By Mr. MORANO:
H. R. 3941. A bill to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
By Mr. FORD:
H. R. 3942. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
By Mr. GOODWIN:
H. R. 3943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mr. HAND:
H. R. 3944. A bill authorizing the prosecution of the work of improvement for purposes of beach erosion control at Atlantic City, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Works.
By Mr. HARRIS:
H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DEANE:
H. Res. 218. Resolution authorizing the Committee on House Administration to increase the telephone and telegraph allowance for Members of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; to the Committee on House Administration.
By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. Res. 219. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the address of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur delivered to the Congress on April 19, 1951; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANFUSO:
H. R. 3945. A bill for the relief of Cosmo Casati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BECKWORTH:
H. R. 3946. A bill for the relief of Master Sgt. Orval Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ELLSWORTH:
H. R. 3947. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an allotment of certain land to Pauline Acusta Dumont; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
H. R. 3948. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an allotment of certain land to Jasper Paloumis; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
By Mr. GILLETTE:
H. R. 3949. A bill for the relief of Angelo Bosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 3950. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3951. A bill for the relief of Leon Alex Piechowiak, alias Leon Piechowiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. R. 3952. A bill for the relief of Ivan R. Wold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WHITTEN:
H. R. 3953. A bill for the relief of Chan Toy Har; 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:

264. By Mr. CANFIELD: Letter from the Honorable Walter T. Margetts, Jr., treasurer of the State of New Jersey, opposing Secretary Snyder's recommendation that the excise tax on distilled spirits be increased from $9 to $12 per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

265. Also, resolution adopted by the New Jersey Highway Users Conference, Trenton, N. J., opposing Secretary of the Treasury Snyder's proposal to double the Federal gasoline tax rate and increase the Federal excise taxes on new automobiles to 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

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

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

Our Father God, to the white altar of Thy grace in the brightness of this new morning we come, bowing in our ignorance and weakness, praying for strength and wisdom to face with courage the somber specters that stalk the darkened earth.

Through the angry emotions of present days help us to seek not the vindication of our opinions, but the truth that shall make us free. Save us from presumptive pride that feigns an understanding that it does not possess. If we secretly covet the superior gifts of others, if we inwardly rejoice in the failure of others, if we give hospitality to thoughts that debase and degrade, if we are satisfied with anything short of our best, if we have readily and perhaps eagerly believed the worst about others, if we have judged our fellows on flimsy and perhaps false reports; if in any human relationship we have been untrue, unfair, unbrotherly: O Thou, who takest away the sin of the world, forgive us, cleanse us, renew us, restore our souls and lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy Name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 2, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing for a period of 10 days, on official business of the Committee on Armed Services.

On request of Mr. JENNER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. KILGORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which is studying amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL DEPUTY SERGEANT AT ARMS FOR A LIMITED PERIOD

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a paper designating Darrell St. Claire as Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms for a limited period.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1951.

In accordance with authority conferred on me by Senate resolution agreed to December 17, 1889 (Senate Journal 47, 51-1, December 17, 1889), I hereby appoint Darrell St. Claire a Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate for the period from May 3, 1951, to May 7, 1951, to perform in my absence any and all duties required of or devolving upon the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate by law or by the rules or orders of the Senate.

JOSEPH C. DUKE,
Sergeant at Arms,
United States Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

routine business, without debate and without speeches.

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

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. AIKEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint resolution eulogizing the achievements of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

"Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur brought glory and renown to the military personnel under his command during World War II with distinction and honor to himself and country; and

"Whereas by his efficient administration of postwar Japan, that country is now ready to accept her right place among the other free nations of the world; and

"Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur has fought a distinguished and able fight in Korea with but limited means at his disposal, and has shown himself to be one of the greatest generals of our country; and

"Whereas we learn with sincere regret of his recall from his post of command of all United Nations forces: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That we extend to Gen. Douglas MacArthur our sincere and heartfelt recognition of his leadership and our pride in his accomplishments, our faith in his integrity and our confidence in his loyalty to all who served under his command, and that we voice that faith by acclamation and inscribe this resolution in the acts of the general assembly of 1951; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send to Gen. Douglas MacArthur a certified copy of this resolution and certified copies of this resolution to the members of the congressional delegation of Vermont.

"WALLACE M. FAY,
"Speaker of the house of representatives.
"JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
"President of the senate.

"Approved April 27, 1951.
"LEE E. EMERSON,
"Governor."

RESOLUTIONS OF NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions I have received from the Nebraska Stock Growers Association. These resolutions deal with the necessity for maintaining our economic stability, keeping our Nation strong, and avoiding unnecessary and restrictive regulations on industry, particularly the livestock industry. I agree with the sentiments expressed in these resolutions 100 percent.

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

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution I

"Declaration of policy and program

"To the fundamental American principles of democracy, as expressed in our two great declarations of American principles—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America—we enthusiastically give our eternal allegiance. Those principles are America. They brought about the development of this country to the greatness that has been hers.

"We abhor all efforts to take from any one of the principles that make our country. We condemn every one and every effort to destroy or injure any one of these principles.

"The current international crisis and the national emergency resulting therefrom is being felt by every individual and every home in the country. This serious problem confronting every American must be met with foresight, with fearlessness, and with sound common sense.

"Our Nation is preparing for a state of total mobilization for war; American boys are giving their lives on the battlefields of Korea. Yet with international diplomatic negotiations in full swing, a stalemate of power politics appears to have been reached which may continue for years to come. Such a situation, if prolonged indefinitely, may tax the strength of this Nation beyond endurance unless a definite long-range policy is established by our Federal Governmert which will set up a sound and practical goal for which we must strive.

"The productive ability of America under the free-enterprise system in all fields of endeavor stands today as the real bulwark against the aggression threatening our freedom. The American people can maintain this position only so long as the economy of this Nation remains strong. We cannot continue to make other nations strong by programs which will make our Nation weak.

"On the home front we condemn waste and extravagance in our Federal Government; we oppose the principles of price controls, subsidy payments and other governmental regulations not compatible with our American way of life.

"We therefore petition the Congress and the President of the United States to outline a policy and to establish certain definite principles indicating the extent to which this Nation will attempt to control through military influence (I) the protection of this Nation and the hemisphere against aggression; (II) to prevent the growth of communistic influence throughout the world; and (III) a program consistent with the economic stability of the United States over a long period of time.

"We believe this will contribute to the complete support of our citizenship and to the lasting protection of our freedom."

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution II

"Controls

"Whereas this country has, during the past few months, again entered upon a period of governmental controls over civilian life and economy; and

"Whereas the experiences undergone during the similar period of controls throughout the wartime are still fresh in our minds, we now express our beliefs and our position upon these questions injected into our lives by the system of controls; and

"Whereas we know, as we have always known and as experience has demonstrated that the livestock industry is one element of our economy that is not susceptible to Government controls because they are neither practicable nor enforceable. And we further know that such efforts to control will certainly result in disruption of supplies and a disgraceful black-market condition; and

"Whereas we know that not only is it impractical to establish or attempt to enforce ceiling prices on live animals but any effort to follow such a route would inevitably injure and retard production—and increased production is one of the two principal answers to the major question; and

"Whereas the other principal answer is economy in government. To stabilize our economy, unnecessary expenditure of public funds by the Government must be stopped; and

"Whereas foolish regulations, such as the contemplated prohibition of calf slaughter, allocations, and the threat or inspiration of rumors and threats of such regulations must be stopped. Every such regulation or threat is an obstacle to increased production and an influence toward reduced production when the opposite is the desired goal: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association is opposed to Government controls on our industry, as they are not only completely unenforceable but lead to confusion and shortages."

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution III

"Ranch and farm labor

"Whereas it is an obvious fact that the production of livestock is an essential industry because from livestock comes meat, leather, pharmaceutical supplies, and other strategic materials requisite to the success of the vast programs being undertaken by our country and the essential character of our industry must be recognized by the Government just as is every other industry engaged in the production of strategic materials; and

"Whereas the adoption by this country of a program of military training and the mobilization of men for such military service creates a serious question affecting the ability of our industry to produce livestock in quantities required by the Nation; and

"Whereas, although we do not request or expect any special or particular treatment or consideration, we do request and expect treatment of our labor problems on the same basis as is accorded all other strategic industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association respectfully requests the Federal Government, the State, and the Selective Service Board, in its administration of the laws, present and to be adopted, relating to military service, give due consideration to the character of the work being done by men in our industry and that essential keymen be not withdrawn from their important, strategic work for the military service, just as such consideration is given to similar men in other strategic industries."

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF INTERNATIONAL FALLS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution unanimously adopted by the City Council of the City of International Falls, Minn., at its regular meeting on March 19, 1951, urging immediate hearings on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of International Falls and surrounding territory are vitally interested in the St. Lawrence waterway project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of International Falls in regular session assembled, That we urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to call immediate hearings on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to members of said Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—RESOLUTION OF BROWN COUNTY RURAL ELECTRICAL ASSOCIATION, SLEEPY EYE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Brown County Rural Electrical Association, Sleepy Eye, Minn., at its annual meeting on March 8, 1951, in support of the St. Lawrence waterway.

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

Whereas the Brown County Rural Electrical Association is today holding its annual meeting at Sleepy Eye, Minn.; and

Whereas said association represents approximately 2,800 farm families located in Brown County and parts of Nicollet and Sibley Counties, Minn.; and

Whereas we believe that the development of the St. Lawrence waterway will provide a reasonable and economical means of transportation for the Midwest; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence waterway will provide electric power in the northeastern part of the United States: Now, therefore, we delegates to the 1951 annual meeting of the Brown County REA strongly urge our Representatives in Congress and in the Senate to strongly support the plan now proposed for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to every Minnesota Member of Congress and to our two United States Senators.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association, Danube, Minn., at its annual meeting on March 21, 1951, urging the development of the Missouri Valley Authority and the construction of transmission lines.

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

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY RESOLUTION

Whereas the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association is today, March 21, 1951, holding its annual meeting at Danube, Minn.; and

Whereas said association represents approximately 2,200 farm families located in Renville County and parts of Nicollet, Sibley and Chippewa Counties in Minnesota; and

Whereas an ample supply of power at fair prices is essential to the operation and growth of our association; and

Whereas the Federal Government is building dams on the Missouri River and has established the Missouri Valley Authority; and

Whereas it has been proven that an abundance of economical power from said Missouri River can be transmitted to the territory served by the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association; and

Whereas hearings have been held before a House Appropriations Committee to consider the appropriation of funds for the construction of a transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation for approval by the Department of Interior in the territory served by the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we as delegates to the 1951 annual meeting of the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association strongly urge Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota to give their whole-hearted support to the development of the Missouri Valley Authority and to consider construction of transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior into the areas served by our Association; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the Minnesota Congressmen and Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Brown County Rural Electrical Association, Sleepy Eye, Minn., at its annual meeting on March 8, 1951, in support of the Missouri Valley Authority.

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

Whereas the Brown County Rural Electrical Association is today holding its annual meeting at Sleepy Eye, Minn.; and

Whereas said association represents approximately 2,800 farm families located in Brown County and parts of Nicollet and Sibley Counties, Minn.; and

Whereas an ample supply of power at a fair price is essential to the operation and growth of our association; and

Whereas, because of the tremendous growth in the use of power by members of our association, available sources of power can no longer supply our needs at a fair price; and

Whereas the Federal Government is building dams on the Missouri River and has established the Missouri Valley Authority; and

Whereas it has been proven that abundant and economical power from said Missouri River can be transmitted to the territory served by the Brown County REA; and

Whereas hearings have been held before a House Appropriations Committee to consider the appropriation of funds for the construction of a transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior in the territory served by the Brown County REA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we delegates to the 1951 annual meeting of the Brown County REA strongly urge Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota to give their whole-hearted support to the development of the Missouri Valley Authority and to the construction of transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior into the area served by our association; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the Minnesota Congressmen and Senators.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3297. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 309).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, Thursday, May 3, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 300. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart;

S. 451. An act for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic;

S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek;

S. 568. An act for the relief of George W. Purdy;

S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs;

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;

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; and

S. 998. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1428. A bill for the relief of John Tzanavaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1429. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

S. 1430. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Barbourville, Ky.; and

S. 1431. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Pineville, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Public Roads to designate a transcontinental highway system to be known as the Crozet Superhighway; to the Committee on Public Works.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

A statement prepared by him regarding the fifteenth anniversary of the Public Affairs Committee.

By Mr. WILEY:

An article entitled "Preparedness," written by him and published in the May 1951 issue of the magazine the Reserve Officer, referring to a long-range program for American preparedness.

By Mr. LODGE:

An editorial entitled "A Critical Situation," written by Charles A. Parker and published in the Civil Air Patrol News of April 23, 1951.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

An article entitled "Ships Aiding Russia Mortgaged to United States," written by Helen Delich, and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 29, 1951.

By Mr. ECTON:

An editorial entitled "City Folks and Meat Prices," published in the Bozeman (Mont.) Daily Chronicle of April 27, 1951.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Letter regarding instruction of young people in better citizenship, written by Charles Kress, of Binghamton, N. Y.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

An editorial entitled "Why Does Labor Act That Way?" written by Edwin A. Leahy, and published in the April issue of Extension magazine.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF POLAND'S DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION (MAY 3, 1791)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I had intended to read into the RECORD a very brief statement, but in view of the fact that I must return to the hearing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement by me on the occasion of the anniversary of the enactment of Poland's democratic constitution on May 3, 1791.

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

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF POLAND'S DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION (MAY 3, 1791)

On this anniversary of the enactment of Poland's democratic and progressive constitution (May 3, 1791), it is a privilege indeed for me to add my voice to the many who are expressing warm-hearted recognition to Poland's splendid contribution to western Christian civilization.

Today, despite that magnificent record, Poland lies behind the iron curtain and those citizens of Poland behind that curtain and their friends and countrymen on this side of the water look to America as among those free nations who have not forgotten Poland's fate and the history of freedom she represents. We in Massachusetts number proudly among our citizens 53,000 men and women who were born in Poland and many others of direct Polish descent. We know at first hand what Poland and what freedom mean to them.

On this anniversary let us all, as Americans, remember the obligation and the opportunity that are ours—the opportunity and obligation of standing for the right of free men and women to remain free and to enjoy that life and liberty and chance for the pursuit of happiness that have since 1776 been the bond which has held us all together. It is those same ideals of freedom to which the Polish people still aspire and for which they long. Let us on this occasion dedicate ourselves to a ceaseless effort to help restore freedom where it has been lost and keep burning brightly the dream of a better day for those upon whom for a time the darkness of tyranny has descended. Let us hope and work and pray that with our help the people of Poland may again enjoy all those blessings of liberty to which they are so fully entitled.

WORLD MOVEMENT FOR WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—DISCOURSE BY HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII AND ARTICLE FROM AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago a very significant event occurred in the area of international relations in world politics, when His Holiness Pope Pius XII issued a statement to the delegates to the Fourth Congress of the World Movement for World Federal Government on April 6, 1951. In view of the importance of this statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Pope be followed by an article entitled "Pope Pius XII and World Federation" and written by Father Edward E. Conway, appearing in the April 28, 1951, issue of America.

