive accomplishments brought about by the Marshall plan, millions of Europeans have been sold the ideology of communism. They believe the United States is an aggressive nation trying to capture Europe in a scheme of world-wide imperialism. Moscow has succeeded in blacking out much of the good will we hoped to achieve. In spite of these reverses, I am confident however, that the forces of evil will never prevail in the end over the forces of right.

In the past as well as the present the United States has given generously to help nations everywhere in the world. Both publicly and privately we have given heavily of our goods and resources. Our Government has provided huge amounts of capital and saved the economic life of many countries. We have provided food, clothing, and machines. In great periods of national stress and disaster the American Red Cross and other private American organizations have eased the disaster with quick relief. Our record of helping our fellow men cannot be equalled by any other Nation in the world. Certainly it stands out like a mountain in a valley compared to the record of Communist Russia. Our efforts to help other countries have been completely unselfish. Time after time

we have made it clear to everyone we do not want or expect any repayment of any nature. We do expect appreciation and good will. On the other hand Russia never has helped any country, but instead has stolen and stripped the resources of every country over which she has exercised domination.

In spite of the merit of our international relationships compared with those of Communist Russia, hundreds of millions have turned against us and flocked to the cause of communism. Throughout the world Russia has deprived us of our reputation for peace and justice and good will toward men. She has done this without the use of a single soldier firing a single shot, while representing herself to be on friendly terms with the United States, with a complete diplomatic staff functioning every day in the Russian Embassy here in our Capital City, and commercial representatives in almost every large city in the Nation.

How has Russia been able to do this? How has Communist Moscow been able to win the battle for the allegiance of millions? I will tell you how. The answer is organization—fifth-column agents and propaganda. Communist Moscow possesses a highly trained and well organized propaganda machine. Through this machine and their fifth-column agents, they are constantly selling the people of every nation that the United States is an aggressor nation determined to conquer the world. "Americans are capitalist warmongers." "America is using every underhanded means to gain control of your government and your country." This is the devilish propaganda they sell. This is the way they appeal to the minds and souls of uninformed people. This is the way they are destroying the moral reputation and the good will of America. In only a very feeble way we have tried to combat this propaganda.

THE VOICE OF FREEDOM

In his report to Congress a few weeks ago, General Eisenhower suggested it would be most helpful to have a strong organization spreading information about the free world. We should let the world know what we are about and what we are trying to do. We do not need to falsify intentions. We need only to tell the truth. The truth is our most powerful ally. This is the idea of General Eisenhower. I think he is very, very right. I believe there should be established an organization representing the Atlantic nations, the purpose of which should be to broadcast true information regarding the principles of free nations, and at the same time conduct a psychological program, explaining the truth about communism and what is in store for nations under the domination of Communist Russia.

This should be an independent agency of the Atlantic or allied nations known as the Voice of Freedom. This agency should be well organized and staffed with the most experienced and best qualified persons possible to obtain. It should take the place of the Voice of America, the Voice of England, the Voice of France, or any other similar organization. These have not been effective and

are too closely associated with the foreign departments of their respective governments, like our own Voice of America and its close relationship with the Department of State. I believe an agency representing the cause of freedom and representing all of the allied countries, operating as a unit could be extremely helpful in destroying communism as an ideology in the heart of its homeland of Russia. In addition, the Voice of Freedom would help understanding in the Atlantic community. It would counteract the undermining propaganda of Russia. It would build our morale and strengthen our health and courage. It would soon show the people of the world what is right and who is right. The truth can never be defeated. It will always win above falsehood. If they knew of its existence I believe the Russian people would prefer freedom to slavery.

The Russian people as well as the people in all countries should be told the truth about why the free world is rearming. They must be told we are doing this not because we want war but because we want a lasting peace. I think our intentions should be made clear, and why it has been necessary for us to reach these serious conclusions. I think we should tell the Russian people and Communists everywhere what freedom stands for and exactly where we stand. I think we should tell them what life has to offer in the free world. I think we should give these people the opportunity of a free choice.

TRADE WITH COMMUNIST RUSSIA

The iron door of communism can be pried open by an organized economic policy on the part of the Atlantic allies. All trade with Russia on the part of the Atlantic allies should be stopped at once. All trans-shipment of goods to Russia must end. American goods sold to other countries must not be resold to Russia. It should be an immediate objective of the Atlantic nations to prohibit all trade with Communist Russia. Since it is our policy now to defeat communism and roll it back to Russia, certainly we should not provide Russia with vital materials and products to be used against us. We made this fatal error in our war against Japan. Prior to the war Japan purchased most of our scrap iron and steel. As a result when an attack was made by the Japs the GI's would shout, "Look out, here comes the Sixth Avenue elevated." Let us not make this mistake again. If it is the purpose of Russia to wage war, to engulf the world in communism, let us force this Russia to be confined to her own resources. If we must face their steel let us be certain it is not our steel making a round trip.

While mentioning this subject of trade, I believe there should be a trade system worked out between the Atlantic or free nations which are cooperating together in this fight against communism. There should be some measure of fairness involved. It should be a two-way road among friends.

Any number of business institutions in allied countries are charging the United States terrific prices for materials we must have for war production. After

these materials are processed into machines and equipment of war, the United States gives the equipment to these nations in order to help them in their war preparation. In other words, they charge us tremendous prices for material we give back to them in the manufactured equipment. Of course, this is ridiculous. These are countries which the United States put on their feet recently with the Marshall plan and other gifts and loans. As soon as possible there should be a conference of the Allied Powers to work out some solution for such inequities.

COMMUNIST RUSSIA CAN BE DEFEATED

In this great struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of communism, I am certain freedom can win. I am confident the Allies can defeat Communist Russia. Ultimate victory and lasting peace can be ours only, however, if we resolve here and now to work in unity as a Nation and as a Nation fully cooperate with all of our allies bound together by the sinews of freedom. As allied countries we must be a unified team possessing a spirit similar to our great American Union. We must keep our eye on the furrow and plow it straight and deep.

To accomplish this unity so necessary to the achievement of our objective, it is mandatory that we establish together and understand together, some basic principles of cooperative effort. These principles I conceive to be the following:

Together we must, of course, have a common cause. This cause seems to me to be the preservation of the free way of life by eliminating any force such as communism which is standing in the way, thereby making it possible for a lasting peace. Our cause must be right. It must command the respect and the mind and spirit of mankind. Our cause must be greater, higher, and more appealing than all things mortal. Our cause must be worth dying for.

Together we must possess a common courage. The achievement of a great unified undertaking requires more than physical courage to face the enemy in battle. Bravery and valor evolve from physical courage and are magnificently admirable. In addition everyone must possess moral courage. We must make personal sacrifices. We must shoulder additional burdens. We must never flinch from doing all if not more than is expected of us. We must be equal to all the demands and inconveniences required. We must possess the stamina to carry on, to keep going, for upon us here and now depends the future of the ages.

Together we must have a common faith. All depends upon faith. Without it victory is impossible. We must have faith in our God, faith in our neighbors, faith in our associates, faith in our country, faith in our leaders, faith in our policies, and faith in our cause. Our faith does not restrain the right to question, or a right to oppose but it does preclude the right to obstruct. Those honored with leadership must do their best, for only one's best commands faith in others. Possessing a common faith the Atlantic community will be equal to its task. Without faith our collective effort

will flounder on the shoals of disagreement and be shattered to pieces.

Together we must possess common ethics. Within the concept of ethics we recognize honor, respect, and honesty. The absence of any of these qualities will cause a breakdown of individual relationships. The same is true regarding nations. No nation, in a common undertaking, can take unfair advantage of another, economically or politically or from a military viewpoint. Every nation must do its part. All must put their shoulder to the wheel of duty. All must respect the efforts of each regardless of whether the country is large or small.