There being no objection, the discourse by the Pope and the article from America were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF DISCOURSE BY HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII DURING AN AUDIENCE WITH DELEGATES TO THE FOURTH CONGRESS OF THE WORLD MOVEMENT FOR WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, APRIL 6, 1951

We are very appreciative of the deference you have displayed by this visit and we take pleasure in addressing you members of the World Movement for World Federal Government. We give you cordial greetings of welcome. Our lively interest in the cause of peace in the midst of a humanity so grievously tormented is well known to you. We have given frequent proof of this interest. That interest, moreover, is inherent in our mission. The maintenance or the reestablishment of peace has always been and always and increasingly will be the object of our constant solicitude. And if, too often, the results have been far from equal to our efforts and our acts, lack of success will never discourage us, so long as peace does not reign in the world. Faithful to the spirit of Christ, the church is striving and working for it with all her strength; she does this by her precepts and her exhortations, by her incessant activities and by her ceaseless prayers.

The church is indeed a power for peace, at least wherever are respected and appreciated at their true value the independence and the mission which the church holds from God, in those areas where no one seeks to make her the docile servant of a political egoism, and where she is not treated as an enemy. The church longs for peace, she strives incessantly for peace, and her heart is ever with those who, like her, desire peace and devote themselves to it. She knows also, and this is her duty, how to distinguish between the true and the false friends of peace.

The church desires peace, and therefore applies herself to the promotion of everything which, within the framework of the divine order, both natural and supernatural, contributes to the assurance of peace. Your movement, gentlemen, dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the church, nor better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate and illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances. It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race in which, for decades past, the peoples have been ruining themselves and draining their resources to no effect. You are of the opinion that this world political organization, in order to be effective, must be federal in form. If by this you understand that it should not be enmeshed in a mechanical unitarism, again you are in harmony with the principles of social and political life so firmly founded and sustained by the church. Indeed, no organization of the world could live if it were not harmonized with the whole complex of natural relations, with that normal organic order which rules the particular relations between men and men and between different peoples. If it does not do that, then, no matter what its structure may be, it will not be able to stand up and endure.

For this reason we are convinced that your first concern should be to establish solidly or to restore these fundamental principles in every field: national and constitutional; economic and social; cultural and moral:

In the national and constitutional fields: At the present time the life of nations is everywhere disintegrated by the blind worship of numerical strength. The citizen is the voter. But, as such, he is in reality nothing but one of the units, the total of which constitutes a majority or a minority, which the shifting of a few votes or even of a single one would suffice to reverse. As far as parties are concerned, he is of importance only for his voting value. No concern is shown for his position and part in his family and his profession.

In the economic and social fields: There is no organic and natural unity amongst producers; a condition that has obtained ever since quantitative utilitarianism, the sole consideration in the matter of net cost, became the one norm determining both the location of production and the distribution of labor, and since the idea of class, which artificially divides men in society, replaced the idea of cooperation within the professional community.

In the cultural and moral fields: Individual liberty, freed from all bonds and all laws, all objective and social values, is in reality only a death-dealing anarchy, especially in the education of the young.

Unless the universal political organization rests upon these indispensable foundations, there is risk of its being infected with the deadly germs of mechanical unitarism. We would like to invite those to reflect on this point, precisely from the federalist viewpoint, who dream of setting up a world parliament. Otherwise they would subject

themselves to the play of those disintegrating forces from which our political and social order has already suffered too much. They would only finish by adding one more legal automaton to the many others which threaten to stifle the nations and to reduce men to the condition of inert instruments.

Just as, therefore, if it is to be true to the spirit of federalism, the future world political organization cannot under any pretext allow itself to be caught up in the play of mechanical unitarism, so also it will enjoy effective authority only insofar as it safeguards and encourages everywhere the life that is proper to a healthy human community, to a society in which all the members cooperate together for the good of the whole humanity.

What a fund of moral steadfastness, intelligent foresight and capacity for adjustment this world authority will have to possess, qualities more than ever necessary in those critical moments when, in the face of malevolence, people of good will must resort to its authority. After all the proofs—trials—of the past and present, would anyone dare to say that the current resources of government and politics are adequate? In truth, it is impossible to solve the problem of a world political organization without being willing to leave the beaten path from time to time, without appealing to the witness of history, to a sane social philosophy, and even to a certain divining of the creative imagination.

There, gentlemen, is a vast field of work, study and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to you our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray God to grant you His light and help in the performance of your task.

[From America of April 28, 1951]

PIUS XII AND WORLD FEDERATION

(By Edward A. Conway, S. J.)

The more I study the April 6 discourse of the Holy Father, in which he gave his approbation to the World Federalist movement, the warmer grows my sense of satisfaction. As I write, I have before me the text of his address in French and two unofficial English translations, neither of which can be considered definitive. I hope that we shall soon have an authorized English version, because the discourse, being the first formal papal pronouncement on world government, has profound significance for all students of world affairs. Scholars will be analyzing and interpreting it for months to come. They should have the authentic thought of the Holy Father to work on.

The original text richly repays detailed study. At the very first reading it was obvious to me that here was more than just another extempore greeting to a group of pilgrims. I thought, as I read, that the Holy Father must have worked over that address as carefully as he did over any of his famed Christmas allocutions. I have since been told that His Holiness confided to one of his auditors afterward that he had stayed up late the night before to complete the text of his discourse, and that previously he had spent many hours in consultation about it. It seems obvious that the Holy Father had determined to make a major-policy pronouncement, and just as obvious that he had determined to use the World Federalist Congress as the occasion for it.

Some of the satisfaction that warms me comes, I confess, from personal considerations. I have been hard pressed at times to defend my presence (with a Catholic bishop) on the National Advisory Board of United World Federalists, Inc. UWF is the largest membership group among the 70 constituent organizations in 27 countries which make up the World Movement for World Federal Government. The unfortunate and, for me, embarrassing fact is that many American Catholics have been turned against world federalism, and specifically against United World Federalists, by the absurd charge that the entire federalist movement is a Communist conspiracy. Almost daily during the past 3 years I have received letters from Catholics—some inquiring, some indignant—about my part in the federalist movement. It would have been much easier for me to answer them if the Holy Father had ever made a clear-cut and quotable statement dealing directly with world federal government. Unfortunately for me and other Catholic federalists, up to April 6, 1951, he had not.

It was always possible, of course, to prove that a Catholic could be a Catholic and a federalist. But it was necessary to string together texts from the Pope's Christmas allocutions—a hint here and a hint there—sufficient, however, to prove to the unprejudiced that "the new world order" desired by the Pope was actually some form of world federal government. But it was an unsatisfactory business at best, complicated and prohibitively time consuming.

I tried another tack some time ago by arguing not from textual but from circumstantial evidence. On November 11, 1948, the Holy Father had addressed 300 members of the European Union of Federalists at Castel Gandolfo. EUF is a federation of European federalist groups, and is closely alined with the World Movement for World Federal Government. The Holy Father told the European federalists that it was "high time" to establish a European union. "Some," he added, "are even asking themselves whether it is not already too late."

My World Federalist friends, I reported, were much encouraged by the Holy Father's partial support:

"Even though the Holy Father, they reason, said nothing explicitly about world federation, his warm approval of European federation will surely give immense impetus to their movement and hasten thereby the larger development they desire."

I added—naively, I know now—that I was inclined to agree with my World Federalist friends. My article ended with the observation:

"American Catholics could make a distinctively Catholic and definitely valuable contribution to the World Federalist movement. It remains to be seen whether the Pope's Armistice Day address will inspire them to do so. At the very least we may expect the more perceptive among them to begin taking an interest in federalism, since it so obviously interests the Pope."

Earlier in the article I had warned the federalists that "Catholics are curiously and often callously indifferent to noninfallible papal pronouncements." But I was totally unprepared for and correspondingly appalled by what followed. Most of "the more perceptive Catholics" remained indifferent to federalism, while the less perceptive began to take what I must call a violent interest in the destruction of the whole movement.

Catholic newspapers reprinted the misrepresentations of Mervin K. Hart's rabidly nationalistic Economic Council Letter, and quoted approvingly from Joseph P. Kamp's We Must Abolish the United States, which asserts that the aims and objectives of the American Federalists add up to treason. Indeed, treasonous, traitorous, and unpatriotic were among the milder epithets hurled at Catholic Federalists by fellow-Catholics. For a time we dismissed these denunciations as being merely what Pius XII called in 1948 the aberrations of an intransigent nationalism which denies or spurns the common bonds linking the nations together.

It was not long, however, before similar attacks came from more responsible Catholic quarters, based only too obviously on the same poisonous sources. Moreover, authorized representatives of respectable Catholic organizations began to appear before State legislatures demanding the repeal of long-standing world-government resolutions. Thanks to this Catholic intervention, some legislatures either repealed or modified them.

United World Federalists, chief beneficiary of this Catholic interest in federalism, and much disturbed by it, asked its most prominent Catholic member to do something about it. He is Thomas H. Mahony, Boston attorney, former president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, now chairman of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs, and for 3 years chairman of the UWF policy committee. Mr. Mahony tried to lift the level of the debate by compiling Parallel Thinking, Catholic and Federalish, Upon the Organization of the World Peace. Under five headings: Disarmament; Security and Preparedness; National Sovereignty and its Limitation; Amendments of the United Nations Charter; A Federated World, he compared Catholic statements from St. Augustine to Pius XII with corresponding UWF proposals. Eschewing all argument, Mr. Mahony simply asked his readers to draw their own reasonable inferences from the comparison. The similarities were sensational.

The booklet was published last September (15 cents, Thomas H. Mahony, 10 State St., Boston 9, Mass.). But it seems to have made little impression in some Catholic communities—Baltimore, for example. Catholic antifederalism reached its apogee there with the appearance of the Baltimore edition of the Catholic Review of February 16, 1951. Under a screaming headline, "Catholics Backing Anti-Federalist Move," the diocesan weekly revealed—it must have had its own revelation—that "almost every Catholic in this archdiocese is expressing support of a resolution * * * up before the Maryland House of Delegates which voices strong objections to the idea of world government as proposed by the Federalists." The Maryland Action Guild, the Knights of Columbus, and the Catholic War Veterans were solidly lined up with the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Daughters of the American Revolution, Children of the American Revolution, the Minute Women of Maryland, and the Daughters of 1812. "The Federalist resolutions," said the Catholic spokesmen, "collided with Catholic patriotic principles." One Louis Carroll, speaking for the Maryland Action Guild, said that World Federalists were most surely moving into the footsteps of Lenin and Stalin (Catholic Review, February 23, 1951, p. 3).

Do you wonder that I, as a World Federalist, felt grateful relief and warm satisfaction when I read these words in the Holy Father's April 6 discourse:

"Your movement [the World Movement for a World Federal Government] dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the Church, or better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate or illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances. It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race."

That solemn approbation should end once and for all the argument as to whether a Catholic can be a Federalist. Whether it inspires Catholics to work actively in the Federalist movement remains, as I remarked once before, to be seen. For my part, I cannot recall a more forthright papal endorsement of any movement, either Catholic, or, as this happens to be, nonsectarian.

Some Catholics, of course, are already saying that the Pope approved only the general ideal of a far in the future world state,

not any concrete program for its proximate realization. None but nationalist diehards would deny that he was talking on April 6 to a definite group with a definite, even though not detailed, program. The Pope implied clearly enough, it seems to me, that the world political organization must be realized as rapidly as possible "if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race"—the current race, not one in the problematical future.

The world federal government which WMWFG proposes and which the Holy Father has endorsed is a strictly limited one. During its Roman congress its fourth, by the way, the movement outlined the powers of that government in its "Declaration to the foreign ministers of the four great powers, to all the governments of the nations, and to the world's war-weary peoples":

"The time has come when the nations and peoples of the world must create an all-inclusive world federal government which can guarantee to each nation security against attack by others. Such a government must have the power—

"1. To prohibit by law the right of nations to use force or the threat of force in international affairs.

"2. To make laws binding upon individuals and national governments prohibiting the construction or possession of armaments beyond that required for internal police purposes, and to administer an agreed schedule for universal disarmament.

"3. To maintain adequate and effective civilian inspection and police forces to assure that the world law affecting armaments is respected.

"4. To bring to trial in world courts any individuals and groups who conspire to build weapons of war in violation of world law."

Catholics who fear that a world state possessing those powers would swallow up their personal liberties overlook the world federalist proviso that—

"All powers not expressly delegated to the world federal government should be reserved to the nations and their peoples, thus leaving each nation its choice of its own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions."

In his Parallel Thinking, Thomas Mahony made it clear that "the proposals do not envisage a superstate in which nations would be merged and lose their identity and domestic autonomy—a unitary state or empire. They contemplate complete autonomy of each nation in its national or domestic field. They merely propose a limitation of the external authority or sovereignty of nations—the right to make war."

Absolute sovereignty, of course, is the motto emblazoned on the banners of the embattled Catholic opponents of world government. I very much fear that a mistaken notion about sovereignty inspires their charge that world federalism is opposed to Catholic patriotic principles. To put it bluntly, I am afraid that they have never accepted that traditional doctrine of the church with which, according to the Holy Father, the world federalist movement is actually in accord. What is that traditional doctrine? Pius XII forcefully defined it in his Christmas message of 1948:

"The Catholic doctrine on the state and civil society has always beeen based on the principle that, in keeping with the will of God, the nations form together a community with a common aim and common duties. Even when the proclamation of this principle and its practical consequences gave rise to violent reactions, the church denied her assent to the erroneous concept of an absolutely autonomous sovereignty divested of all social obligations."

Is it too much to hope that the Holy Father's latest interpretation of that principle and its practical consequence—the ceding to a world government of enough national sovereignty to save the world from catastrophic war—will not give rise to violent reactions? My modest hope is that it will inspire all American Catholics to study this remarkable document. Every one of its paragraphs is pregnant with meaning. Almost every one of its lines reminds one of more extended treatment of the same topic in other papal pronouncements.

I hope, too, that the Holy Father's discourse will arouse new interest in Guido Gonella's A World To Reconstruct. Cardinal Stritch's bishops' committee on the Pope's peace plan published it in 1944 through Bruce of Milwaukee. My esteemed associate, Father LaFarge, predicted at the time (America, September 5, 1944) that the book would produce "wide enlightenment." Would that it had. Signor Gonella, most authoritative interpreter of the mind of Pius XII on the problem of world order, may still be, in Father LaFarge's phrase, "strong medicine." But I question whether, in view of the Pope's recent pronouncement, he still is "much stronger medicine than most people in this country and most of our politicians are prepared to swallow." Is it too much to ask that a revised version of Gonella be published promptly?

In view of the widespread misapprehension that all World Federalists are Communist conspirators, it is unfortunate that in the story on the Pope's April 6 discourse distributed by the NC News Service his concluding remarks were omitted. I add them here to reassure and inspire all Catholic Federalists:

"Therein [solving the problem of a world political organization] lies a vast field of work, study, and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to your our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray God to grant you His light and His help in the performance of your task."

May thousands of American Catholics soon merit that benediction. May theirs be the mission of helping the World Federalists to skirt the pitfalls which His Holiness warned against in his cordial endorsement of their movement.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS AT MEETINGS OF THE ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, since the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee voted this morning to permit Members of the Senate who are not members of the committees to attend the current hearings on national defense policies, which they now have under consideration as a part of their agenda, it is obviously unnecessary for the Senate to take action upon the so-called Watkins-Ferguson resolution, Senate Resolution 137, as originally offered.

However, the junior Senator from Nebraska, speaking, he is sure, on behalf of many Members of the Senate, believes that the question of whether the committees should hold open, public hearings on matters which do not concern vital security subjects should be determined by the Senate. The Senate should make the final determination.

In order that there may be a clear-cut decision on the question, the junior Senator from Nebraska will move that the Senate do now consider Senate Resolution 137. The resolution is the so-called Watkins-Ferguson resolution.

Mr. President, I will be perfectly frank. If the Senate agrees to my motion, I will move that all after the word "Resolved," referring to the admission of Senators to the hearings, be stricken from the resolution, in view of the fact that such permission has now been granted and to insert in lieu thereof provisions directing open, public hearings, except on matters of vital security, as determined by a majority of the committees.

The junior Senator from Nebraska believes that the American people are entitled to direct, first-hand knowledge of the testimony as given by witnesses before the committees.

The country has heard a part of the story. Why should they not hear the rest of the story? The safe, sure way of getting the facts before the people is to permit the press and radio to report the proceedings directly as they occur and to admit as many people to the hearings as the hearing room will accommodate.

Mr. President, I have just come from the first session of the hearings which convened a short time ago. Never before have I had so many newspaper men rush up to me as when I came out of the door of the committee hearing room. They rushed up to me and asked, "What did he say? What did he say?" In the newspapers this evening, Mr. President, this man will be quoted, and that man will be quoted; this man will give his interpretation, and that man will give his interpretation. Either interpretation may be completely different from the intention of the direct testimony. I plead with Members of the Senate to think of what will happen.

I say most respectfully that there is no intention, in asking for hearings to violate any provisions of national security. Men of the caliber of MacArthur, the Secretary of State, and other trusted officials, who will testify before the committees, will not answer any question if the answer involves a violation of the security of the United States. Everyone knows that to be so. The fact has been demonstrated in previous hearings, which were held, for example, on the troops-to-Europe issue, or the so-called Wherry resolution. It has been demonstrated time and time again. Witnesses who were asked such questions, very modestly, humbly, and properly asked that they be permitted to answer such questions in executive session, and that was done. The same procedure could be followed in this case. By and large, the bulk of the testimony should be made public and should be available to the people of the United States.

Policies have been discussed. They have been laid on the table. We should

know whether there is backing for the policies proposed, because the people, through their Congress, are the ones who determine national defense policies. Of course, military questions are left to the military command, as they should be. All questions of national security should be left to them.

I have never had demonstrated to me more clearly than this morning, when I left the hearing room, how the press will try to get every grain of information they can get, to give it to the public. All that can properly be furnished to the public should be furnished to them in the form of direct testimony, reported directly by the press and radio, and only matters of security should be left to the executive session.

As I said, the country has heard a part of the story as it affects the national defense. They should now hear the rest of the story. The safe and sure way of getting the facts before the people is to permit the press and radio to report the proceedings directly as they occur, and to admit as many people to the hearing as the hearing room will accommodate.

Mr. President, I am not asking for a show. I am not asking that the hearings be held in a ball park. I am not asking for a burlesque affair. It was not a burlesque before, and it does not have to be a burlesque now. Under the able chairmanship of one of the finest Members of this body, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is known for his fairness, I will not worry about an open hearing, as he would conduct it, being classified as a burlesque show, or any other kind of show. The hearings will be conducted with respect and dignity. I hope the Senate will take the initiative before it is too late and give the press and the radio an opportunity to report to the public what they can report with respect to the great national defense policies, which the people must help to determine through their representatives in Congress.

It is not unusual to ask for public hearings by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. Both committees deal in matters affecting vitally the national security, and both committees are quite able to distinguish between matters which should be kept secret in the public interest and matters which should be made public in the public interest.

Secrecy in Government procedure is abhorrent to the American way. It is not the American way. Foreign policy and national defense policies of this Republic are, in the last analysis, made by the people. I am not complaining about the character or ability of those who constitute the two committees, or about their trustworthiness. But all the Members of the Senate and House who are duly elected by the people are the ones to form the defense policies of the country. In the United States the people rule; and if the people are to make the right decisions, they must have all the necessary facts to do so.

I say to Members of the Senate, including my good friend the majority leader—and I say this from the bottom of my heart—that it is only in this spirit and with this approach that the junior Senator from Nebraska now moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137, which is the so-called Watkins-Ferguson resolution.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 137) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That any Member of the Senate is authorized to attend as an observer any hearing or other meeting, whether executive or open, held by the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations in accordance with the order of the Senate of April 25, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I intend to offer, which was to be printed and lie on the table——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate must first proceed to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely asking that the amendment which I propose to offer be read at this time, if the present occupant of the Chair will permit it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no disposition to prevent it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that it be read at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert the following:

That the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly to consider matters affecting the national defense, be, and hereby are, directed to hear General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and other witnesses in open, public hearings: *Provided*, That no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may continue for a moment, I neglected to state, as I should have stated, that if my motion is agreed to, it will only temporarily displace the unfinished business. This is the only way such a motion can be made. My understanding is that if the motion is agreed to, when the resolution is disposed of the unfinished business will be the farm-labor bill, or it could be made the unfinished business on motion of the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the Senator's remarks, the Chair suggests that the adoption of the resolution would displace the unfinished business and send it back to the calendar. Another motion would be necessary to take it up again. It would not be merely temporarily displaced.

Mr. WHERRY. If that be the case, not only will the junior Senator from Nebraska support a motion to make the farm-labor bill the unfinished business, but I am satisfied that I speak for many Members on this side of the aisle when I say that they will support it. There is no intention to cause any undue delay in the passage of the farm-labor bill. The demonstration made on the floor of the Senate by many Senators who are in favor of it, including the Senator from Nebraska, certainly is evidence of that fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What will happen to all the amendments to the pending bill which have already been adopted by the Senate if the bill is sent back to the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments which have been agreed to would not be affected.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the status of the bill would remain as it now is, so far as the amendments which have already been adopted are concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct; and the amendment pending would be pending when the consideration of the bill was resumed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have been engaged in consideration of the farm-labor bill for an entire week. This is the eighth day since its consideration was started. We have been deprived of an opportunity to pass the bill largely by speeches on the MacArthur controversy. I do not know how the Senate is going to transact any business if that sort of thing continues.

I take the position that, regardless of what my personal ideas may be, the committees should be permitted to pass upon their own procedures, and decide whether they are to have open hearings or closed hearings. It would certainly be an unusual procedure for us again to put on a show before the public.

The Senator from Nebraska has stated that General MacArthur came before the joint meeting of the Senate and House and discussed certain matters. I presume he told everything that he wanted to tell in open hearings. I presume that at that time he told the things which he thought the public ought to know. The main thing which I want the people to have the benefit of, to as great an extent as possible, is the documentary evidence. However, a part of that is highly secret. A request has been made for the plans of the fighting in Korea. I would be willing to concede, at least for the sake of argument, that General MacArthur would not reveal any secret, but once a question is asked in regard to a secret document, that secret document becomes evidence. Everyone knows that in the trial of cases in court questions are frequently asked for their effect upon the jury.

Mr. President, before passing on the question of taking up the resolution and displacing the farm-labor bill, I feel that we should have a quorum call, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I withhold it for the moment.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following conference report, which was read:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vermont, for agricultural purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising nine hundred forty-two and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vermont, and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of transfer.

"The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the conference report on Senate bill 271 has been approved by the House. That is the bill relating to permission to the Department of Agriculture to transfer the so-called Morgan horse farm at Weybridge, Vt., to the Vermont Agricultural College under certain conditions. I understand that the conference report was approved by the House today. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator from Vermont think that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] ought to have notice that the conference report is being taken up?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon wants notice of it or not.

Mr. McFARLAND. This is a privileged matter, and it can be taken up immediately after the quorum call. I think we ought to have a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Anderson	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Kilgore	Robertson
Carlson	Langer	Schoeppel
Cordon	McFarland	Wherry
Dirksen	McKellar	Williams
Ecton	Martin	
Ellender	Maybank	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will act accordingly.

Mr. NEELY. I ask unanimous consent that the motion be repeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion has been agreed to, that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order. There is no quorum present.

Mr. NEELY. I ask unanimous consent to amend the request so that it will be in conformity with the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot consider a unanimous-consent request when there is no quorum present, and it has been so announced.

After a little delay, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in order to make effective the provisions of the bill it will be necessary to obtain an appropriation from the Vermont Legislature. The legislature will adjourn next week. Therefore, in order that the President may be able to sign the bill before it is too late, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to lay on the table the motion to reconsider made by the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make very brief comment. I merely desire to say that everything I said in the past in opposition to the bill I now say again by way of reference, and theoretically incorporate as a part of my remarks. I recognize that the Senate has spoken. Nevertheless, I think time will prove that the observations I made in opposition to the bill were right.

OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear with reference to the pending motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think it would be setting a very poor precedent if the Senate were to adopt special rules directing committees how they shall hold their hearings every time a hearing is held. I think such matters should be left for determination to the committees themselves. I believe the Senate would regret it in the future if it agreed to the pending motion.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has made the statement that he is certain the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would be able to conduct hearings which would not be a show and would not reveal any secrets. I am glad that he has confidence in the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I hope that he will have sufficient confidence in him to follow his good judgment in regard to what ought to be done with reference to the resolution directing that the committees shall have open hearings, which would be contrary to the majority judgment of the committees.

I have at all times stated, and I am still of the opinion, that every bit of evidence which can be divulged without risk to the security of the United States and without risk to the lives of our boys in Korea should be given to the public. Such has been my position from the very beginning. I think the Senate of the United States is not in the position of making such a determination. The Senate as a whole should not make the decision. The members of the committee know more about the contents of secret documents. Therefore, so far as I am personally concerned, although, as I have said from the very beginning, I am in favor of the public having the benefit of every bit of information which does not risk the security of the United States of America. I believe the question should be left to the committees. As I said, it would be a poor policy to establish a precedent of this kind.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution before the Senate is not for consideration. The question is on the motion to take it up.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, as one of the sponsors of the resolution, wishes to thank the committee, particularly the chairman, for having voted in committee today to permit all Senators to be present at the hearings. I believe at times this morning more Senators who are not members of the committee were present at the hearing than the 25 members who constitute the committee. It showed the great interest felt by Senators. I am satisfied that the testimony convinced every Senator that the problem involved is of great concern to the Nation. I suppose there will be differences of opinion as to whether or not any word was said of a nature which should not be given to the general public.

Mr. President, the sons of our citizens are dying on the battlefields of Korea. At the hearing this morning appeared the Commander in Chief in that area, who was there with the boys. He personally went to the front on many occasions. He testified this morning.

The Senator from Michigan has not taken the floor on the merits of the controversy, but merely on the procedure to be followed. The Senator from Michigan spoke briefly yesterday on the necessity for allowing the Senators to hear the testimony. I also said that I was in favor of holding public hearings. I hope that the hearings will be open. I should like to be corrected if I am wrong, but I understand that no vote was taken by the committee this morning on the question of holding open hearings. I again wish to thank the members of the committee for what they have done today for the United States Senate and for the people of the United States, by allowing Senators to attend the hearings. At first glance the resolution which it is sought to have considered may seem to be moot; but it is not moot.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Did the committee vote this morning to permit only Senators to attend the hearings, or did the committee vote to permit also Members of the House to attend?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that only Senators were permitted. If I am wrong, I should like to be corrected. The Senator from Michigan was not present when the vote was taken.

Mr. President, this is not a moot question. The only way we can get the question parliamentarily before the Senate is by a consideration of the resolution. It is the intention of the Senator from Michigan, in behalf of himself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to modify the resolution, so as to include the language of the amendment which is now on the desk. I should like to point out to the Senate exactly what we would be voting on. The modification provides:

> That the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly to consider matters affecting the national defense, be, and hereby are, directed to hear General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and other witnesses in open, public hearings—

This is the important part of the language—

> *Provided*, That no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings.

Mr. President, they can hold executive hearings on all matters which are secret, or which should be considered in secret because they involve the security of the United States. That is the only question. There is no excuse for a private hearing on anything except matters which would affect the security of the United States. This is an investigation of a question of policy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. I agree that if any question involves the security of the United States, it should be considered in secret. We have lost too many men, and we do not want to lose more by virtue of making public any information which involves the national security.

I hope we can get a vote on this question, and have an assurance from the chairman of the committee that he will call his committee together and place this proposal before them, so that they may do as they did this morning, namely, reverse their ruling and allow hearings under the terms of the modified form of the resolution, depending upon the security of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say, Does the Senator from Michigan know whether or not anything will come out at the hearing which may be in the nature of a military secret?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not know what the committee has in mind bringing out. The Senator from Michigan can only say what he heard this morning. The Senator from Michigan will say at this moment that he did not hear anything which he believes would affect the security of the United States. It might benefit, but I do not think it would be detrimental to the security of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask a further question. Does the Senator believe that the 26 Members of the Senate who are members of the joint committee, and will be listening to all the evidence brought out, would be more competent to pass upon the question when it arises in the committee than the Senate as a whole would be? Which group would be more competent?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not the question before the Senate today. It is proposed to give to the committee authority to pass upon the question of security.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is that after the question has been asked and answered, or before?

Mr. FERGUSON. It will be at the time the question is asked. This problem has been solved in Appropriations Committee hearings and in hearings before other committees. Practically all the witnesses will be military men. If they are not military men they will not know any military secrets.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. They will be able to say whether or not a certain question is prejudicial to the security of the United States.

This procedure has been followed by committees during the entire life of the Senate. During World War I and World War II committees held public hearings. Military witnesses are very careful. They are not going to say anything which is prejudicial. Questions which involve the

security of the United States can be answered in a secret session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does not the Senator know that while various and sundry questions are being asked at a public hearing, with the public listening in, Stalin will have his stool pigeon there, and that when questions are asked and answered Stalin will immediately know what benefits Russia. Is that not true?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the same procedure would apply to these hearings that applies to all other open hearings. I take it for granted that representatives of Tass and other persons who are interested in Russia would be present. Even in the departments there are persons who have been known to give evidence to Russia. Even in the Justice Department, when the FBI reports came through, minutes were taken from them and delivered to Russia. Even in the Defense Department there were persons who mimeographed reports of secret documents.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. The evidence clearly shows that there was a microfilming machine in Georgetown, where the agents of a foreign government were making microfilms of documents when they were not able to carry packages of them to New York, in order that they might be given to the secret agents of Russia.

We are talking about the public in this great Republic, where public opinion must be a force, and yet it is said that the public is not entitled to open hearings.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is not a transgression of the rules of the Senate to inquire about procedure in the other body, am I correctly informed that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House announced yesterday that they propose to have open hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives? If they do, will it not make the Senate seem positively silly?

Mr. FERGUSON. I saw what the Senator has indicated in the press, and I take it to be a fact.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator has described some tragic events where great effort was evidently made to obtain some of the secret information with reference to the security of this country. Is the Senator not aware that what he here and now proposes would make it possible for the information to reach the enemy without his having to go to so much trouble? I wonder if he is seeking to make it easier for him.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator knows that what he says is an absolute falsehood. He knows it. There is no doubt about it. He accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to an enemy, Mr. President.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. I will not yield, Mr. President.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to say this——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators will respect the desire of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not going to say any more to the Senator from Oklahoma, except to tell him this: I am reminded of the farmer who was kicked by a mule. His friends said, "What did you do to the mule?" He replied, "I considered the source." I now consider the source from which that remark came, and I have no further reply to it.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was sincere when he requested yesterday that Members of the Senate be permitted to be present at the hearings. One of the first men to appear there was a man who filibustered on this floor last night, using ridicule because he did not have anything to say. He was the first to go into the hearing and sit there. Oh, if the public could have seen his face when the testimony was being given at the hearing, he would have been able to convey to Oklahoma some of the real facts. I am sure that when he lies down in bed he will remember some of the things he said upon the floor of the Senate, ridiculing the general who testified. God gives man a conscience, so that he can repent for wrongs.