Together we must have a common determination. Our belief, our cause, our courage to stand the strain, our faith in our ability and the ethics of our conduct, will avail us nothing toward the achievement of our goal, unless we possess the common determination to win through to victory regardless of the sacrifice. In unity we must be determined that the enemy shall be defeated. In unity we must be determined slavery shall be abolished from the earth. In unity we must be determined to achieve a lasting peace.

CRITICISM

Within the function of our collective operation we are certain to engage in criticism. We may strongly disagree with policy and method. We may rightfully question the wisdom of certain proposals and present our views in an effort to reach decisions based on sound judgment. Criticism, if it be the right kind, can render inestimable service. The criticism in which we indulge, in these solemn times, must be constructive and not destructive. We must try to build and not to tear down. Unless our remarks will improve rather than retard, they had better not be spoken. Unless our criticism strengthens our faith in the attainment of the goal, a free world in lasting peace, it had better remain unsaid. We must hold fast to our faith. We must be worthy of trust and trust each other individually and as nations.

These are the days when the allies of freedom are molding plans, pooling resources and making the social and economic adjustments required in this vitally important collective undertaking. The five basic principles I just outlined are fundamental if this new alignment of free nations is to mature into an operational unity.

A MESSAGE TO STALIN

Your Excellency: The transmitting of a message to you from the floor of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is somewhat indirect and irregular. The regular way is through the channels of the Department of State, and His Excellency, the Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in Washington. But I am quite sure you can appreciate irregular procedure and the value of its employment in certain situations. This is one of them.

Like your country the United States of America is large in territory, not so vast as Russia, but large enough so that our Government is not in the least interested in increasing its size. America has no

interest in absorbing other nations or gaining any control whatsoever over them. In the history of human events, America is not an old country, but for 165 years our beliefs, our intentions, and our objectives have been known to the leadership of the world. They were known to your predecessors just as they are to you. Our national principles are very direct and very simple.

We believe in God.

We believe all men and women are created equal.

We believe the people are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We believe that Government derives its power from the consent of the governed, the people.

We believe in law designed for the wholesome benefit of all the people.

We believe in justice, that no individual should be deprived of his life, or liberty without a fair trial by a jury of the people.

We believe in the freedom of body, mind, and spirit.

We believe in helping our neighbors.

We believe in the independence of nations.

We believe it is possible for all mankind to live in lasting peace.

In support of these beliefs we have pledged our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. In your considered judgment, sir, are these principles sound? If you believe any of them wrong will you favor the people of the United States with the benefit of your views? If you would give to the world a statement of the basic principles of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, disclosing its intentions and objectives, as well as the beliefs and hopes of the Russian people, you would greatly contribute to world understanding.

If your Government could endorse for the Russian people the principles under which America has progressed and flourished, from a few small colonies in a new land, to the mightiest Nation in the world today, you would relieve the tension which is becoming tighter and tighter, day after day, between your country and the free people of the world. Unless you have objections to the American principles is not this possible?

You sir, possess one of the greatest opportunities ever to come to anyone in the history of nations. You have the opportunity to guide your country and your people into a golden future in which they may fully share the fruits and glory of lasting peace. Or you may lead your country into a devastating war against the free world, a war in which your country would be desolated, your people ruined, your Government abolished and you would disappear into oblivion. It is well to remember that in any conflict between freemen and those in bondage, freemen will win, for God created man to be free.

If you choose the way of peace and good will toward men you will receive the full cooperation of America and the free countries of the world. You will achieve many advantages for the Russian people. The talents of men everywhere can be turned to the constructive

accomplishments which bloom into a larger and more abundant life. The dreams and hopes of the Russian people will become true and real in a trusting, peaceful world.

If you choose to resort to war against the free world, you and your country will experience all of the might and fury of an all-powerful America. Established in freedom, America never will permit the free way of life to pass. Your blue skies will be hidden by the wings of great bombers forming a ceiling of destruction for your industries, your cities, and your people. Your crops will be destroyed. Your fields, your soil will not produce again for many years. They will not produce—not even a weed. This is the force of destruction of modern, scientific warfare. This is the power of America. Your country will be blockaded from the sea and bombed from the sea. Your ships will be sunk. Your harbors torn to ruin. This is the power of America. Your Government will collapse. Your armies will disintegrate in confusion. Your people will suffer from disease and starvation. Your country will be desolated. This is the power of America. It is our hope and our desire you will never force us to use it.

As you probably know, here in America the people enjoy freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of movement, freedom of expression. Every important issue affecting the future of our country is extensively debated. Wide differences of views are expressed. Sometimes the people take one side or the other. The Government's business is the people's business and is discussed by the people everywhere in the country. You must not be misled by American differences of views regarding important questions. You must not be misled by the expressions of the leaders of our established political parties. You must not be misled by the debates in Congress. When a decision is reached on any issue America will stand in unity behind the decision. Do not be misled.

In these fateful times, sir, you may have the honor and esteem of the Russian people or you may have their contempt and hatred. You may have the respect and admiration of the whole world or you may harvest its derision and scorn, as did Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo. You can rise to greatness or you can fall into infamy. You, sir, have the choice. It is yours to decide. Men of all faith and all nations, men in bondage, men who are free are counting on you. May God give you the light to see the right. May your choice cause the pealing of bells and the cheers of people. May your choice be peace, Your Excellency.

CONCLUSION

Our new American foreign policy is late in taking shape. It is not too late, however, if we can pull together in unity. This cooperation is our test in these critical moments. If we fail to work together, the free way of life is lost, lost perhaps forever. Now that the decision has been made communism must be defeated as a force standing in the pathway of peace. I approve of this decision. If the men in the Kremlin in Moscow are

scheming to gain control of the world through international communism, these men must be defeated.

It is possible this new foreign policy, together with the necessary decisions to support it, may lead our country into war. It is extremely difficult to finally reach a decision to endorse this policy. It is a serious decision and I want you to know I reached it after long hours of thinking, hours filled with anguish and torment. Many a night I have been unable to sleep. Many a night I have sat through in the quiet with my conscience. Many a night I have asked for divine guidance that I might clearly see the right way and make the right decision. I believe I have made it, thanks to God.

I firmly believe the decision to end the spread of communism and sweep it from the pathways of peace might prevent war rather than cause it in these times. I believe this decision will save the free way of life for generations yet to come. If this decision were not made, I believe millions and millions more people of the world would be engulfed into the deep chasm of Communist enslavement. This in turn would lead to war—a war in which many of the advantages we possess today would be on the side of the enemy, a war in which freedom might not have an even chance.

The great decision to meet the challenge of communism now provides the allies of freedom with advantages heavily in our favor providing we do not foolishly permit them to pass over to Russia. Some of these advantages are involved in our maintaining control of Western Europe, the countries of the Atlantic-Mediterranean community. I firmly believe we must hold this area. I firmly believe we can hold it. It is for this reason, I believe it is necessary to send American troops and American military forces to Western Europe. To decide otherwise is to teeter-totter with our destiny. We must not be a party to a game on the teetering board when it is possible for the see-saw to abruptly end with a terrible bump.

Since it is necessary to send American troops to Europe, I strongly believe the Congress should refrain from placing any limitation on the number to be sent. Congress is not the body to decide this question. This is a matter of military operation and military planning. This is not a political question or a question in which Congress should interfere. The number of troops to be sent to Europe is determined by the capabilities and military forces of the enemy.

It is important not to misunderstand this situation. From the viewpoint of saving Western Europe for Western Europe, I believe it is right to urge the countries in this area to do their full share. From the viewpoint of holding Western Europe for the cause of freedom which is the cause of America, I still believe it is right for these countries to do their full share. But from the consideration that Western Europe is all important to our success, that it constitutes our first line of defense, that to lose it might mean failure, I believe the controlling issue is to hold it and hold it at all costs. If it means the difference between victory and defeat for America and the

cause of freedom, then I say we are being extremely foolish to place any limitation on the number of American troops to be sent. If it is a question of fighting for survival, I think the battleground should be at the first line of defense. In this crisis this line is Western Europe.