Mr. President, I was sincere when I made my request yesterday, and I am sincere today. I yield to no man in patriotism or in the desire to defend America. I know what communism is. I have studied it. The Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Michigan took affirmative action when they proposed the security bill, which other Senators joined them in passing, but which was opposed by some Members of the Senate. That bill was passed in the Senate and in the House over the President's veto.

Yet, it is said that we on this side who want open hearings are traitors to the United States of America!

Mr. President, I never thought the time would come when men's consciences would leave them, and for political benefits they would say things upon this floor in accusation of other Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not rise with any hope that any appeal to reason in this body in the prevailing atmosphere could possibly have any effect. I regretfully express the opinion that the Senate has passed the boundary of reason in these matters. I rise in justice to myself to speak on a question about which I have profound convictions, and in order that the record for the future may be quite clear.

May I be permitted to advert briefly to the question of Senators attending this hearing? I have had certain difficulties in arranging the hearings and in attempting to follow my policy of consulting with all the members of the committee with respect to the details. I encountered a difficulty when the Armed Services Committee in the first instance, as I understood, voted unanimously to conduct the hearings in executive session. Public sentiment was at fever heat after that action was taken.

I do not challenge the right of any person to reverse himself, and I am not undertaking to apply the doctrine of estoppel to any Senator. A Senator has a right to change his views at any time he sees fit. I merely point out some of the difficulties which a Senator who is charged with the responsibility for arranging a hearing on such a highly inflammatory issue encounters.

I went into the meeting of the two committees with a typewritten agenda for the hearings which I desired to submit to the committees. Several of the items were discussed. I reached that point on the agenda where I had written that there was a problem before the committee of determining as to whether or not the committee should accede to the request of Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives that they be permitted to attend the hearings. Before I could proceed with my further suggestion, which is incorporated on that agenda, that as many Members of the Senate be permitted to attend as we could accommodate, discussion broke out in the committee, and by practically unanimous vote it was decided that no Members of the Senate or of the House of Representatives should be admitted. I do not relate these facts as an attempt to apply the doctrine of estoppel to Members of the Senate who desire with the agility of an acrobat in the arena to change their minds. That is fully within their rights. I cite it merely to show the difficulties I have encountered and the state of mind of Senators in the existing hysteria.

Pursuant to the instructions of the committee I told Members of the Senate who were among my best friends that they could not be admitted to the hearings, and I did it under the impression that I was supporting the committee. The committee promptly failed, or many of them, to support me.

This morning I called the committee together before the time for the hearing of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, and suggested to them that the committee change its place of meeting to the caucus room in the Senate Office Building in order that all Members of the Senate might be admitted. I state that, Mr. President, merely for the RECORD, not with any attempt to please any person, not in any attempt to curry favor with any Senator or any other person, but in justice to myself.

Mr. President, though I usually value the good will and the high opinion of my colleagues in this body on both sides of the aisle as much as any man can, I have about reached the stage in these proceedings where I recognize the hopelessness of having anything whatever to

do with respect to my position in connection with these hearings, without giving offense. I always undertake to exercise patience. I was taught in my youth that patience was one of the primary virtues of men. My patience in some matters has been worn a bit threadbare, but that is entirely a personal matter.

Mr. President, there is no question of the right of the Senate of the United States to instruct any committee in this body in any way they see fit. Of course the committee is a servant of the Senate, and the servant cannot be more powerful than the master. I do not challenge the right or the power of the Senate—I do not say the right, for I do doubt the right, but the power of the Senate to instruct a committee of this body to take any action a majority of the Members of this body think should be taken.

I do not challenge the accuracy of the statement so frequently made upon this floor and offered as an excuse by some for reversing their position in various matters, that there is a great clamor on the part of the American people to have these hearings televised and to be put on the radio. Of course it is a fiction to talk about an open hearing if it is to be confined merely to the caucus room in the Senate Office Building. That is a fiction, and it is a political fiction of the worse sort, because few would appear there for the mothers and the fathers of the sons who are fighting in Korea. Precious few of them would be able to get into that room. Members of Senators' families and their best friends would be there; but there would be no room, do not mistake that, for the mothers and fathers of sons who are fighting in Korea. That is the reason given why this unnecessary gamble should be taken, this hazard with those boys' lives who are now fighting in Korea—to permit their parents to attend. It is pure political fiction.

If the Senate sees fit to adopt this extraordinary step of instructing a committee on a matter of this kind, material secrets which would be of assistance to the powers in the Kremlin or those in Peiping would get to those centers of Communist power. That would happen unless the American people are denied this entertainment of a televised hearing. Which is more desirable?

I do not doubt either, Mr. President, that a great deal of political capital can be made out of the positions of Senators with respect to this issue. Where public sentiment is in full swing, and where public clamor is most strident, there is the opportunity for political capital. And it is here in this issue.

Mr. President, I have been disturbed in recent days, and been concerned as I have never been before in my life because of the way Senators take position on affairs of Government, by taking action in response to a quick expression of uninformed desire, when the facts at issue have not been placed before all the people from whom the clamor comes. I believe, Mr. President, that there is an issue in this controversy that has survival considerations more important than are the considerations of our tenure of office and our salaries, which depend upon the length of our stay in this body. There is something here that is more important than the election of the President of the United States in 1952. That is the question of national security, of the lives of American boys. For my part I think that these times are very opportune for Senators who wish to demonstrate the courage of rising above the expedient thing of the moment, of doing that which is right, that which will serve their country. Let the political consequences take care of themselves and do that which is right.

Mr. President, we started these hearings this morning. Of course, we have not proceeded at any great length with them. I think they have been conducted—if I may be pardoned for giving expression to such a statement, in view of the fact that I am chairman of the committee—in an orderly manner. I think there has been a semblance of dignity in the committee room. We have not had the klieg lights; we have not had the radio; but I daresay that more progress was made in the course of the session this morning—delayed as it was and brief as it was—in getting at what should be our objective, namely, the truth and the facts, than would have been made with 4 or 5 days of hearings in a circus atmosphere. There can be no question about that. Orderly procedure, expeditious handling, objective search for the truth, protection of the national security, Mr. President, will be best accomplished in an executive session, with all the great care and devotion to detail with which we have gone forward to see that the facts reach the American people promptly and reach them fully, except for those things which would be helpful to the enemy and would be harmful to the American people, and would be paid for by the blood of our very boys in Korea to whom Senators refer in demanding that the hearings be open.

All the people of the United States are represented in these hearings by the Senators who care to attend—Senators who have been duly selected and sworn as the representatives of the people.

Senators talk about having had open hearings of committees all during all the wars. Mr. President, I was in the Senate all during World War II, and I served on the Committee on Appropriations, to which other Senators have referred, and I served on the Committee on Naval Affairs. There was never a single word of testimony—not one—taken on any item affecting the national defense, much less the national security, which was not taken behind closed doors.

Is our country at war today? Are American boys dying today? The political campaign is approaching. During World War II we did not conduct open hearings on such matters. The same glamor, politically, did not attach to the personalities involved and arouse the emotions of the American people as at the moment, but the same basic requirement of protecting the national interest is present today, even as it was in those times. Should that cause us to surrender to political considerations?

Mr. President, I did not hear the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. When reference is made to shows, I must confess that I am almost a two-ring affair today in trying to attend the committee hearings and also endeavoring to be in the Senate Chamber to make a record which I think it is vital to have made. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska said that I would be able to protect the public interest in open hearings.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I said that I attended the hearings this morning, and I spoke in the highest terms of the Senator from Georgia, whom I deeply respect, and who conducted the hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I said to the Members of the Senate and to the people generally that I knew the Senator from Georgia was so fair and had so much ability that I was sure, regardless of whether the hearings were open or closed, he would conduct them with dignity and with respect, and there would be no burlesque show, and he would conduct the hearings in a fashion which would be a credit to the United States Senate. I mean every word of that, because the Senator from Georgia knows the high regard I have for him and my feelings toward him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's remarks very much, and his high regard for me is one of my cherished possessions. I had not correctly understood what he had said. As I walked on to the floor of the Senate the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] was speaking, and I understood him to say that the Senator from Nebraska had said that I would be able, as chairman of the committee, to protect security matters.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct, but I said I felt sure there would be no burlesque show and it would not be like a ballpark performance, because I knew that the Senator from Georgia had the ability to protect the hearings, even if they were open, so that they would be conducted in a dignified and orderly fashion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement. However, my understanding of his statement was that he said I would be in a position to conduct the hearings in such a way as to protect the public interest and avoid disclosure of damaging plans.

Mr. WHERRY. I said the Senator from Georgia had the ability to protect the meetings so that there would be no burlesque show or no resemblance to a meeting in a ballpark, but that the hearings would be conducted with the dignity and the ability which always characterize the activities of the Senator from Georgia.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall yield in a moment, but first let me make one statement.

Dignity—which I have never sought to assume—and ability—of which I have never boasted, but which are attributed to me by the distinguished Senator—and

I appreciate the attribution—are a very poor substitute for security and for saving the lives of American boys.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is one of the points I raised, namely, that because of the ability and knowledge the Senator from Georgia has of military affairs, I was positive there would be no violation of the national security as a result of the questions which were asked and answered in the hearings. I am as sure as I am sure that I am standing here now, that because of the ability of the Senator from Georgia, not a question would be answered which would in any way violate the national security. I have so much faith in the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I am entirely sure of that.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I understood the Senator from Arizona to say in referring to the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska, and that is why I remained on the floor to make this statement, because I refuse to have this responsibility even impliedly saddled upon me by the words of any Senator. Mr. President, I have never shirked any responsibility that it was possible for me to discharge. I do not do so now, but I refuse to accept any such responsibility even if the Senate by a majority vote should seek to impose it upon me. No patriotic man who feels as I do about the importance of protecting the critical secrets of this Nation in this dark hour would assume any such obligation if he knew the nature of the documents and the evidence involved in this hearing. I am here to express by my vote my protest against any action of the Senate which would place any such fearsome and impossible duty upon any Member of this body. The Senate cannot fix any such responsibility by the words or actions of any other Senator. If the national security is endangered, if future disaster should result, the responsibility rests upon those who vote for open hearings and they cannot be cleared of that responsibility by mere words which seek to fix it elsewhere.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, but I must be brief.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not take long. First, I wish to say that I completely approve the position—not an easy one—now being taken by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, who is an ornament to the post he holds as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to address a question to the Senator. Noting that the last clause of the resolution reads as follows:

Provided, That no matters the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open public hearings—

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not true that a majority of such committees has already, upon full deliberation, determined that it would be prejudicial to the security of the United States for them to proceed in open public hearings in the matter now entrusted to them for hearing?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have only a few minutes more to remain on the floor, because I wish at least to get a sandwich and a cup of coffee before the hearings are resumed.

I shall answer the question by saying that, in my opinion, those words are nothing but window dressing or vote bait. No committee chairman can control questions of members which might endanger the national security, much less the answers which will be given by the witnesses who will be on the stand.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has just come through the hearings on the troops-to-Europe issue. We heard from all the Joint Chiefs of Staff and from various other military men. Questions vital to the security of Europe and questions vital to the security of the United States were asked at those hearings. Therefore, I now ask the Senator this question: Does he not feel that those meetings were conducted in such a fashion that there was no violation of the national security, but that in the end the result was to perform a real service which was of help to the people of the country, in enabling them to understand what was involved in the national defense of Western Europe as well as in the defense of the United States of America?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no more analogy could be drawn between those hearings, involving a question of opinion on a political matter, and the hearings now being held, involving war plans, secret documents, and things of the like, than could be drawn between a donkey and a race horse. There is no comparison whatever.

Mr. WHERRY. A question of national security is certainly involved.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has brought that in again.

Mr. President, I shall ask, because time does not permit me to read it, that I be permitted to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this juncture the requests which were submitted to me, and which have been submitted by the Republican members of the committee, for secret documents. I challenge and defy the Senator to point to one secret document which was requested or was brought into play in the hearings on the troops-to-Europe question to which he referred. Not a single secret document was requested or brought before the committee in those hearings. In this instance, a veritable mass of the most intimate documents dealing with the defense has been demanded, and I have requested the Department of Defense to supply them. There cannot be any analogy, there cannot be any comparison. I wish I could read all the requests. I cannot do so, but I want the RECORD to show them.

There being no objection, the requests, in the form of a letter dated April 23, 1951, addressed to the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman, Committee on Armed Services, from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], also four other letters requesting classified documents and other material were ordered to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 25, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Senator BRIDGES to me which I believe is self-explanatory.

In preparation for the MacArthur hearings before the combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate, I would appreciate your making available to the committees by Tuesday, May 1, as many of the documents referred to in Senator BRIDGES' letter as can be secured within that time. If you are unable to supply any portion of the material requested, please so inform me.

In additon to the material referred to in items (a) through (f) in Senator BRIDGES' letter I request that you make available to the committees such other documents and information bearing on this same general subject as will assist the committees in their efforts to get a rounded picture of the pertinent factual and documentary data which exist in this field.

In compiling this material the committees request that the security classification of the various documents and items of information be reexamined and downgraded to the maximum extent which you consider consistent with proper security.

I realize that it will not be possible for you or the committees to forecast at this time all of the subjects which may arise during the course of the hearings. As the hearings develop, you may wish to furnish additional compilations and the committees may find it necessary to request additional documents and materials.

In addition to the specific documents referred to above, and the others which I anticipate you will furnish in response to this request, I would like to request that the committees be furnished a copy of such record as may have been made of the Wake Island meeting of last October, which was recently discussed in several newspaper accounts.

I am hopeful that this material can be presented to the committees by a representative of the Department of Defense at an executive meeting to be held Tuesday, May 1. This procedure would assist the committees in understanding the nature of the material submitted and what additional is available.

Sincerely yours.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
April 23, 1951.

The Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: As the ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, I suggest that you have the Defense Establishment make available to the committee within the next few days the following documents:

(a) The Wedemeyer Report submitted to the President under date of September 19, 1947. (This report was submitted at the same time as his report on China, which was published in the so-called China white paper in August of 1949.)

(b) A copy of war plans relating to Korea and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff prior to the outbreak of hostilities on June 25, 1950. This document will give the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to what they believed our demands should be in the event aggression took place against the Republic of Korea.

(c) The minutes of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to the strategic importance of Formosa during the 12 months' period, July 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950, together with correspondence and memos between the Department of Defense and the Department of State, dealing with the subject of Formosa during the same period of time.

(d) Directive issued to the members of the United Nations forces in Korea through the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to Republic of Korea officials being restricted from areas north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

(e) Joint Chiefs of Staff document dated on or about January 12, 1951, relative to steps to be taken in regard to the Korean conflict in the event of certain eventualities.

(f) Exact dates subsequent to January 1, 1948, on which Far East headquarters requested additional troops and the number of troops requested in each case. Also dates of the replies from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, showing the number of troops, if any, supplied in conformity with such requests.

(g) Also any other documents that you consider pertinent to the situation.

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
April 28, 1951.