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not want a single son of American parents to be sent to war in Europe. I do not want war. I hate it. I have seen it in all of its terrible fury. I am willing and I am trying to do everything I can to prevent the coming of another war. I wish I could tell you this afternoon that there will be no war and that we can go about our life in peace. I cannot bring you this message because if I did I would be misleading you and I shall never intentionally mislead you. There is a possibility of war. Because of this possibility we must prepare. We must be ready. We must follow the advice of our military leadership. Above all we must not pull the rug out from under General Eisenhower in his effort to mold a unified military force, equal to the task of defeating communism and its Russian military machine.

It is not my purpose to recommend that America do the whole job or more than its fair share. I believe every free country in the Atlantic-Mediterranean community should do its part; carry its share of the load. I do not believe in giving a blank check to anyone. It is my purpose to make very clear that we cannot permit our cooperative effort to break down on the shoals of disagreement as to which country shall do what job. If we are to succeed we can only do so as a completely cooperative force operating as a unit. We must trust each other. We must believe in our cause. We must know in our hearts we are right. We must have the determination to do the job. If in the end we accomplish our objective, we win our victory, it does not matter too much if one has carried more of the load than another. To command honor and respect and to feel deep pride of satisfaction, comes only from the knowledge our country did its best, that our country did its part, above and beyond the call of duty.

The decision to meet the challenge now and to meet it on our own terms could well be the deciding factor in saving the lives of many thousands of our men, thousands of our citizens, as well as saving our country and our freedom. If this decision was postponed or if we fail to make full use of the precious time we still have or if we fumble our opportunity, I fear the cost might be a hundred, yea, a thousand times greater. The cost might be freedom. It might be our country. It might be our lives.

THEN THERE WAS PEACE

It is my firm conviction that if we are to win out in this great struggle of our time we must stop creating ghost issues and wasting time on them. Our real objective is to have a lasting peace. To achieve this America has contributed more than any other country. Oftentimes it is said America wins the wars, but fails to win the peace. After some reflection I have concluded it is misleading to give the impression that the

nature of peace is competitive and is either won or lost. This is not true. Peace is a quality of the mind, evolved from the heart and spirit of mankind. To be achieved, peace must be wanted. As long as any group or nation desires to interfere with the lives of others and possesses the power to do so, there can be no peace. Lasting peace will be possible only when the sword is sheathed as a method of adjusting the differences between men and nations. This is our real goal. In the not too distant future we shall anxiously look to the breaking sky and by the dawn's early light we will see the glorious ensign of freedom and peace waving in the breeze on high. This is the mission of this generation on this earth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

BOYS IN TRAINING CAMPS SHOULD BE PROTECTED AGAINST INTOXICATING LIQUORS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, within a few days this House will give consideration to one of the most important legislative proposals that will be presented to the Eighty-first Congress. It is a bill to provide for the effective utilization of manpower resources and for the authorization of universal military training and service, and other purposes.

The bill, among other things, provides for the continuation of the drafting of men in the Armed Forces and for lowering of the age of draftees to a minimum of 18½ years. It is the intent of this legislation, as I understand it, to increase the personnel of the armed services. According to reports we have received; it is the plan of the administration and of the military to maintain the biggest peacetime armed force in the history of this country.

The particular problem to which I want to direct your attention briefly today deals with the use and sale of alcoholic liquors in and around the training camps where our Armed Forces are located and are in training.

I have received a great many letters from mothers and fathers of boys who are separated and others about to be separated from their homes and their home surroundings and to be placed under conditions and circumstances far different from those to which they have been accustomed. Among other things, they will be subjected to the use of intoxicating liquor. The amendment I propose to offer to the legislation when it is considered on the floor of the House provides in substance that—

No person, corporation, partnership, or association shall sell, supply, give, or have in his or its possession any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine, inside the confines of or within a reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training or mobilization place which is being used at the time for men in the Armed Forces; but the Secretary of Defense may make regulations permitting the sale and use of alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the provisions of this section or any orders, rules, or regulations made by proper authority

thereunder shall unless otherwise punishable under the Articles of War be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000 and/or imprisonment for not less than 30 days nor more than 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, an amendment similar to the one I shall propose was submitted for the consideration of the House Committee on Armed Services, so it will not be new to the committee when it is presented for your consideration. This, in my opinion, is an extremely important amendment. I see no reason why this House should not be willing to offer the protection embodied in this amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not only a question of protecting the boys in their health and their future happiness, but it certainly contributes to the benefit of this country. The adoption of this amendment is a part of the program of the training of the men in the Armed Forces, and, as I said before, the approval of the amendment will give a little consolation to the mothers and fathers of these boys who are required to meet new surroundings and undergo unusual adjustments.

In order to emphasize the need of this amendment, it might be well to remind ourselves that Germany was a nation which made liquor freely available to the young men in her armies; we have twice defeated Germany. Italy subscribed to similar principles, and the attitude of that nation toward vice included legalization, and state-supervised bordellos; and Italy has twice within my lifetime come out rather badly in armed competition with the clean-living young men of America. France's code on the issues involved in this amendment might possibly coincide with the opinions of Members who will vote against it, and we have twice had to put American men into uniform to save France. Finally, the protections desired by this amendment were the protections given the soldiers of the United States in World War I, and while I may be slightly prejudiced on that subject, I thought the American soldiers did pretty well in World War I, in competition with soldiers from nations which would not approve of this amendment.

Under the circumstances I have outlined in this statement, the last thing we want to do is to see these boys confronted with a temptation that will dull the edges of sensation. Most of these boys going into the Armed Forces are not drinkers. No one contends that the drinking of liquor will be helpful to them in any respect. I think anyone who has been addicted to the use of alcohol will tell you that when used to excess, it is an enemy that steals away man's brains.

Very unfortunately, we have a few people in this country who for selfish interests and profits would, as Dr. Hamaker has well said, "Shut their eyes to the desolation and ruin that may come to many a soldier boy in 21 or 27 months." It is our job and our responsibility to defend these boys against that sort of thing insofar as we can do so. Let us see to it that men in uniform will find it difficult rather than easy to take on a thing that is bound to do them harm and

at the same time make them less valuable as members of the Armed Forces.

In support of what I have had to say, I am including a statement by Lionel Shapiro that appeared in the Evening Star of February 16 entitled "Eisenhower Troops Offend French With Drunken Rowdism." This statement alone ought to make us appreciate the situation in which we are placing American boys, and it shows also the misunderstanding that may be created in a foreign country. I should add that these boys are not altogether to blame for the things described in this statement. It is the American Government and those in charge of our Armed Forces that will have to assume a share of the responsibility. The article reads as follows:

EISENHOWER TROOPS OFFEND FRENCH WITH
DRUNKEN ROWDYISM
(By Lionel Shapiro)

PARIS, February 16.—If one may judge by the incidents which have occurred in Paris streets and cafes since the buildup of General Eisenhower's headquarters at the Astoria Hotel here, American military authorities face a grim problem of disciplining their own troops.

Only a comparatively few troops, mostly on temporary duty from German bases, have arrived in Paris. But the graph of police-reported incidents is already rising to a point which indicates a future problem of some gravity in the relationship between American soldiers and French civilians.

In the post-liberation period 6 years ago, General Eisenhower had indifferent success in his earnest efforts to curb troops rowdism. Today, according to a French police official (who declined to be quoted by name), the advance guard of American troops is displaying a rough arrogance which is accomplishing more for the "Go home Eisenhower" campaign of the Communists than all of their newspaper propaganda.

During the last two evenings this correspondent witnessed incidents which illustrate the official's remarks.