Hon. RICHARD RUSSELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR DICK: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff together with a copy of his reply to me. I believe that this information is different from that requested by you in your letter to Secretary Marshall. However, will you please add to the information requested in your letter to Secretary Marshall the material requested by me in my letter to General Bradley.

I believe that in your letter to Secretary Marshall you requested the notes of the Wake Island conference which were released to the New York Times a short time ago. The information on Wake Island which I have requested deals with a meeting in the Pentagon Building on Wednesday, October 18, 1950, where the correspondents were given background material relative to the Wake Island conference. This meeting was called by Defense Department officials. Secretary Pace did most, if not all, of the "briefing" though General Bradley attended the meeting.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

APRIL 25, 1951.

Gen. OMAR BRADLEY,
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Pentagon Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL: As a member of the Armed Services Committee and in preparation for the hearings that will start next week I would like to receive as soon as possible the following:

1. The build-up of United Nations forces in Korea by months and by nationalities (including United States forces) from July 1, 1950, to April 1, 1951 (or more current figures, if available) for Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Korean theater of operations.

2. The stenographic or other notes made by the Department of the Army or its public-relations staff dealing with the press conference held in the Pentagon Building Wednesday, October 18, 1950, wherein the correspondents were given background material relative to the Wake Island conference.

3. Copy of communication from Gen. Matthew Ridgway to Gen. Lawton Collins or the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to his views on the use of the troops of the Republic of China as allies in the struggle against Communist aggression in Korea.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter requesting the information you would like to have in preparing for the hearings the Armed Services Committee expects to hold next week.

In order that your request may receive early consideration, I have taken the liberty of passing your letter to Secretary Marshall. I am informed that he has received a request from Senator RUSSELL, the chairman of the committee, for similar information. As much of the information being requested deals with the same matters, it would make our task easier and eliminate many duplications if all the requests could be handled through your chairman. I hope this is entirely agreeable to you.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

OMAR BRADLEY.

MAY 1, 1951.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Will you please request of the Senate Appropriations Committee that they furnish the original copy which will show information supplied as a result of the committee's requests and the carbon copy (showing information deleted by the State or Defense Department) of the committee hearings held on Monday, June 26, and on Tuesday, June 27, 1950, at which time Secretary of State Acheson, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, General Lemnitzer, and others from the State and Defense Departments were present and testified relative to military aid in the Far East and elsewhere.

In addition, we also request that the hearings held in executive session on Monday, August 28, 1950, at which time Admiral R. H. Hillenkoetter testified, also be made available to our combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. This information is pertinent to the inquiry and I think will give the members of the combined committees information not previously available to them.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

MAY 1, 1951.

Hon. RICHARD RUSSELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Will you please request from the State Department the stenographic notes of the conference held in the State Department on October 6, 7, and 8 of 1949 relating to China and far-eastern policy?

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one point other than security. Of course, the Senator knows that I have very great regard for his ability, but the difficulty of controlling the secret nature of these matters is, I think, insuperable. But, in addition to that, does not the Senator think that actually getting at the truth of what the nature is of the difference which has risen, is much more likely to be achieved in executive sessions than in public sessions, aside from the matter of security? Assuming that the Senator is interested, and that the country is interested in getting at the real truth, is it not the Senator's opinion that it is much more likely to achieve that purpose in executive session, because witnesses will be very reluctant to speak about things which are in this field in open session? That is simply human nature. They will not bring themselves to be as frank with the committee as they would if the sessions were closed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there can be no possible question about that. I undertook to emphasize on last Monday that we shall expedite the hearings and reveal the truth if we conduct the hearings in this manner. We can give the American people every fact which can be published without giving aid and comfort to the enemy, whereas, if the hearings are held in such a way that a man must guard every word he utters, if the hearings must be partly in secret and partly in the open, with Senators becoming confused and coming into an open session to ask a question about a secret document which they saw in the closed session, it would obscure the truth, if it did not hide it forever, and risk the lives of American men and the security and safety of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, when I vote upon this question, I wish to make it perfectly clear, so far as I am concerned, that, merely because I am chairman of the committee, I cannot assume responsibility for the protection of the vital interests of the people and of the lives of the sons of American mothers. We have opened the hearings to 96 Senators, representatives of all the people. If we followed the course of permitting the attenance of friends of Senators and the representatives of the press, it would open it up, not only to the representatives of the American people, but to the representatives of Pravda, and the Kremlin. That is the effect of it. It would keep the people from getting the facts and at the same time endanger American lives needlessly.

Mr. President, it might pay political dividends, and there is no question in my mind but that it would, but when it comes to serving the best interests of the country, we would ill serve that interest by open hearings.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the representatives of the Russian press have already asked for a transcript of the hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that is the fact.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as that is concerned, it makes no difference whether the hearings are open or closed, does it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, it certainly does make a difference.

Mr. WHERRY. On matters of security, information would be withheld, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has the votes, I have been informed. He can take the responsibility of opening the hearings to our enemies. I am not endeavoring to escape any responsibility I should seek to fulfill, but I refuse to accept a responsibility forced upon me in this manner and under these circumstances, and for such reasons. I will not do it, though never in my life have I knowingly avoided any responsibility or duty which could fairly attach to me in any public office I have held, from the time I was a member of the General Assembly of Georgia, down to this good hour.

Mr. President, who is the principal figure in this great drama. The General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. I gave General MacArthur every opportunity, if he thought it well to have the hearings in public session to say so, and to have them held in public session, at least so far as he was concerned. General MacArthur has been in the service of his country for 52 years, and has dealt with security matters for that length of time. He may not have exactly the political interest in this question that others have, because he has disavowed politics, though I think he would be nominated by acclamation if the Republican convention were held any time within the next few months, and he might well be, when it is held next summer. General MacArthur says he disavows politics, I do not think that all of the Republican leaders could stop the stampede. He would be nominated; unless he used Sherman's expression when he was about to have the nomination forced upon him, he would be the Republican nominee—and an able candidate he would be. But General MacArthur certainly has as much at stake in this matter as has any Member of the Senate, and he has much more knowledge of what will affect adversely the lives of the men from whom he was torn in Korea, and of the public welfare and the interests of the United States, than all the men who clamor for an open hearing. I submitted it to him. I said, "If you desire a public hearing, we will have it." He evidently did not desire it. To this moment he has expressed no desire. He realizes the value of security, and he is not a politician in the ordinary sense of the word. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not want to leave the impression, does he, that the distinguished general said he would leave it up to the committees?

Mr. RUSSELL. He made no statement to me about it whatever.

Mr. WHERRY. He has been quoted by a member of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not had time to read the newspapers and to keep up with all those developments.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely ask the Senator the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have kept in touch with General MacArthur, through correspondence and telegrams, and he has not so expressed himself, though given an opportunity. I do not believe the general would do a committee of the Congress the discourtesy to tell the newspapers something that he would not tell the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have more regard for him than to think that he would treat a committee of Congress in such manner. I have known General MacArthur for 20 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to leave the impression that General MacArthur has refused to testify in public hearings, or that he himself has made a selection or a choice?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator attempts to cut it a little thinner. I gave him the opportunity. I told him that if he desired to have the hearings in open session, we would have open sessions; but General MacArthur, who understands security values, who is a great patriot, who has been in three wars, did not desire to jeopardize the lives of the men whom he left in Korea.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is the last time I can yield. I am sorry. The hearings are to commence at 2:30, and I have another iron-clad obligation in 15 minutes. I yield this once, and I ask Senators to appreciate the fact that I cannot continue to yield.

Mr. LONG. Unless the Senator from Louisiana got an erroneous impression, the Senator from Georgia today suggested to General MacArthur that if he wanted to have the hearings conducted in open session he could have them in the open, so far as his testimony was concerned. Am I correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think I made that statement to him today. I am not sure that I did. I made the statement at the opening of the hearings, and I may have referred to certain telegrams. I am not sure regarding that, or as to just what I said, but I had in writing given him the opportunity. He is a man who has a vital interest in the issue at stake, for his reputation is involved. There may be Senators who think they can speak for Douglas MacArthur. I have been around these halls for about 18 years, and I have served with many Senators. I have never yet seen a man on this floor who could speak for Douglas MacArthur as Douglas MacArthur can speak for himself. Yet there are a great many people who would speak for him in connection with these hearings.

Mr. President, time forbids that I should proceed much longer. I merely wish by this statement to place the responsibility for any disclosure where the responsibility belongs. We must bear in mind that all the witnesses are not going to be Douglas MacArthur or George Marshall or Omar Bradley or members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. All of them will not know how to protect America's security in the public interest as well as do those men who have spent so many years in the business of protecting the country and the national security.

Mr. President, I repeat, when some persons have shouted about the public interest in open hearings they hope that back of public interest there lies political benefit.

Mr. President, it will be a poor comfort to the mothers and fathers of America whose sons are in Korea to see these hearings on a television set or to hear them on the radio, if as a result of such action they, within a few days, receive a telegram reading, "We regret to inform you that your son has died in action."

Mr. President, I shall vote on this question; I shall leave the session of the committee to do so if the motion is not voted on immediately, because I desire to be on record as voting on this issue.

That vote will cleanse me of the blood of American boys that will be unnecessarily spilled on account of inevitable disclosures. What a poor consolation that will be if I am compelled to see the blood of those American boys on the hands of other Senators. With the perfect conviction that I serve my country's best interests, I shall vote against this motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and the position which has already been taken by a substantial majority of the two committees in expressing their conviction that the hearings, with all their far-flung implications, must, in the protection of the national security, be held in closed session.

Mr. President, in what I shall have to say, there will not be any recriminations, there will not be any charge or the intimation of anything other than patriotism as existing in the heart of any other Senator. But in the very nature of things, I must say that I think the judgment of those who think the hearings should be conducted as open hearings is unwise judgment, unsound judgment, and, besides that, it is judgment which, if it be followed, will make the hearings much longer drawn out. It will not produce a quick development of the facts, secret or otherwise, with reference to many of the separate fields which have to be covered in the inquiry, but it will be a distinct disservice to our people as a whole, and particularly a continuing source of hazard to the security of the approximately quarter of a million American men in Korea who now are fighting for us and for the cause of freemen everywhere.

Mr. President, in a question which I asked of the Senator from Georgia, I have already invited attention to the fact that the last paragraph of the amendment to the resolution lays a predicate for doing the very thing which has already been done by a majority of the two committees, and done, as stated by the Senator from Georgia, and as obviously must have been the case, for the very reason recited in the last paragraph as an adequate reason for keeping the

hearings closed rather than open. The last paragraph reads as follows:

Provided, That no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings.

That ends the quoted part of the resolution.

Mr. President, it is well known to every Senator and, I think, to people generally throughout the United States, that deliberately and after a calm consideration of the whole question, a sizable majority of the two committees, including, it happens, at least one Member who comes from the opposite side of the aisle, has already ruled that, in the judgment of that sizable majority of the two committees, the field to be covered by this investigation necessarily involves matters which could be so prejudicial to the security of the United States, if brought out into the open, that the hearings shall be closed hearings.

If anything more were required to make it appear that the resolution, no matter how well intended, is at most and at best an empty, idle, and vacuous gesture, that fact well appears from the reading of that last paragraph, because it is very clear upon reading it that the Senators offering the resolution do not want to assume the responsibility for untoward incidents which might develop from open hearings upon this grave subject, and which might come in such a way as to jeopardize the security of the United States. Therefore, they have inserted the last paragraph in order to put the responsibility where it belongs, upon a majority of the two committees, and where it has already been exercised by a majority of the two committees—exercised, there can be no doubt in the world, because to permit the hearings to go along in public would present a continued jeopardy to the national security and a continued jeopardy to the welfare and the lives of American boys serving in Korea, as well as the lives of our allies serving there under American command.

Mr. President, let us see what it is that is proposed to be brought out at the hearings. In the first place, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has already placed in the record of the debate a long list of top-secret documents which have been requested by Members of the Senate to be produced in the hearings. Certainly anyone looking at that list knows perfectly well that the secrecy of those documents must be preserved and that the discussion of matters concerning them must remain secret. He knows perfectly well that in a hearing wherein a large number of top-secret documents of this kind become matters for discussion by witnesses, it is extremely unwise and hazardous to leave it to chance questions by various Senators, operating under the very best of motives, as to whether those questions will themselves be prejudicial to the public interest and destructive of public security.

Mr. President, I shall not go into a discussion of incidents in the past. There have been frequent instances when Senators in good faith have asked questions at hearings which themselves disclosed public secrets of great significance and of great importance. There would be a continuing opportunity and invitation to just that sort of a disclosure and that sort of a situation by having the hearings go on in public, with so many different Senators present, and clothed with authority to ask questions, and having the hearings searched by eyes which certainly might not be friendly, to discover whether questions were asked from time to time in the conduct of the hearings which questions themselves put people who are inimical to us and to our best interests and our best security on notice that there are important secrets in fields which heretofore were, to them, unknown and undisclosed.

Mr. President, what is it that the distinguished General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur, brings to the committee? In the first place, I remind Members of the Senate that before the dramatic appearance of the General of the Army, and as soon as the difficulty arose under which he was relieved by the President of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] stated upon the floor and stated to the press that this was a matter which vitally affected the conduct of the war—regardless of whether we wished to call our Korean engagement by that name—and which required, in his judgment, the presence of the late field commander of our forces in that war to give information to the Committee on Armed Services on the conduct of the war and upon all of its far-flung aspects.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment.

We know that on one subject which will be explored in great detail, namely, the conduct of the war thus far in Korea, the witness will have to add his comment based on his own peculiar knowledge, of the essential details, which are most closely guarded secrets, with reference to such things as the number and disposition of our forces, the units among our forces, the way in which our forces are armed, the way in which our forces have been behaving so far as their morale is concerned, the kind of naval support which has been given, the force in which our Navy is serving on the two coasts of Korea, the kind of air support which is being given, the number of planes and the variety of planes which have been available, and the attempts which have been made to use, and the use that has been made of, new weapons, some of which have been announced and some of which may not have been announced. In short, all of the intimate details of the conduct of what has certainly grown to be a real war, regardless of what we may call it, is within the knowledge of this distinguished witness.

We know perfectly well that at least one of the purposes of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is to ask that an authoritative report upon all of these matters, and many more affecting the conduct of the war, shall be made available to the members of the Committee on Armed Services at this particular hearing.

Mr. President, has there been any prior occasion at all when a field commander of a fighting army, which has been fighting under very great difficulties, has come before a committee clothed, as is General MacArthur, with knowledge of such secrets? I may add that the greatness of the difficulties has not been made any clearer by any other source than by the statements of the General of the Army himself.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate should give very careful thought to the fact that the distinguished field commander is here to give a report and to make available to Senators for their official guidance, as members of the committee, and later for the guidance of all Members of the Senate, facts which they will need in determining the many issues which will come before the Senate for solution.

It is ridiculous to make a report of operations of that scope, importance, and secrecy in the goldfish bowl atmosphere which prevails at an open hearing of a committee of the Senate. I cannot understand where the judgment of Members of the Senate has fled when they ask that such information and such a report, basic as they are to any decision to be made upon the whole question, shall be considered except in well-guarded and closed hearings of the Senate committees which are charged with the duty of conducting such hearings.

Mr. President, let us go to other matters which are equally secret: The number, the units, and the disposition of the enemy forces, both North Korean and Red Chinese; the number, disposition, and state of supply of forces of the potential enemy, Russia, across an artificial line only a few miles away, where at least they must be taken into very serious consideration; the number and disposition of Chiang Kai-shek's forces on Formosa, which the general of the Army feels could properly and beneficially be used in the difficulty in Asia, and their morale, state of organization, and arms. Matters of that kind simply cannot be discussed out in the open.

The general of the Army has already made a dramatic public appearance and a dramatic public report at a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. The Senator from Florida was glad to join in inviting him to make the report. He was glad to applaud him for much of the great work he had done, both as a military man and as a civilian organizer and diplomatic leader in the last 5 years of his important work in Japan.

The Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that that report was certainly public, and that the numerous reports which have been made since, in other appearances by the general of the Army, have certainly also been public. What we have come down to now is the matter of making available to the Members of the Senate who must make recommendations, and upon which recommendations the Senate itself must finally act, all the intimate facts and all the intimate details concerning our own organization and performance in the war,

and the organization and performance of our enemies, both actual and potential, as well as of our potential friends.

Mr. President, other matters of the greatest importance and secrecy must be gone into at such hearings upon the testimony offered by General MacArthur. One of them has to do with Japan. The general has done a tremendous job in Japan. I am very sure that the committee will want to know what the military potential of Japan is. They will want to know what the feeling of the Japanese people is at this time, both as to their morale and as to their attitude toward us, as well as toward those who fight with us and on our side. They will want to know what the economic situation is in that whole part of the Orient, and as to whether it is in our favor or whether it is adverse to our success.

There are so many facets of the information which must be sought and given at this hearing, Mr. President, that it seems to me that it would be an idle and ridiculous thing to instruct the committee to have open hearings, and end with a paragraph which gives the committee the authority to determine that it shall not go ahead with anything that it regards as prejudicial to the security of the United States, when it has already ruled that it thinks the entire hearings are so enmeshed with secret matters which must not be brought out into the open that a closed hearing is required in order to preserve the secrecy of those many issues, many of which are already known, and many of which are probably unknown to us at this time, and will have to be probed by this particular committee.

There is not the slightest indication or intimation that anyone on either of those committees is trying to hide facts which should come to the Senate. All Members of the Senate were invited to attend, and many were present this morning listening.

Furthermore, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that already the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has released two documents which were regarded as of very great importance, the release of one of which had been long sought by many persons interested in it. I refer to the so-called Wedemeyer report, the release of which has been sought for a period of 2 years or more.

Is it an indication of unwillingness to give information which can be safely given that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has very promptly availed himself of the right to demand the production of this document, and then, having seen that most of it can safely be made available at this late hour, has made it available and turned it over to the public, which has eagerly desired for a long time to see it?

In addition, the Senator from Georgia has also asked for the report on the Wake Island conference between the President of the United States and General MacArthur, and has made that report public and available. It certainly has not been available heretofore.

It ought to be rather apparent that the Senator from Georgia is letting the chips fall where they may, because a certain group of people were clamoring for one of these reports. The views of that group were supported by the recitals of one of the reports. Another group finds itself supported in part by disclosures in the other report.

The Senator from Georgia has shown with complete fullness that he wants to be fair, and that he is going to make available to the public those things which can safely be made public knowledge, just as quickly as he can determine that fact.

There is one further thing which I think has not been given sufficient emphasis, and that is the apparent unwillingness of those who sponsor this resolution and the position which lies behind it to attribute to the majority members of the joint committee and to the chairman of the joint committee a complete sense of fairness and justice, and also to attribute that quality to the minority members of the joint committee. It is true, of course, that the minority party has almost equal membership on the committee with the majority party. The minority membership of the two committees which have been directed to hold joint hearings consists of most able and distinguished Senators. Let me recite the names of the Senators from the minority side of the aisle who are members of the Committee on Armed Services, and who, if they saw any departure at all on the part of the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the joint committee, from the path of fairness, justness, and sound Americanism—and I am sure there will be no such departure—would certainly be under obligation of the gravest sort immediately to call attention to any such departure.

Surely the Members of the Senate on the minority side must remember that they have on the Armed Services Committee the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], a former governor of his State; the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], also a former governor of his State——

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator——

Mr. HOLLAND. I will not yield until I finish this list.

There is also the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]; and the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that here are men who have grown gray in the service of their Nation and in the service of their States. Many of them have served in a military capacity in wars which our Nation has fought. I know that one of these men suffered the loss of a dearly loved son in World War II. Surely, Senators on the minority side of the aisle do not find themselves in the situation of being unwilling to rely upon men such as those whose names I have just read, not only to do the fair thing, but to bring out into the open any departure from rules of fairness, justice, and sound Americanism, if there should be any such departure in the transactions of the joint committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I do not want to be disrespectful in any way. The committee is to reconvene at 2:30. Nearly all these arguments have already been brought forward. I wonder if the Senator would not cooperate and permit us to obtain a vote on the pending motion and on the resolution itself. Unless the Senate acts before the committee reconvenes at 2:30, there will be further delay. I do not say that in any sense of disrespect to the Senator or his right to the floor. If he wishes to make the argument, that is all right, but I am saying to the distinguished Senator that the committee is to reconvene at 2:30. I am perfectly willing to forego any answer to anything that has been said, in order to obtain a vote on the resolution. It ought to be done before 2:30 if it is to be done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Florida will not take much more time by his remarks, but he wants to be clearly on record as to how he feels on this matter. He must ask the Senator to indulge him for a few minutes longer.

Let us go to the membership of the Foreign Relations Committee. At the present time there are five distinguished Members of the minority party on that committee. There is a vacancy which can be filled on an hour's notice, and I understand it will be filled immediately. But considering only the five members already upon that committee from the Republican side of the aisle, I call attention to the names of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]; the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], a former governor of his State; the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], a former governor of his State.

I call to the attention of the Senate in general, and particularly to the attention of the minority Members of the Senate, the fact that they have distinguished representation upon the Foreign Relations Committee. Upon that committee are men who have served their States and their Nation ably. Several of them have served in the Armed Forces. Members of the minority can surely rely with complete certainty upon the soundness of service of those men, and upon their willingness to bring to light any departure from the rules of fairness, sound Americanism, and real patriotism, if there are any departures in those respects on the part of the chairman of the committee—of course, there will be none on his part—or on the part of any other members of the committee.

The Senator from Florida will not read the names of the majority members

of the two committees; but among that group are several former governors as well as several men of great distinction from the judiciary—for example, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], former chief justice of the highest court of his State. Incidentally, he too lost a beloved son during World War II.

Mr. President, Senators simply cannot properly take the position of questioning the patriotism of members of the committee, and the soundness of the procedure to be followed by men of such high quality and character. They have already clearly expressed their view, by a majority vote, to the effect that in justice to the country and its most sacred secrets and most carefully guarded measures, measures which are of great importance to our men now serving in Korea, we cannot subject this hearing to open consideration of all these matters and to the possibility of the defeat of our security by bringing in, even unintentionally, matters which point to a situation on which should be carefully concealed and kept away from public knowledge.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is about to conclude. He feels that the Senate has already shown by its action in this matter that it regards this matter as of the gravest importance to the United States because it has assigned this matter jointly for hearing to two of its most distinguished committees, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, thereby showing that it feels that the subject matters to be gone into by those committees do have a most vital impact upon those matters in our national structure which have to do with national defense and particularly with the conduct of the war now going on in Korea; and they also have to do intimately with the matters of our foreign relations with our allies and with others who are not our allies, and with other nations throughout the earth generally.

Mr. President, that very action shows that the Senate recognizes this matter as being extremely grave and as being of the most vital importance to our Nation in these two great fields.

Mr. President, the question now is whether by the adoption of the proposed resolution the Senate will proceed to place upon the committees the burden of trying to go ahead with open hearings when the committees have already declared that they think that course is unsafe and unsound, and when the committees have already shown by their action that they feel that such a course would not be the safer course, would not be the satisfactory course, would not be the course which gives information most quickly, information which should be given as quickly as possible to our public, and, above all, is not the course which will safeguard the security of our fighting men.

Mr. President, after all, that is the matter of supremest importance. The casualty lists have already struck pretty close to many of us. They have already reached close to the senior Senator from Florida. He knows something about what is going on in 60,000 homes in the United States, where boys from those homes have either given their all or have suffered wounds, so as to have them named as casualties in the war which is now going on.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator that as I listened to General MacArthur this morning I got the distinct feeling that the thing that will determine the security of the boys in Korea more than any other one thing is the making of a right decision by the people of America in their choice between the courses of action suggested. The Senator will remember, I am sure, some of the words which I shall not at this time attempt to repeat, but words the Senator will surely remember, of General MacArthur. He was not this morning speaking, so far as I could detect at any point, with the concern of one who is trying to justify a course of action, but as one who was trying to give information and presenting to the Members who were there listening the importance of making a decision that would affect the security of the boys in Korea. Without the information to make that decision properly how can the boys be given security?

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from South Dakota. Perhaps he was not here when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] made his statement, part of which was that already, since the hearing of this morning, General MacArthur has stated he had to withhold, and felt that it was wise to withhold at a meeting of that kind, facts that are of importance and will have to be given later, but which he feels pertain so vitally to the security of the United States that he could not go into them at that meeting.

The question is this: Shall we go ahead with what does not go beneath the surface, that does not deal with vital questions, shall we skim over everything, and lay aside matters affecting the disposition of our forces, the arming of our forces, the health of our forces, to see that they are supplied with ammunition and other weapons which they can use; the question of the disposition of our naval forces and their numbers engaged, and of our air forces, the question of support which has been accorded to us in this common effort by our allies, who are already in the war, about 20 allies, that is; the question of the organization of those who are our actual enemies, and those who are our potential enemies, and also those who are our potential friends; the question of intimate facts affecting Japan—and we cannot ignore Japan with its eighty or ninety million people who, thanks largely to the service of General MacArthur, are apparently now most friendly disposed to us?

All those matters are so intimate to the whole discussion. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota, that if we carefully evade any reference to them and carefully evade going into any matter which touches them we have very little left.

It is because of that fact that the two commitees have, in their joint judgment, already agreed, by their majority vote, that they do not feel that it is sound to go into this question in open hearing.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I merely wish to ask him, Was it not understood that whatever public hearings might be had, the committees might proceed with executive sessions thereafter, to consider intimate details?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, it was so understood, I will say to the Senator from South Dakota. The very fact that that was the case defers and delays until later hearings getting at the meat in the cocoanut. And I will say to the Senator that if it is important for the Congress of the United States to take action, if it is important for the Congress of the United States to decide what policy, in its judgment, is best, it must have the facts, and not just that skimming of facts which in the judgment of the committee is safe to be exposed at public hearings.

Mr. CASE. I may say very briefly that I understood that following the hearing this morning General MacArthur said there was nothing he said this morning that might not be given to the public. I heard several Members on both sides of the aisle at the hearing say the same thing after the hearing this morning. But it is my considered opinion that many of the things said by MacArthur this morning would have had a terrific impact on the country if the people had heard what he said, and had heard the way he said it. It would affect the security of the boys in Korea.

Mr. HOLLAND. Anything that does not pertain to the security of the country can be made and will be made available to the country, of course, and the Senator knows that. He knows that his side of the aisle is safeguarded by the presence of nearly half of the members of the joint committees as representatives of his side of the aisle, and if there is any disposition to withhold anything which is really so safe that it can be made public knowledge, that it is within the power of the Senators upon that side of the aisle who sit upon the committees to see that public knowledge is had of those matters. So it seems to me so clear that what is sought to be done is to skim off those things which can be made safely available to the public, but hold back the vital information and facts upon which any judgment to be sound must be based.

I say to the Senator that judgment which is sound cannot be based upon the skimmings. In order for a sound judgment to be made, there must be available the whole substance of the facts which show what is our situation over there in the Orient, what is the condition of our Armed Forces and those who compose them, and of those who may be on one side or the other in the future.

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear from the question of the Senator from South Dakota that what he would like to do,

that what those who support the resolution would like to do, is to skim off hurriedly a few facts, which can be made matters of public knowledge, but to hold back the meat upon which solely any sound judgment can be made, and to allow again, the public to have a partial description of what the facts are, and to allow the formation of public judgments, either sound or unsound, without getting the needed knowledge quickly to Senators who represent the various States in the Nation—and I hope that all of us feel that we represent all the people of this Nation.

I say to the Senator that I think he and those who share his feelings are suggesting a completely unsound method of approach, and I believe we have had too much of that unsoundness already. Now we need to get at the very essential meat of the situation which confronts us in Korea; and in order to get at that meat, we have to delve into the secret matters which cannot be disclosed in the open. It will not be possible for sound judgment to be reached in connection with such matters until those vital questions have been probed and until we have the benefit of the mass of information which is in the mind of the great field commander who until so recently was in command of our men in Korea and the mass of information which is in the minds of others who are in part entrusted with representing us in the military field.

Mr. President, I do not agree with those who conclude that in order to appease the popular demand for information now—not information as to the ultimate facts, which cannot be made public, but information as to the facts which can be made public—the procedure in the committee should be a casual, hurried, skimming off of such harmless facts from the total facts to be presented at the hearings.

Mr. President, the people of Florida, who are writing literally thousands of letters to me about this matter, wish us to get at the vital facts, and in that connection they want the benefit of the expressions of those who represent them as to what are the best interests of our Nation and what we can do to achieve a policy which will be sound and will lead to a victorious conclusion of the struggle in Korea. They do not want a prolongation of the whole question by means of having the committee spend days and days in a useless endeavor to skim off the facts which can be made public, and to separate them from the vital facts which cannot be made public, but on the basis of which alone the decisions can be made.

I say to the Senator from South Dakota that what he and those who are associated with him in his position suggest is that instead of coming to a quick conclusion based upon sound knowledge of the vital facts, we prolong this difficult and dangerous situation by skimming off a lot of facts which can be made public and by conducting the hearings as a sort of Roman holiday, from day to day, and postponing until after that time the determination of the real facts which alone—and I repeat that only the possession of the real facts will make it possible for anyone—whether it be the distinguished Senator from South Dakota or any other Senator on his side of the aisle or any Senator on this side of the aisle, or any other person representing the public, any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House of Representatives—to reach the sound conclusions which are so necessary. Those who take the position the Senator from South Dakota takes would, in effect, have us prolong this whole miserable experience and postpone for a long period into the future, the getting down to the meat of the coconut. However, that is exactly the wrong way to approach this matter, because it is clear as crystal that it is our duty to probe as quickly as possible in order to reach the ultimate facts as promptly as we can, and then to reach sound conclusions on the basis of those facts. Until we have those facts, it will be impossible for us to reach sound conclusions regarding these matters. In connection with the probe that we must make, we must bear in mind that the facts which we must obtain in order to reach a sound judgment are, by their very nature, a part of the intimate secrets of our Nation, secrets which cannot safely be disclosed to the public; for if they were disclosed, they would bring greater danger and greater suffering and greater punishment to those who represent us in Korea.

Nevertheless, there are some who say, "Let us postpone until some distant time, some days or some weeks from now, the time when we shall come to grips with this problem, and in the meantime let us have a lot of sparring on the inconsequential questions which can safely be brought out into the public gaze."

Mr. President, I say that I do not believe Senators who take that position have thought through this matter. Nevertheless, that is the position essentially, which some Senators now take when they say there should be long hearings, open at first—although such Senators recognize that there must be closed hearings eventually and that the serious, grave facts cannot be disclosed in open hearings. However, they would have a long series of open hearings held and spun out at length, and thereafter would have the committees get down to the matters which really count. Mr. President, that is not the proper way to approach this matter.