In a huge brasserie, a coffee house with musical entertainment, a woman singer was interrupted by shouts of "Get hot!" and "Take it off!" from half a dozen American soldiers, obviously drunk. The singer finally was forced to retire from the microphone, and the eyes of some 300 middle-class Parisians who were being entertained became fixed on the Americans.

The latter thereupon got to their feet, glared about the room, and challenged any of the "yellow Frenchmen" to come out and fight. After a period of tense silence, the Americans broke into paroxysms of laughter and frolicked out of the place.

A more serious incident occurred in a restaurant just off the Champs Elysees. Two voluble American soldiers, who claimed in their more amiable moments that they were in Paris on temporary duty from the military police detachment in Frankfurt, set themselves up at the head of the bar and accosted every woman who entered the restaurant, whether accompanied or not, as a street-walker. It so happened that an American Air Force captain in uniform entered with his wife.

The soldiers, one a Pfc and the other a corporal, maintained their gutter commentary in such loud voices and in terms so execrable, that several diners called for their bills and left the restaurant. When the owner of the restaurant interceded, he was told if he wasn't so old he would get his head knocked off.

Finally the Air Force captain and his wife proceeded to leave the restaurant. The latter, fighting back tears of chagrin and em-

barrassment, said to the soldiers as she passed them, "You are a disgrace to America."

One of the soldiers took hold of her arm and twisted it in the best Hollywood tough-guy fashion. In a moment the French people in the restaurant witnessed a vicious fist fight between two American enlisted men and an American captain.

When the police arrived, the captain and his wife took advantage of the confusion to get away. After some scuffling, the police pinned the two enlisted men, who kept shouting that they belonged to General Eisenhower's headquarters. They were released, and scuttled down the street laughing and shouting, leaving behind an empty restaurant.

Parisian police claim that the attitude of American soldiers who have arrived thus far is much more troublesome than in the post-liberation period. The arrogance of the men, they say, is overwhelming.

A complicating factor is added: During and after the last war, Parisians appreciated that the men had undergone hard combat and were entitled to wide leeway on their leaves. Now, however, the men are being obstreperous without apparent excuse and Parisians are not so easily inclined to accept insults and degradation.

The problem is an acute one. It can hardly be resolved, in this correspondent's opinion, by an indoctrination course which consists of a pamphlet advising the troops to adopt a modest attitude toward the French. This kind of advice gives the youthful American soldier the secret idea that he is a superior being, and this notion grows in direct ratio to the amount of drinks he has consumed.

Indoctrination on behavior should begin, it would seem, with basic training. This, too, may be late, and may have to be enhanced by stricter discipline than now obtains in American units stationed in foreign lands. It will probably require a generation of education to the responsibilities of world leadership before the rank and file can learn instinctive diplomacy and respect for other nations.

Mr. Speaker, now I want to call your attention to a memorandum handed me by a former officer of the Armed Forces who was in Europe for a long period of time, not only during the war but thereafter. His statement speaks for itself. I hope you will read it carefully:

Liquor, wine and beer are being sold by United States Government agencies in the German area of occupation at a profit.

Liquor and wine are known as Eucom (European command) class VI supplies. A commissioned officer known as a Eucom class VI officer heads up a central agency which is civilian staffed. The civilian staff are allowed to use billets at a nominal charge, commissary, post exchange and all other privileges presently enjoyed by other Government employees in the area.

This Central Agency forms a part of the Eucom-staff and has a governing body called the class VI board, consisting specifically of designated chiefs of certain headquarters staff divisions. This agency makes all purchases of liquor and wine and sells to lower echelon class VI establishments in the many major commands throughout the theater on an allocation basis. It employs Government transportation by water, rail and motor. Its accounts are audited and inspected by prescribed officials of other government staff divisions in accordance with theater directives.

Class VI stores are located in major commands and sell bulk supplies to club facilities for officers, enlisted men and civilians. They also sell over the counter on a ration basis to officers, enlisted men not below the rank of sergeant, and civilian employees

and adult dependents of such personnel. Size of allowance increases with rank, and number of dependents. Minors are allowed to purchase. Supplies reach Germans through unauthorized channels. Enlisted men below the rank of sergeant have little trouble getting bulk supplies. Stores are operated under supervision of the Major Command Headquarters, employ some military personnel but are mainly civilian staffed.

Clubs or messes sell over the bar by the drink. Enlisted men below the rank of sergeant have no difficulty obtaining service for themselves and their girls regardless of age.

Profits of the central agency support numerous activities including some VIP special privilege establishments. Profits of class VI stores are similarly used but within the command. Special service clubs, although in direct violation of pertinent regulations, have been dispensing for profit.

Some German breweries operate under contract to make certain kinds of beer, which are sold in bulk through exchange service to authorized individuals and to clubs and messes.

This system has existed for several years and has failed to curb excessive drinking either by the military or the civilian personnel. In fact it appears that the reverse has resulted. It has promoted a situation whereby our Government is presently engaged in a business which has a considerable demoralizing effect not only on the young soldier but on other personnel as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HIGH FOOD PRICES

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I was among the Members present this afternoon who greatly enjoyed the basket brigade presented by the gentlewomen of the Republican Party. To me, their message was most impressive because I, too, am seriously concerned about the rising cost of food. Many Members of the House will recall my activity in attempting to secure mandatory price and wage controls last July when we passed the Defense Act of 1950.

The basket brigade also demonstrated the increasing number of gentlewomen in the Republican membership and I can accurately predict that as the Republicans elect more and more ladies their party looks better and better. But may I go one step further and point out that while the gentlewomen improve the appearance of their party, they still follow the traditional Republican pattern. I believe it was about 5 years ago that the talented and able Democratic lady from California, Mrs. Douglas, appeared on the House floor with a grocery basket demonstration and presented a convincing argument of rising food prices during the Eightieth Republican Congress. This leads me back to my statement, to wit: That Republican ladies, like Republican men and the Republican Party, usually follow the Democrats, even though it may take 5 years to catch on.

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

Mr. McKINNON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. This observation or inquiry is not made in connection with the remarks made by our distinguished lady Members from the other side, but I remember last year when we tried to give

the President the power to control gambling—gambling, cold-blooded racketeering, you might say—on the commodity exchanges, the power to control the price of food by the President's having the power to raise margins, to control it through margin requirements. This very body refused to give the President that power, and that has been a powerful contributing factor in increasing the cost of living because in the intervening time speculation has gone rampant according to the reports of our own Government agency, Commodity Credit Corporation, in the commodity exchanges of the country.

Mr. McKINNON. I thank my majority leader for that contribution.

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

Mr. McKINNON. Not at this time. I was going to make the point that when it came time to protect the housewife and the American family not a single one of the basket brigade who was in Congress at that time supported the prohibition against gamblers and speculators on the commodity market exchanges. In fact, the list of those who favored striking out that protective clause read like a Who's Who of the Republican Party of the House. They are the ones who supported the protection of gamblers on the commodity markets and that support has resulted in the high food prices of the present time.

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

Mr. McKINNON. Not at this time. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York if I have time when I complete my statement.

As an illustration of my statement the price of cotton has gone up from 33.40 to 45.29 between July of last year and March of this year, and other commodities like wheat, corn, and meat, have followed suit.

No wonder the retail price of food has gone up; and the Republican Party certainly must assume that responsibility.

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

Mr. McKINNON. As soon as I finish this statement I will be glad to yield.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday on this floor, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] made a most unusual speech. He hit at one of the basic questions which is often discussed today. Are communism and Russia a real threat to our way of life today, or are we in the midst of war hysteria?

I firmly believe that communism does offer a definite threat to our free existence and I know that most of us here feel that same way. Yet, I think that the gentleman's speech may be interpreted to leave the impression that communism is no threat to our world today.