I think I have expressed what is the only wise position in regard to this issue. The only proper course is for the Senators who are charged with this inquiry to get at the real facts and the secrets as quickly as possible, and they wish to do so under conditions under which they can examine both secret and nonsecret matters with equal ease and dispatch, just as a matter of course; they wish to proceed with the inquiry in such a way that from minute to minute or from question to question they will not have to be worried as to whether a certain question does or does not break the rule of security, which of course all Senators will be trying to observe.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether he agrees with the change of heart that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee have had in regard to allowing all Senators who wish to attend the hearings to do so?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that I am one of those who urged that the joint committees take that action.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask a further question. I have the highest regard for the integrity and understanding of the distinguished Senator from Florida, but I wish to ask whether he would have any objection to having the chairman of committee exercise his own judgment in regard to whether the data being presented must be kept secret, in the interest of the security of the country, and whether the Senator would object to having the proceedings in this case conducted along the lines of the previous proceedings, over the years, so far as I recall, namely, by allowing the public to hear the evidence when the security of the Nation is not involved?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have implicit confidence in the sound judgment as well as the patriotism of the Senator from Georgia. Only a short time ago he advised the Senate that he felt he could not assume the responsibility of conducting the hearings without having them conducted in secret and then making known the matters which could safely be disclosed to the public. He made it very plain that the joint committee had already considered the question and had ruled that in its sound judgment it was not proper or wise to proceed on a hit-or-miss basis in the hope that it would catch every improper question ahead of time and would catch every exposure ahead of time in such a way as to preserve the secrets of our Nation. If the Senator from Nevada had been in the Chamber a short time ago, he would have heard the Senator from Georgia speaking from the depths of a very great conviction, say that he felt that to proceed in any other way—in any way other than in closed hearings—would be unsafe and unsound in this situation. He reminded the Senate that, as a Member of the Senate, he sat upon the Committee on Naval Affairs throughout World War II, and that in every hearing that committee held on matters relating to the conduct of the war or matters having to do with the vital secrets of our Nation, the hearings were always secret.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Of course I understand that the present situation in Korea is still a police action and is not world war III; at least, does not the Senator from Florida understand that to be the interepretation which still is made?

Mr. HOLLAND. Regardless of the name by which it is called, I understand that it is a most bitter adventure. I speak of it as the Korean war. When there have been more than 60,000 casualties among our American boys, I

think it is a colossal tragedy and catastrophe, and I think it is entitled to be called a war; and I regard it as such at this time.

At the same time, I remind the Senator from Nevada that it is completely true that it is still a police action; it is an effort on the part of a large number of nations, in which we have assumed and are taking the largest part, by reason of geographic and other considerations, to prevent the outbreak of a world war and an effort to prevent aggressions from crowding out of existence a tiny republic which we helped create and sponsored and which the United Nations sponsored. In that sense of course it is still a police action. But it is grave enough in its size, and in its implications with respect to thousands of American homes and lives, to be dignified by the name of war. The Senator from Florida will not quarrel with the Senator from Nevada, regardless of what name he applies to it. To the Senator from Florida, it is a serious war, as well as a very grave police action.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, I agree with the Senator from Florida that it is a war. I thoroughly disagree with him, however, if he agrees with the President in his conduct of the war; but I do not hear that subject discussed very much. The war is being conducted in the manner of a football game, so that we cannot break up the huddles, but we must stop them at the scrimmage line. We have worn out the thirty-eighth parallel in going back and forth across it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to comment on that point?

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, the Senator from Florida has not agreed, by any manner of means, with all the decisions of the President of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to hear that.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the next place, the Senator from Florida would not be as interested in these hearings as he is, did he not think they will disclose new facts and give new light upon which sounder decisions can be based. In the next place, he does not feel that it is sound for the Senator from Florida or for the Senator from Nevada to depart from the rule of withholding judgment upon this serious matter, which affects tens of thousands of American lives, until he can get the facts, and he wants the facts to be made available with all possible speed. He is saying to the Senator from Nevada and to those who take the same attitude, that it appears to the Senator from Florida that they are trying to raise a sandstorm of all sorts of inconsequential things, though some of them may be tremendously appealing, and to hold back the opportunity to get at the meat in the coconut, and to find out what the real facts are.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Without discussing whether we can win a war while tying the hands of the Army and facing a terrific enemy, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether, in the hearings, when a question arises which is of public interest, he could trust the judgment of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of General MacArthur on the question of what it is necessary to conceal in the interest of the public safety and the national security, and as to what would be merely a historical review of the situation? Would the Senator from Florida be willing to trust their judgment?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida would be willing to trust those distinguished military officers as far as any human being could be trusted, to safeguard our secrets. But the Senator from Florida calls to the attention of the Senator from Nevada three things: first, that mistakes can be made, and they have been made, by the best trained men we have, and with the best of intentions; second, that questions may be asked which will be completely unwise from the standpoint of maintaining our secrets, and they will be used before there is any chance to stop them.

The Senator from Florida reminds the Senator from Nevada of the old courtroom story about the judge making a lawyer withdraw a question to a witness, which question itself had done tremendous damage; the lawyer, of course, withdrew the question very gladly, only to be reminded by counsel on the other side that he withdrew the question, as an attacker would withdraw a red-hot poker which had already been inserted into the vitals of the person attacked, claiming that he had done no harm, since he had withdrawn it. So the Senator from Florida reminds the Senator from Nevada that even in asking questions there is danger of doing irreparable harm.

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

Mr. LOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I see no danger in asking a question in regard to national security, so long as the question does not convey information affecting the national interest. But I would say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I am very happy the majority of the committee changed its attitude and allowed Senators to attend the hearings at which General MacArthur is to testify. It is the firm conviction of the junior Senator from Nevada that if the people of the United States could have heard the testimony this morning, the party would be over.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida expresses his appreciation to the Senator from Nevada. Before the Senator from Nevada leaves the Chamber, the Senator from Florida desires to state the third point of his answer, which he was prevented from doing by the last question of the Senator from Nevada. The third value which is to be remembered is that much greater speed is possible if a complete investigation of each field which is being investigated can be made at the time it is before the committee, and that it does not make either for a better understanding or for good speed or a quick solution of this matter to have each of the many fields which must be explored only broached in the open hearing, only scraped, if the Senator from Florida may use that term, and then to have all the substance of it relegated to the background, to be held for a period of days or weeks, until the two committees can return to it and the witnesses can be called back, at which time other more important aspects of the question in that field may finally be explored. So, the Senator from Florida feels that the only expeditious way and the only secure way and the only sound way to proceed is as stated by the Senator from Georgia and as determined already by a majority of the two committees sitting jointly, including in that majority at least one Senator who comes from the minority side of the aisle.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then I would say further to the Senator from Florida that the strategy determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the last 9 or 10 months should have been based upon the forethought and the great deliberation the Senator is describing, instead of their coming up to the barrier, after 9 or 10 months of fighting, with nearly 70,000 casualties, and blood and guts strewn all over Korea, back and forth across that little wart on Asia. The strategy should have been settled in meetings of the great Joint Chiefs of Staff, instead of having the football game which is being played in Korea, for the very reason that England and other empire-minded nations want to save some of their areas in the Far East, such as Hong Kong and Indochina. England has recognized Communist China; and the newspapers today state that 120,000 tons of rubber have been sent into Communist China by England within the past 9 months. Of course, we all know what the British have been doing. The junior Senator from Nevada was in Asia. He flew over Korea twice, and he was in Japan and all over China in 1948. At that time it was well known what the British were doing in the way of sending strictly critical supplies from Hong Kong and Shanghai into Communist China.

I venture the guess that, through the Marshall plan, the 16 Marshall plan countries, the 96 trade treaties which certain of them have with iron curtain countries, and as a result of the materials sent to Singapore by them, at least two-thirds of the materials fired back at American boys in Korea was paid for by the taxpayers of America, the fathers and mothers of those boys.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida answers that long, complicated question, I wonder if he would yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I object. I have waited for a long time to get recognition and have been denied it——

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, what I have to present is a matter of ceremonial comment.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not object to that. I thought the Senator from Connecticut wanted to make some comment about the soundness or unsoundness of the resolution. There has been a filibuster going on because we have not been able to obtain a vote by 2:30 o'clock——

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not yield, Mr. President. The Senator from Nebraska is talking about something that is completely false, and he knows it to be false.

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has made a point of order, and the Senator from Florida will take his seat.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Florida be allowed to proceed in order.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from Florida be permitted to proceed in order.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut if I may do so without losing my place on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Connecticut without losing his place on the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

(At this point Mr. BENTON called attention to the presence in the galleries of distinguished visitors from foreign countries touring the United States as guests of the Trans-World Airlines, and appropriate remarks were made by him and by the Vice President, which appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I proceed further I should like to ask unanimous consent of the Senate to expunge from the RECORD the single word "false," which I think was inappropriate; and without objection——

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the gesture of the distinguished Senator from Florida; and if the word "filibuster" is in any way objectionable I withdraw it. When last night I asked if there was not some way we could proceed to the consideration of the resolution, it was difficult to get cooperation. I deeply appreciate the action of the Senator from Florida, for whom I have the highest regard, and I want to thank him for his friendly gesture.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska and I appreciate his withdrawing the comment which brought on my immoderate statement. Of course, it is completely unnecessary to say that so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned he is not planning anything in the nature of a filibuster, because he expects to conclude shortly, and he is sure the Senator from Nebraska never meant to attribute any marathon speaking ambitions to the Senator from Florida.

I remind the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Florida has sat on the floor of the Senate from January 3 to this moment and has listened to hundreds upon hundreds of hours of speaking on foreign-relations questions and questions with reference to Korea from other Senators, particularly Senators on the other side of the aisle. He believes he has listened to dozens of hours of such speeches by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. He has never expressed any umbrage or fear that the Senator from Nebraska was going to deprive the Senator from Florida of his right to be heard upon the floor. He has never accused the Senator from Nebraska or any other Senator of putting on a filibuster, although he has spent many, many days in listening to the expression of their convictions. Therefore the Senator from Florida was disappointed that the Senator from Nebraska seemed to feel justified in charging the Senator from Florida with doing something that he was not doing. He therefore now appreciates the attitude of the Senator from Nebraska.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I realize that the Senator from Florida is a very distinguished Senator. His judgment is always respected by other Senators. All of us appreciate his observations. Therefore I could not see why reading the names of the minority members of the committees had anything to do with the facts in the case. Perhaps it was well to emphasize the respect in which we hold them. But I say to the Senator from Florida, really and truly, that we all know who the minority members are. They have a right to their places on the committees. It took the other side a long time to concede it. After the urgency with which I presented my resolution to the Senate I simply could not understand why it was necessary for the distinguished Senator from Florida to read the names, for example. It looked to me as though an effort were being made to continue to talk until after 2:30 o'clock, which would make it very difficult to obtain a vote on the resolution without inconveniencing many Members of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate what the Senator from Nebraska has said. Unfortunately, many people who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will not have the intimate knowledge of the situation which is possessed in such great degree by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. They do not know, for instance——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not need to read the names again.

Mr. HOLLAND. They do not know, for instance, the personnel of the various committees. They do not know the high, distinguished, and honorable records which have been made by the members of the committees. For example, they are not aware that a great many of the members have been governors of their States. The Senator from Florida has a peculiar affection for ex-governors, as the Senator from Nebraska well knows. The Senator from Nebraska knows the background of the members of the committees. He knows which of them have made terrible personal sacrifices, through the loss of members of their own families, in the Armed Forces of our country. The general reading public does not know it. Therefore, the Senator from Florida hopes that the Senator from Nebraska will be patient with his friend from Florida, and will allow him in his own way to conclude the first statement which he should like to make upon the subject of Korea and Asiatic policy, after he has listened for almost endless hours—though he assures the Senator from Nebraska that his remarks have always been most interesting, and that time passed quickly and pleasantly—to the distinguished Senator declaim upon the mistakes which our country has made in Korea, as he feels, and in Asia, as he feels, and as he has shown the depth of his conviction and his willingness to stand upon such convictions.

I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have sometimes agreed with his position, and I do now agree with some of his criticisms. I do not agree with the idea of making a Roman holiday out of a hearing which is designed to probe into the depths of our military policy and strategy and our most closely guarded military secrets about a war which is still going on and is a bigger war today than it has been prior to this time, when we do not know that the end of it is in sight and there are 250,000 American boys over there whose lives and safety depend upon our reaching sound solutions. Therefore I am certainly not in accord with the policy advanced, I think mistakenly, by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I think it is based upon very poor judgment. I think it is exceedingly unwise. However, I know that the Senator has a deep conviction about it, or he would not urge it.

The Senator from Nebraska is seeking to make a Roman holiday out of a hearing in which there must come the time—and apparently the Senator from Nebraska hopes it will come much later than the Senator from Florida hopes it will come—when intimate secrets of our Nation, with respect to our military planning and strategy must be bared to the able and patriotic Senators from both sides of the aisle upon whose shoulders and hearts and consciences lie the heavy responsibility of making sound recommendations.

The Senator from Florida feels that it is unwise to go into the question in such a way. He does not feel that only a few of the most easily discovered and most harmless facts should be brought out over a period of days and that there should be held back for a period of days, or perhaps weeks, the coming to grips with the serious issues. The Senator from Florida has heard the Senator from Nebraska repeatedly, in the course of this spring, and other Senators on that side of the aisle, and this side also, talk about our boys having to fight a war

with one hand tied behind their backs. I remind the Senator from Nebraska that if he forces open hearings he will put the 23 or 25 or 26 Senators—depending on whether or not all of them are present—in the position of having to devote almost all of their time for days or weeks to the vain effort to satisfy the avid curiosity of people who want to hear things but who cannot, when the payoff comes, safely be allowed to hear the real facts in the controversy. The Senator from Nebraska knows that perfectly well.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. The sooner we get the real facts produced in private the sooner decisions can be made. It is such decisions on vital policy which the Senator from Florida eagerly awaits and wants to get to as quickly as possible. He does not like delaying tactics of the kind represented by the resolution, under which the actual bringing in of facts would be suspended for a period of days or perhaps weeks.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no quarrel with the position of the Senator from Florida. He has a perfect right to his convictions. The committees have a perfect right to hold executive or closed sessions. My judgment is that open hearings bring out the facts and bring out the truth. I have just as strong convictions as has the Senator from Florida. I have just been handed a report taken from the news ticker in the cloakroom. It says:

President Truman told a group of foreign newspapermen that if the people of the world can get the truth peace will come automatically.

I suppose the Senator agrees with that statement.

He spoke to the group in the Rose Garden at the White House.

He spoke to a group of newspaper representatives from 14 countries. The statement is emphasized again:

Mr. Truman said he hoped they had seen and found for themselves some things which they can tell their people when they get home.

I emphasize the words "found for themselves some things which they can tell their people." Not something that was skimmed off for them.

Mr. Truman said, "If we can get the truth to the people, peace will come automatically."

That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to get the truth to the people.

I have a right to my convictions. When I say I want open hearings, I want open hearings only in respect to defense policies which the great men who will come to testify agree can be made public. Certainly the Senator does not mean that General MacArthur, General Bradley, or General Collins, for example, or Mr. Acheson, would go before the committees and intentionally violate the espionage laws of our country. Such a contention is completely ridiculous. I am surprised that the distinguished Senator, whose judgment is very highly regarded in the Senate, should even suggest such a thing.