He declares that the present program of the administration to warn the people against the threat of communism is nothing but an expensive propaganda effort. He continues by stating that you are "not going to fool all of the people all of the time."

What the gentleman is saying, whether he realizes it or not, is that the people are being fooled when the facts about

the threat of communism are told them by the administration. What the gentleman is saying is that communism is not a threat to the world today.

I remember that the gentleman fathered a statement on foreign policy by a group of Republicans on this floor about 4 weeks ago. Does his speech of yesterday amend that statement to include the charge that communism is no real threat to the free peoples of the world?

If, the people are not awake today to the threat of communism the fault lies not with the efforts of the administration to warn them and to present them with the truth, and to provide them with a program calculated to halt the march of communism. The fault lies rather with the statements such as that of the gentleman from Wisconsin which lead only to confuse the people and to keep from them the real threat of communism in our world today.

I shall now be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has referred to this amendment about speculation in commodities; is it not a fact—it is my recollection—that this amendment was offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], a Democrat, in a Democratic Congress, and it was supported by a great many Democrats?

Mr. McKINNON. It is a fact that it was offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]; but it is also a fact that the people who voted to protect the market basket of the American people, came primarily from the Democratic side with the addition of a dozen or two Republicans who voted with the administration Democrats. The vote to eliminate the amendment which would prohibit speculative gambling on the commodity markets was supported by the Republican Party overwhelmingly.

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

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wonder how the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] voted on that proposition.

Mr. KEATING. I voted against Mr. COOLEY's amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding; so did the gentleman from Iowa; so did one of the gentlemen from New Jersey, and perhaps others. I think it is fair that those who did vote against it should be noted. Each one of us individually has our own responsibility.

Mr. KEATING. That is true, but I think it a little inaccurate to allege that this was a Republican amendment. That impression has been sent out over the country. In fact, it was introduced by a Democrat and it was carried in a Democratic Congress that had a clear majority.

Mr. McKINNON. I did not say it was a Republican amendment. I said the Republicans supported the amendment. Had it not been for Republican votes the amendment would not have been adopted.

Mr. KEATING. And, of course, it could not have passed without the Democratic sponsorship.

Mr. McKINNON. It had no Democratic sponsorship. A Democrat sponsored the amendment but the administration and the committee opposed the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Why, the gentleman from North Carolina, is chairman of the Agricultural Committee, a part of the administration forces in this body.

Mr. McKINNON. He was not chairman of the committee that handled the legislation on the floor that day. The Banking and Currency Committee handled the Defense Act of 1950.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from New York is in a very strange position of having voted right and now trying to defend a wrong.

Mr. KEATING. No; I am not defending a wrong. What I am defending is the Republican Party and my colleagues on the Republican side who happened to disagree with me on that particular issue, just as some Democrats disagreed with me. That was not a party issue. As the majority leader has said everyone bears responsibility for his own vote. The administration forces, including the President of the United States, have gone out over the country or, more properly, that part of the country where it served their interests to do so, claiming that the Republican Party prevented the incorporation in the Defense Production Act of a provision to curb gambling on the commodity markets, in fact, the amendment was something introduced by a Democratic Member of this body and it was carried in a Democratic Congress.

Mr. McKINNON. With Republican votes. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I hold him very high in my esteem.

Mr. KEATING. I hold the gentleman in high esteem also.

Mr. McKINNON. If we had more Republicans like him I think we would have a much better country and a much better market basket for the housewife.

Mr. KEATING. That is very kind of the gentleman and I appreciate those remarks. I entertain the same high regard for the gentleman. But what I am objecting to is not the unfairness but the inaccuracy of the gentleman in attempting to foist upon the Republican Party the Cooley amendment, which was passed in this body in a Democratic Congress. I do not go along with that philosophy.

Mr. McKINNON. Would the gentleman be willing to answer a couple of questions "Yes" or "No" that I would like to ask him?

Mr. KEATING. Well, that will depend on the questions. Some lend themselves to that treatment and some do not, but shoot.

Mr. McKINNON. They are simple questions.

Mr. KEATING. Simple questions do not always lend themselves to "yes" or "no" answers.

Mr. McKINNON. Did a majority of the Republicans support the Cooley amendment?

Mr. KEATING. I have no knowledge of that one way or the other. I am absolutely certain that at least 25 Republicans voted against the amendment

offered by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. About 90 percent of them voted for the amendment.

Mr. McKINNON. I believe that is correct. I rapidly checked the roll call before I came on the floor.

Mr. KEATING. If it would not be unparliamentary, I would like to wager that 90 percent of the Republicans did not support the amendment. How many Democrats supported it? This was a Democratic Congress. That is the thing you gentlemen seem to forget. You have the responsibility for what goes on or does not go on here; that rests with the Democrats, not the Republicans. When the Republicans organize the next Congress under the people's mandate, they will then accept responsibility gladly for what is done here, but not until then.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman is not presenting the true facts of life. He knows very well that in this Congress we have three different segments. We have the Republican Party, we have the administration Democrats and we have a group of southerners who are Democrats but who frequently do not go along with the administration program. The administration Democrats do not have a majority any more than do the Republicans, but had a majority of the Republicans voted against the food gamblers, our market baskets would have been larger today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 1, and if there are minority views that the minority may have the same right.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RESTORE THE POWER OF CONGRESS

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, so as to permit either House of Congress to reject reorganization plans proposed by the President by a simple majority vote, rather than the constitutional majority now required by that act.

The events which make this measure advisable are fresh in all our minds.

On Tuesday, March 13, the House of Representatives voted 153 to 61 to require only a simple majority for the rejection of emergency reorganization proposals. Thus, the House clearly went on record in favor of untying the hands of the Congress.

On Wednesday, March 14, a resolution to reject Reorganization Plan No. 1, a permanent reorganization plan, which would abolish the Board of Directors of

the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and substitute a single administrator in its place, failed of adoption in the House of Representatives, although a majority of those present and voting indicated their disapproval of the plan. The vote was 200 for the resolution disapproving the plan, and only 197 against the resolution.

The reason the plan to reorganize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was not killed in the House of Representatives was because of the provision of section 6a of the Reorganization Act of 1949. That section provides that a reorganization plan can be rejected by either House of the Congress only by an affirmative vote of the authorized membership of that House.

The will of the people through their elected representatives was thwarted by an abnormal obstacle, which an administration majority was able to insert in the Reorganization Act of 1949. I propose to remove that obstacle and to restore to the Congress—where it belongs under the Constitution—at least that portion of the vast legislative power which has been ceded to the Executive in the past two decades.

I believe the episode we have just witnessed demonstrates beyond question the wisdom of taking this action now. By this amendment, the Congress will be fortified in the event that future far-reaching and ill-considered proposals are presented under the Reorganization Act of 1949.

I warn the House of Representatives now against the situation which may in the future confront it under the present Reorganization Act. Even though a majority of the House or the Senate might strongly oppose a reorganization proposed by the executive department, this majority would be powerless to prevent the reorganization, because of the abnormal requirement of a constitutional majority.

I do not intend to review or to discuss at length the merits of the President's plan to reorganize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Senate may yet assert its prerogative and reject this reorganization plan. I believe it should.

The Senate, in one sense, has more interest than the House in this particular reorganization plan.

First, there now is pending before the Senate a more comprehensive legislative proposal, S. 514, to reconstitute and reorganize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Second, the Fulbright subcommittee, for the past year, has been conducting a penetrating exploration of some phases of the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Third, the rights and prerogatives of the Senate would be impaired through the approval of a plan which would permit the Senate to pass upon the character and qualifications of only two, rather than five, individuals responsible for the management of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Senate would be given just one opportunity to pass on the merits of such appointments. Both the Administrator and the Deputy Administrator, under the plan, would serve without fixed terms and would need

to come before the Senate for confirmation on renewal appointments.

Whatever action the Senate may take, the fact remains that the Reorganization Plan No. 1 was ill-timed, ill-considered, hastily drafted and hastily presented to the House of Representatives. It was motivated by a desire to alleviate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from the public indignation arising from the Fulbright exposures. It confuses structure with personalities. It is not in the public interest.

Although the 200 Members of the House of Representatives who were opposed to this plan outnumbered those who favored it, the majority will now be thwarted by a rigid rule which has succeeded in limiting and weakening the power of the Congress to act on public policies. This roadblock to the expression of the will of a majority of the representatives of the people should be removed at once.

It is my conviction, and one which is of long standing, that what is needed most by our country today is the strengthening of the Congress. This has been a major plank in the platform upon which I have offered myself for public service. It has been a primary objective, and will continue to be a primary objective, in my service in the House of Representatives.

Unless we are ready to admit that democracy cannot work in a modern, mechanized society, it seems to me inescapable that the Congress must be so constituted as to develop and to express clearly and in unambiguous terms its own independent policy with respect to national and international programs.

We Representatives and our committee staffs should study intensively the problems, facts, reasons, arguments and views underlying legislative proposals. We should conduct this study in the light of the sentiments of the citizens of this country whom we represent, to whom we are responsible, and with whose aspirations and desires we are intimately familiar. The resulting enactments should contain our own independent, sincere and well-founded convictions.

I think it is uncontradictable that the authors of our Constitution, acutely aware of the dangers of the centralized executive authority of a tyrannical king, took great pains in writing our Constitution to vest the policy-making authority of our Government in the elected representatives of the people under conditions rendering it easy for the removal of a Representative whose views were out of harmony with the sentiments of his constituents.

This is more than prosaic constitutional philosophy. This principle is the very heart of the liberty of this Nation and its freedom from dictatorial control by a greedy despot. It is a basic concept of our American economy. It is the foundation upon which rest the rights of our citizens and the freedom and dignity of the individuals for whom this Government was constituted.

This sacred principle should be continuously and vigorously upheld. It should be jealously guarded by those who have sworn their faith to the sovereign

electors who sent them here, and who have vowed to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

I challenge the right of any of us in this House to abdicate the precious legislative power of the Congress which we have sworn to preserve and uphold. Those who part faith with their sworn, solemn obligation to defend the integrity of the great legislative body of which they are a part thereby forfeit the right to represent the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in the events of the last 2 days we have witnessed the low state to which the Congress was brought when the Reorganization Act of 1949 was passed. We saw the great House of Representatives of the United States powerless to act in accordance with the will of the majority of its Members and subjected to the will of one man, to whom the Democratic leadership in the Eighty-first Congress transferred legislative power.

Here is an issue which transcends any temporary, partisan consideration. Whichever party is in power, the forces of executive encroachment always will be operative.

Not because we are Democrats or because we are Republicans, but because we are lawgivers endowed with the authority of the sovereign people of the United States, we must retain in the Congress the authority which belongs to the Congress—the authority which the Constitution intended the Congress to have in order that it may effectively express the will of the people of this Nation.

We must be alert to attacks upon the source of our authority and quick to defend it. We must resist any weakening of the power we have undertaken to administer. We must continually foster and develop that power in relation to the rapid evolution of our society under the economic forces of the times.

The bill I have introduced will go only a short way in the direction of restoring to the Congress the power and the dignity it has permitted itself to lose in the past two decades. But it will be a reversal of a trend which, in my judgment, threatens our free political institutions. It is, therefore, in the public interest.

I hope the party in power will not treat this measure as a partisan one. I hope the leadership of that party will not utilize its majority in numbers to obstruct a movement to fortify and strengthen the body of which we all are Members, to which, in my judgment, our allegiance must be devoted in supremacy to our allegiance to either political party.

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

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the gentleman on this fine statement. He has been a member, and a valuable member, of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and has rendered distinguished service in the preparation of at least one of the reports on the bills which have come before us. I feel that there is no one better equipped to speak with knowledge on this subject and no

one who more appropriately should be the author of a measure such as the gentleman has introduced.

I am sure that the American people generally share the view which the gentleman has expressed to the effect that they do not want us to give up our right to determine matters by a majority vote. It is regrettable indeed that here just within the last 24 hours this Congress by a majority of four or five spoke its will, but its will was not carried into effect because of the fact that more than a simple majority was required. Understandably that is extremely difficult for the American people to comprehend. I feel certain that they will support the gentleman in the position he has taken. I hope the leadership on the Democratic side, as the gentleman has said, will give an early hearing to this measure and thrash out this question.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman very much for his kind remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 4 minutes.

ARGENTINA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes, and also that I may revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, less than a year ago, I stood here on the floor of this House and denounced the Export-Import Bank hand-out of \$125,000,000 to Dictator Peron, of Argentina.

On that occasion, in the statement to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 6, page 7637, I said this:

Peron, the tyrant, the steadfast supporter of the Nazi-Fascist axis, represents everything against which Americans laid down their lives in World War II. Does anyone contend there is freedom in Argentina today? On the contrary, Dictator Peron has strangled free speech, freedom to assemble, and freedom of the press. Yet when this enemy of freedom faces a financial crisis, a crisis that could well end his tyranny, the tax dollars of the citizens of this country are rushed to his rescue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote from a dispatch which appeared in the newspapers of this country on May 27, 1950:

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA.—The evening paper La Epoca suggests that Representative H. R. Gross, Republican, of Iowa, be investigated by the United States Senate "because if he is not a Communist or a fellow traveler he must be something very akin."

La Epoca bitterly attacked the Waterloo, Iowa, Congressman Friday for his floor speech denouncing the recent credit to Argentina as a "betrayal and moral sell-out."

Gross deliberately lies when he maintains the Argentine Government suppressed freedom of speech, freedom of meeting, and freedom of the press, the newspaper said.

Mr. Speaker, events of the past few weeks have established conclusively the identity of the liar.

La Prensa, one of the oldest and probably the most influential newspaper in Argentina, has been strangled into si-

lence by a violent, Peron-inspired strike. This great newspaper has been throttled because it dared oppose the dictatorship and tyranny of Peron and his henchmen. The same fate befell another Argentine paper in Cordoba. And so it appears that only those Argentine newspapers which lick the boots of Peron and mouth his decrees will continue to be published.

The last vestige of individual freedom hangs by a thread in Argentina. It will be gone if freedom to speak and print the truth is now trampled underfoot.

Mr. Speaker, our State Department has draped a friendly arm around Peron for a long time. In one of those time-wasting promotions, whereby Members of the House and Senate sit in the Library of Congress before striped pants and brass hat potentates of the administration, I asked Acheson the following question: "Did the State Department support the recent loan to Dictator Peron of Argentina?"

Acheson replied: "Certainly."

Earlier, Assistant Secretary of State Edward Miller, attempting to justify the hand-out to Peron, was quoted as voicing the hope that the United States "can learn to work with the Government of Argentina."

At that time, I inquired that if we were supposed to learn to work with as dictatorial a regime as that in Argentina, why we were not told that we should learn to work with Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

Now Peron's stooge sheet, *La Epoca*, has labeled as "lamentable impertinence" a statement by the same Assistant Secretary of State Edward Miller to the effect that the strangling of *La Prensa* hindered the United States Government in its "positive efforts of cooperation" with Argentina.

I wonder, therefore, if Mr. Miller has now learned the hard way what many of us learned long ago through the application of common sense and decency that it is preposterous even to imagine that we can learn to work with or do business with dictators of any stripe.

Whether he has learned or not, the tragedy remains that Miller, Acheson, and others in the administration approved use of the funds of American taxpayers to aid the tyranny of Dictator Peron.

We can mark down this revolting spectacle as one more costly mistake and moral sell-out by the spineless State Department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on the statement made a few moments ago by the gentleman from California [Mr. McKinnon]. I am sorry the gentleman has left the Chamber. I do not know whether he includes me in his legislative Who's Who, but I was one of those Republicans who voted to put curbs on the speculators in the commodity-exchange markets. I have not forgotten that in 1 year alone in this country the grain gamblers traded in approximately 27,000,000,000 bushels of grain, 22,000,000,000 of which was nonexistent. In other words, in that same year less than 5,000,000,000 bushels of

grains of all kinds were actually produced in this country. I dislike having the gentleman from California [Mr. McKinnon] attempt to load on the Republican Party the failure to pass restrictive legislation on the grain gamblers of this country. The fact remains that there is a Democratic majority in the Congress and in the House of Representatives and there was last year to an even greater extent when that proposal was before the Congress.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keating] stated a few moments ago, you on the Democratic side must bear responsibility for the measures that you bring in; you have the majority; you can pass that legislation if you want to pass it.

If the story is that the southern Democrats did not vote with you on that occasion perhaps you had better do something about it. Throughout most of the Southern States, as I understand, Democratic patronage is still being distributed. If it is the southern Democrats who are defeating your administration proposals on the floor of the House, why do you not frankly say so and take the action that is necessary to read them out of the party if you do not want them in?

ROCKFORD, ILL., POLL ON FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I recently noticed an Associated Press dispatch in the New York Times that the city of Rockford, Ill., which has a population of some 90,000, is planning to submit to its voters at a referendum on April 3, two questions dealing with foreign policy. According to the AP dispatch, it is expected that there will be some 40,000 ballots printed which will contain two questions as follows:

1. Shall the United States immediately adopt a policy to defend itself and its possessions and give limited assistance to free nations?

2. Shall the United States continue to follow its present world-wide foreign policy and lend unlimited assistance to free nations?

The newspaper account states that the voters will check the ballots to show which of the two courses they favor with the results to be forwarded to Congress for its guidance.

While I do not make any charge that there is unfair or impure design behind a vote of this kind posed as the questions are, it does seem to me to be important to point out that the questions that the city of Rockford proposes to put before the voters are phrased in such a way as to make a mockery of the proposed test. I invite your attention to the phrasing of the second question which predicates in the question itself implications of fact that I submit are false; namely, the question implies that the United States is at present following a foreign policy of rendering unlimited assistance to for-

eign nations. That is absolutely incorrect. We all know that the United States is not now, never has been, and never will be, engaged in rendering unlimited assistance to our friends abroad. Both the executive branch and the Congress are continually reviewing our foreign policy commitments in conformity with our own budgetary limitations and financial requirements, and are constantly imposing limits on the amount of monetary aid that may be extended. Congress, itself, is constantly engaged in paring down programs for foreign spending even after they have been cut back by the President from original submissions to him. It is ludicrous to suggest that anyone in his right mind would ever vote to give unlimited assistance to any kind of a project domestic or foreign.

If such a policy were followed, Congress could simply abdicate its functions and all that would be required would be the passage of authorization and appropriation bills providing open-ended authorizations or appropriations available in any amount desired by those spending the money for the particular purposes named. Such a thought is too ridiculous to even bear discussion.

Now let us look at the alternative question, "Shall the United States adopt a policy to defend its possessions and give limited assistance to free nations?" Please note the phrase, "Shall the United States adopt a policy." Here again is distortion of fact. Are we not now doing exactly what this question suggests we might start doing? Would anyone have the temerity to suggest that our present policy, in addition to rendering limited assistance to free nations, is not dedicated to defending ourselves and our possessions? Of course, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are now doing and it is not presenting proper questions to the voters to suggest we should adopt such a policy.

If the AP press account is accurate, therefore, I submit that the city officials of Rockford, Ill., are not submitting fair questions to the people in submitting these, "When did you stop beating your wife?" type of alternative choices found in these, probably unintentionally, trick questions to be put to the Illinois voters. If the City of Rockford, Ill., wishes sincerely to test the voters' attitude on foreign policy, then it should not state incorrect premises in forming the questions that it proposes and thus lead the electorate up a blind alley in believing that its choice on the referendum will represent any helpful addition to public opinion on the crucial issues in the world today.

These observations of mine are offered constructively in the hope that questions that fairly and properly present the issues will be submitted.

ROCKFORD, ILL., GETS TEST ON FOREIGN POLICY IN VOTE

ROCKFORD, ILL., March 2.—Rockford, population 92,503, is going to tell Congress how its voters feel about foreign policy.

The city will put the issues of the great debate squarely up to its residents in a referendum April 3. The poll of sentiment will be taken as part of the city's aldermanic elections. Some 40,000 ballots, representing

the number of registered voters in Rockford, will carry these two questions:

"1. Shall the United States immediately adopt a policy to defend itself and its possessions and give limited assistance to free nations?"

"2. Shall the United States continue to follow its present world-wide foreign policy and lend unlimited assistance to free nations?"

Voters are to check the ballots to show which of the two courses they favor. The result will be forwarded to Congress for guidance.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the New York Times.

Mrs. KELLY of New York asked and was given permission to extend her remarks.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article showing the great contribution Texas is making to the defense effort.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of Kansas (at the request of Mr. BUFFETT) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the transcription of a radio broadcast made by Earl Godwin yesterday.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN PELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. VELDE) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include additional matter.

Mr. CORBETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. RHODES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorials and newspaper articles.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KIRWAN (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Hal Boyle on This Is a Great Day for the Non-Irish.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an article on the passing of O. S. Warden, an editorial from the Great Falls Tribune; and in the other a speech by Sean McBride, Minister for External Affairs for the Republic of Ireland, given at the National Press Club on yesterday.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MORRIS) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. DORN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in today's Washington News entitled "Housecleaning Now," a statement by Dr. Alan Valentine.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article written by Dr. Carroll and appearing in a recent issue of the Harvard Public Health Alumni Bulletin.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. BUFFETT, for 5 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 28. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 47. An act for the relief of Madeleine Quarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 60. An act for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 77. An act for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 119. An act for the relief of Joseph Girard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 124. An act for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 155. An act for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 166. An act for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 178. An act for the relief of Zdenek Marek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 181. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 210. An act authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 214. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 216. An act to amend section 631b of title 5, United States Code, by adding a new subsection to be cited as subsection (c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 223. An act for the relief of Azy Ajderian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 243. An act for the relief of Dewey Pickett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 249. An act for the relief of Ruzena Pelantova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 259. An act to fix the responsibilities of the Disbursing Officer and of the Auditor of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 261. An act to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 262. An act to amend section 3 of an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia, approved February 11, 1929, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 276. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander V. Papanicolaou and his wife, Emilia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 277. An act for the relief of Lily Pfannenschmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 300. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 336. An act authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first Monday in February of each year as National Children's Dental Health Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 348. An act for the relief of Jacoba van Dorp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 353. An act relating to the time for publication of the Official Register of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 356. An act for the relief of Edith Winifred Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 361. An act for the relief of Herk Visnapuu and his wife, Naima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 363. An act for the relief of Irmgard Kohler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Wiernik and her daughter, Genevieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 379. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 417. An act for the relief of Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 427. An act for the relief of Nene Baalstad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 451. An act for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 463. An act for the relief of Alice de Bony de Lavergne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 488. An act to increase the fee of jurors in condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 490. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 494. An act to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 516. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine (a) the powers of said corporation, (b) the right to the use of the name "The American Legion" and "American Legion"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 529. An act for the relief of Humayag Dildilian and his daughter, Lucy Dildilian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 548. An act for the relief of Freidoum Jalayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 568. An act for the relief of George W. Purdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 587. An act for the relief of Sotirios Christos Roumanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 631. An act for the relief of Conrad Xavier Charles Maurer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 648. An act for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 666. An act for the relief of George Panteras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 683. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 695. An act for the relief of William Greville Birkett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 822. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 824. An act for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2268. An act to authorize the payment of interest on series E savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

287. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska', as amended"; was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committee were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 163. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 99; without amendment (Rept. No. 267). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 196. Joint Resolution to continue for a temporary period the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2394. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts; with amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2829. A bill to exempt the members and certain employees of the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights from the operation of certain conflict-of-interest statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1. An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3244. A bill to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to computation of accredited service of duly designated official representatives of national organizations of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3245. A bill to provide that leaves of absence granted duly designated official representatives of national organizations of postal employees in respect to organizational duties be construed as allowable service in determining eligibility for promotion; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3246. A bill to establish a chiropody section in the Army Medical Service Corps and in the Navy Medical Service Corps, and to authorize appointments to such corps from among graduates of accredited schools of chiropody; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3247. A bill to provide for emergency furlough or leave for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States in the event of the death of a member of such person's immediate family; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3248. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a 20-percent increase in annuities, pensions, and certain lump sums payable under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3249. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a 20-percent increase in the survivor annuities and insurance lump sum payable under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3250. A bill to provide that certain determinations with respect to Federal assistance for school construction may be based on school attendance figures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, instead of for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 3251. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to require that all decisions of the Supreme Court shall be participated in by the full Court, and that any vacancies or absences in the membership of the Court shall be temporarily filled by circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3252. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child-labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 3253. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3254. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the labeling of soaps and detergents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3255. A bill to enlarge the definition of cosmetic contained in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by removing the exception made in the case of soap; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3256. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by requiring

the labeling of bread or rolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, by providing for the regulation of chemical additives in food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3258. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as amended, to provide reimbursement for fines paid and for lost pay and other benefits upon correction of military and naval records; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3259. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to raise the income limit for admission to low-rent housing provided under the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend section 6 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, so that for purposes of passage of a resolution of disapproval by either House of Congress the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of such House will not be required; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 3262. A bill to provide for the payment of certain unrecovered costs incurred by producers of strategic and critical minerals and metals for use in the prosecution of World War II; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 3263. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district courts with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3264. A bill to increase by \$30 per month the retired pay and disability retirement pay of enlisted persons of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 3265. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to provide for the payment of certain compensation to William E. Cook; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to proposed discriminatory and excessive in-

creases in the Federal tax on wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, relative to requesting Congress not to enact any legislation or make any appropriations for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to instructing delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to requesting legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to requesting Congress to admit Hawaii as a State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to requesting Congress to remove all racial restrictions on the privilege of naturalization for citizenship in the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3266. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Harman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 3267. A bill for the relief of Zora Krizan, also known as Zorardo Krizanova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 3269. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vasilios Georgantas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 3270. A bill for the relief of Anthony N. Goralep; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3271. A bill for the relief of Toshiaki Shimada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3272. A bill for the relief of King Mayberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3273. A bill for the relief of George F. Willis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3274. A bill for the relief of John A. Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3275. A bill for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Blasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Narcisso and Slava Zomberlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 3278. A bill for the relief of Enrico Colandria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3279. A bill for the relief of Magda Erdossi Frosh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eml Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Fanny Tshrintge Papan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

125. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Letter from Richard H. Nelson, vice president, Herman Nelson Division, American Air Filter Co., Inc., Moline, Ill., regarding capital gains tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

126. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

127. Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for Congress to pass antipoll tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

128. Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for the President and the Congress to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

129. Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for Congress to pass law to grant a special name to a new United States Veterans' hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

130. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

131. Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress for legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the committee on the Judiciary.

132. By Mr. LOVRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress, the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Animal Industry to continue its cooperation with the Joint United States-Mexican Aftosa Commission in its program of combating and ultimate eradication of the dread disease among livestock known as foot-and-mouth disease, prevalent in the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

133. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to require military service of all qualified citizens without regard for race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Armed Services.

134. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to ward off foreign invasion of fundamental American rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

135. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress to repeal section 241 of title 25, United States Code, annotated, known as the Indian liquor law and all laws or parts of laws in respect thereto which would treat an Indian differently than any other citizen of the State of South Dakota and of the United States of America; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

136. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision for payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the States and other lesser political subdivisions whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

137. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress to propose and adopt an amendment to section 11 of the act of Congress of February 22, 1889; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

138. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for the use of the State of South Dakota in relieving counties in said State from the burden imposed by nontaxable Indian land and to direct that such funds be used for welfare, law enforcement, road construction, and health, in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

139. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, Office of the Chief Engineer, to continue its investigations and work to prevent future waste of water from the Artesian Basin by sealing existing wells within the areas to be flooded by the Missouri River dams in South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works.

140. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota opposing and protesting the proposal of the United States Treasury to impose a tax on State and municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

141. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, proposing that the United States delegation to the United Nations propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

142. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, advocating facilitation of citizenship for parents of deceased members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pecoraro and Scanlan, New York City, N. Y., relative to Plymouth Brethren IV, Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1951

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

Almighty God, with whom there is no shadow that is caused by turning, conscious that in this rough and rushing world there is upon us constantly the hot breath of malice and envy, of evil tempers and thoughts, in this quiet moment of devotion breathe on us, breath of God, fanning to flame our smoldering faith that the cross which weights the wings of our spirits may be consumed. As those into whose unworthy hands has been placed the crying needs of stricken humanity, may the thoughts of our minds and the sympathies of our hearts, the words of our lips and the decisions of our deliberations be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 15, 1951, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning later today and continuing through Wednesday of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to continue its hearings on the railway dispute this afternoon.

PUBLIC HEALTH ASSISTANCE TO STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 445) 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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the debate between now and 2 o'clock will be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the pending bill, Senate bill 445, and will be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does not the majority leader feel that a quorum should be called, the time to be charged to both sides, so that Senators may be here during the debate?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is agreeable to me to have a quorum called. The only point is that Senators seem to wait for quorum calls, and much time is wasted. We were trying to get away from having a quorum call at the beginning of the session. However, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll, the time consumed to be taken out of the time allotted to both sides.

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

Alken	Hayden	Martin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Byrd	Hoey	Mundt
Cain	Holland	Murray
Capehart	Humphrey	Neely
Carlson	Hunt	O'Connor
Case	Ives	Pastore
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kem	Schoepfel
Douglas	Kerr	Smathers
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworschak	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eaton	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	McCarran	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Watkins
Frear	McFarland	Wherry
Fulbright	McKellar	Wiley
George	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Magnuson	
Green	Malone	

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate in attendance on the sessions of the Committee on Organized Crime in New York City.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Chair is ready to recognize either the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] or the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], if they wish to occupy some time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we have had two speakers on this side—

Mr. DIRKSEN. We may have only one.

Mr. HILL. If that is the case, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I expect to address my remarks to the statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I should like very much that, if possible, he will remain in the Senate while I am making my remarks.

Mr. President, in supporting this measure I desire to emphasize certain points, particularly because I was so much impressed by the argument made by the Senator from Illinois yesterday with regard to the necessity of economy in Federal expenditures. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Illinois said that in a time such as this, when we are faced with enormous expenditures for national defense purposes, we should not spend money for anything which is not necessary and which is in addition to essential defense services. Therefore in analyzing the situation I think we must understand clearly what the pending bill aims to do.

As I analyze the bill—and I hope I can convince my good friend from Illinois that there is soundness in the position I am taking—we are not starting anything new. Senate bill 445 is merely an extension of a proved program already in existence. In certain sections of the country local health units are well established, and we all agree that the local health unit is the grass-roots foundation for any program to improve our national health. Such units have met with remarkable success in many ways in past years, and this bill merely provides a practical procedure for extending the local health units through comprehensive State plans.

Mr. President, it will take time—a number of years—to develop the State