No one is asking for a Roman holiday. All we are asking is that the people of the United States get the facts, and not the skimmed-off facts which come from secret hearings, or statements which may be misinterpreted. When I left the committee hearing this morning literally scores of newspapermen gathered around me and asked, "What did he say?" Already certain statements have been made as to what was said. They represent the skimmed-off portion.

What we want is open hearings on everything which has to do with the defense policy. General MacArthur has placed on the table his proposals. Why can we not have the evidence to support those proposals? Why cannot the people of the country be informed as to what those proposals are? That is all I am asking. I hope the Senator, in his fairness, will not charge me with seeking by the resolution to have a Roman holiday or a big show.

I went through all the hearings in the so-called Connally committee, when the question of troops for Europe was under consideration. While it is true that the hearings were not televised, yet I believe that my mail will substantiate the statement that the people of the country were better informed when we finished than they would have been if they had been carried by television, and much better informed than they would have been if closed hearings had been held.

The trouble has not been with open hearings. The trouble has been with secret hearings. In my opinion, the last two World Wars were caused by secret hearings. I believe that the blood of the boys to whom the Senator has referred would not have been shed on the battlefields of Korea if the Wedemeyer report had not been suppressed for three long years. It has now been made public. We know what is in it. If we had followed the course outlined in his report at that time, the great generals whom the Senator loves, General Ridgway, and General Van Fleet, about whom he spoke so highly the other day, would not even be in Korea today.

All I am asking is that the things which do not need to be suppressed shall not be suppressed. It is the secret agreements—Yalta, Potsdam, and all others of them—which have brought the United States into war. It is secret agreements which are responsible for the bloodshed the Senator has been talking about in his defense of secret hearings. Give us open hearings, and let the people of the country know the facts. Open hearings will result in unity among the people. The people will then support whatever policy is determined upon. But when we try to skim off certain facts and give the people what some persons want them to hear, we get into trouble.

Mr. President, my convictions are just as strong as those of the Senator from Florida. If I have been impatient about obtaining consideration for the resolution, I want the Senator from Florida to forgive me. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Florida now say that he will help me to obtain a vote on this proposal sometime during the day. I think the people have the right to know the facts. Those who believe in opening the hearings think the people should be informed about the things they should know. Those who do not want the people informed want the hearings to be closed.

I am not quarreling with the Senator's position. I am not quarreling with anyone who wants closed hearings. That is all right with me. I simply do not agree with that procedure. I believe that history has substantiated the convictions which I hold as to open hearings. I have no secrets. If I had, someone would find them out anyway. I should like to see anyone keep the newspaper men from finding out what happened today at the hearing. I listened to about an hour of the testimony. I did not hear it all. I will say to the Senator from Florida that every word I heard could have been given in open hearings to the people of the United States. If they had been permitted to hear the testimony, that fact would have done as much to help unify the people as anything we have heard about in hearings since I have been a Member of this body, during the past 9 years. I say that honestly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. There are two comments which I wish to make upon his statement.

First, with reference to the Wedemeyer report, it required the action of the joint committee, through its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], even to get the report.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. That was the first showing, and a very definite showing of the fairness and thoroughness of the committee. One of the first things it asked for was the Wedemeyer report; and as soon as members of the Committee had an opportunity to assure themselves that the question of national security was not involved, they made the report available. It seems to the Senator from Florida that instead of criticizing the functioning of the committee, at least with reference to that report, the Senator from Nebraska ought to be paying warm praise to the committee for having already given earnest evidence of its desire to serve patriotically by making public something which could safely be made public. Time after time during the past 3 years I have heard the Senator yearn for publication of the report.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what resulted in the report being made public. It was the yearning and the speeches which were made to pry it loose.

Mr. HOLLAND. The next thing I wish to comment on is this: The Senator's position voices the attitude that it is a good thing to proceed with those parts of the facts, those crumbs from the table, which can safely be made available to the public, and to hold back the meat of the issue until later. That is exactly where the Senator from Florida thinks the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska is very badly at fault. I do not question

the patriotism of the Senator from Nebraska. However, I believe that the sooner the witnesses can give to committees of the Senate the vital facts without which we cannot intelligently pass upon these questions, the better.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield after a bit; not now.

The Senator from Nebraska may feel that from the wealth of his experience and observations he has amply safe ground upon which to base a permanent judgment. However, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, so far as the devoted members of these two committees are concerned, and, he believes, so far as the sound thinking people of the nation are concerned, they know perfectly well that no skimming of the froth is going to serve any good purpose.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at this time. I allowed the Senator to speak for 10 minutes without ever voicing a question.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has spoken for 3 hours.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to say what I would like to say, I should like to remind him that when any witness, whether it be General Bradley, General MacArthur, some diplomat, or some other person not even yet named as a witness, completes his public statement, if he has knowledge of secret facts, then is the time, if we are to consider his testimony as a cohesive whole, to investigate the things of which he has intimate knowledge. Under the Senator's program that would be impossible.

I remind the Senator—and I hope he will pay attention——

Mr. WHERRY. I am listening.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now before he leaves that point? He is going to another point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make my point, if I may.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has made three points.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's impatience, but I should like to make my point, if I may.

The Senator from Nebraska would like to have one of the generals make his statement in general, without at all disclosing any secrets, but simply voicing his opinion, as to what he thinks the proper policy should be, without being subjected at that very time, at that very hearing, to the necessity of having to answer certain questions from Senators on both sides of the aisle as to what are the facts underlying the decision which he think is wise—the facts as to men, as to matériel, as to experience; the facts as to the attitude of our allies, and as to the attitude of those who may be our allies or may be our enemies in the future. I say to the Senator that it is completely wrong to have the public get the impression that such and such an expression of opinion from a distinguished witness is the ultimate fact, without having available the facts upon which that opinion is based.

The Senator knows that good people do not always agree. I am prepared to admit that the Senator is a very distinguished and highly patriotic American. The Senator, however, does not always agree with the Senator from Georgia on these questions, yet the Senator from Florida feels that the Senator from Georgia is also a distinguished and highly patriotic American. Men's minds differ on vital questions. The Senator from Nebraska proposes to adopt a program under which only those comparatively innocuous things which do not go to the root of any of the problems can come out at the time of the expression of the policy which one of the witnesses feels should be adopted.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to yield until I have finished my statement. I fear that the Senator's impatience sometimes runs away with his manners.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is perfectly courteous and good manners to ask the Senator to yield before finishing a point, or before making three or four more points, or making a speech.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has not finished his point.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was saying—well all right, I will refrain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield when I get through making my point.

My point, Mr. President, is that it is unfair to the public and it is unfair to the witness and it is unfair from every point of view to have a mere expression of opinion on policy go out as the ultimate, unassailable fact of the matter, without having at the same time the opportunity and the chance to delve into and to explore the facts which lie behind that expression of policy and which, by their very existence, determine the wisdom or unwisdom of that policy. The Senator knows perfectly well that the Senator from Florida is correct in that.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. That is because it is so obvious on the face of it that any mere expression of opinion, whether it is General MacArthur's opinion, or Mr. Acheson's opinion, or whosoever's opinion it is, is only an opinion until the facts upon which it is based can be made public. Yet the Senator proposes a program under which opinions become permanent, and the expression of opinions is substituted for the opportunity to explore into what the ultimate facts may be. The Senator from Florida thinks that is a very unwise decision, and a very unwise way to proceed; and he thinks that the members of these two committees have deliberated to good advantage and have brought forth a wise decision, much wiser than that which the quick efforts of those who have presented this resolution would leave us make. He thinks the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is much better qualified than is the Senator from Florida or the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to know what the implications are in investigating these questions, as to their importance to national security, and as to what particular facts need to be explored to determine whether or not an opinion based upon facts is sound or unsound.

The Senator from Georgia and a considerable majority of the committees sitting jointly have come to the conclusion, with which I agree implicitly, that it is unsound and would be unwise to adopt the course which the Senator suggests, and which would leave opinions expressed without giving any chance at all to look for the foundation upon which those opinions are based. The Senator knows that is not good policy, it is not logical, it is not sound, and the Senator even appears to be speechless when confronted with that situation.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. In the course of the discussion by the Senator from Nebraska he intimated or stated or alleged that the procedure taking place was one of skimming off what the committees wanted the public to know, and keeping the cream of the information from the public. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the procedure now in effect in the committees whereby every question and every answer is taken down, and subject only to deletions of information by one charged with the responsibility of protecting the security of the United States; that with that exception alone, every question asked and every answer made is immediately given to the press?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida understands that is the practice; and he cannot, to save his life, see why the Senator from Nebraska and others who, like him, support the resolution, are unwilling to have those who best know what is required for the security of this country made the deletions to which the Senator has referred.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further.

Mr. KERR. Then is it not a fact that the only thing being skimmed off is what the ones charged with the direct responsibility for the national security conceive or consider to be information which would be of benefit to the enemy were it published?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. And the obverse of the statement is true. The only matters made available under the program suggested here by the Senator from Nebraska are those things which cannot even be construed as being remotely connected with the national security. The public will get a great deal more information by following the program which has been put into force than by following such a program as that suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, in which he proposes that only those things that can safely be mentioned come out, and that everything else be held back, and that if there is a question about any matter, of course that matter shall be held back.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from

Florida yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if it is quite clear to him why the Wedemeyer report was held secret for 3½ years, and just recently released.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not having seen the secret and expurgated portions of that report, which are shown even now to have been eliminated, the Senator from Florida does not know what the implication of the inclusion of those parts of the report would have been; and he suspects that if it had been released earlier there would have been a great many more items taken out. I judge from the developments now that the time has come when those charged with the preservation of the secrets of our Nation feel that by cutting out only a little, they can make most of the body of the report available. They may have been mistaken in their earlier action. Probably they should have made the report available a long time ago; I do not know about that. But neither the Senator from Kansas—and I say it with all respect—nor the Senator from Florida, is competent to judge that question, because neither of us knows what was in the portions that were eliminated. Neither of us knows what may have been in other portions that would have been of vital benefit to an enemy if it had been released earlier.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator from Kansas does not hold himself out as a military expert, nor is the Senator from Kansas privileged to be a member of the great Foreign Relations Committee or the Armed Services Committee. Sometimes we secure information as to what goes on in those committees second or third hand.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he does not believe that some of the basic matters in the Wedemeyer report, which cannot be construed to be matters of strictly secret information, could well have been brought to the attention of the American people before 3½ years had elapsed? I should also like to ask the Senator, if he will pardon me for asking two questions in one, whether that type of procedure has not led to the public of this great country being distrustful of those who are doing such things?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has asked two questions, first as to whether the Wedemeyer report, or the substance of it, could have been made available earlier. The Senator from Florida is inclined to think it could have been. The Senator from Florida does not, however, nor does the Senator from Kansas, have all the facts upon which he can be perfectly assured that his opinion is correct. I speak now for the Senator from Florida, and I think I can speak for the Senator from Kansas, because neither of us has seen the deleted portions of the report.

As to the other question, I think candor requires me to say that it would have brought good results if the report had been made public earlier.

I do not want to hold back information. Information which can be given out without violating the security needs of the Nation should be given out, of course. I agree that some of these matters have been withheld from the public too long, and when that is done the practice tends to diminish public confidence.

I am trying to have us move swiftly ahead now, in this hearing, as we endeavor to meet the vital problems confronting the Nation.

At this moment the Senator and I are not talking about an academic question; we are talking about 250,000 live American boys. Some of them will not be alive tomorrow night, and more of them will not be alive a month from now. I and those who feel as I do think it is imperative to get to the heart of this question, and that the only way to do so is to let the large group of very fine and very honorable men who are members of the two committees—Senators from both sides of the aisle—follow their own judgment, as it has already been expressed, and quickly reach the very heart of this question, and then make their recommendations to the Senate.

The other method is a sparring method, one which shows, even before the investigation starts, that it would not be the purpose to explore the substantial questions at an early stage of the inquiry, but, instead, that the purpose would be to conduct a sort of Roman holiday in the course of which the 200, 300, or 400 persons who could obtain admittance to the hearing room would be given a chance to see what occurred there, but by which the vital security of the Nation would not best be served and by which the speedy solution of the problems confronting us would not best be served.

I feel with deep conviction that it is tremendously important to the Nation that we move as quickly as possible to the heart of this question. I believe it would not best serve the interests of the Nation if we were to postpone the solution or if we were to have the members of the committee devote their time to mere expressions of opinion, which, after all, are likely to vary widely. It is inevitable that men will differ in their opinions as to what the wise course is. Therefore, the giving of publicity to mere expressions of opinion would simply intensify the dispute and the discussion and the confusion and the lack of harmony prevailing in the Nation, whereas I want with all my heart to have the Senate move as quickly as possible to do away with such confusion and lack of harmony.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does not the Senator from Florida feel that it is a responsibility of those in the Pentagon and those who have access to the secret information to see that certain columnists do not have access to it, when it is withheld from the Senate and the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator means that certain columnists have had information which Senators were not able to obtain, I certainly agree with the Senator. At the same time, I would not at all agree that the most secret matters of the Nation have been disclosed. I remind my friend, the Senator from Kansas, that the atomic-bomb secret was so carefully safeguarded that no one had any notice of the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars had been expended for that purpose and thousands and thousands of persons were working on that task and entire cities had been created and were contributing, by means of the efforts of those who dwelt in them, to studying that problem and to reaching the solution which brought a much speedier end to the war. So I know, as does the Senator from Kansas, that that secret was well safeguarded.

I also know, by reason of having been given, only recently, certain secret facts in connection with the discussion before one of our committees, in secret hearings, of the so-called dispersal program, that there are many other things in which just as good secrecy is being maintained.

So I think the Senator from Kansas errs if he reaches the conclusion that because certain wrong things have been done by letting certain secrets out of the bag, so to speak, on a few occasions, those who are charged with the custody of our most vital secrets have been convicted of being untrue to their trust or of giving everything away. I do not believe that is so. Otherwise I would have to reach the point—and I know the Senator from Kansas feels the same way about the matter—where I did not believe that almost all the men who devote their very lives to the service of our Nation in high military and civil posts wish to serve the Nation truly and well. Most of these men are fine men and are true to their trust. I know perfectly well that because they have been trustworthy many matters which necessarily will be delved into during the hearings are still secret and these secret matters go to the very heart of the solution of the difficult problem which confronts us. I wish to have the committee and the Senate reach that vital stage in this entire matter as quickly as possible.

I believe that sparring and talk and expression of opinion before committees would merely delay our reaching the necessary conclusions. After all, opinions have already been expressed before the joint session of Congress and in various parts of the Nation and more opinions will be expressed.

On the other hand, what we need are the facts. Many of them are not going to be communicable to the public. The distinguished Senator from Kansas, himself a veteran of highly honorable service, knows this is true and knows perfectly well that the sooner we brush away all this fog and the sooner we reach the question of how we can with the greatest possible dispatch and the greatest possible certainty have available to us the facts upon which alone

we can base sound judgment, the better our country will be served.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am sure the Senator missed the point of my question. I asked whether there is a responsibility on the part of those who hold these secrets to see that the information is not disseminated by a few columnists, thus leading the people of the Nation to believe that those columnists have inside information, particularly when some columnists are clever enough at times to obtain just enough secret or inside information to be able to lead the public to believe that they do have a great deal of inside information—all of which leads to a further breaking down of public confidence, as has been the case when the Wedemeyer report has for 3½ years been kept off the list of items available for public information, and only now has been released, thus causing many of the public to raise their eyebrows and ask, "Well, what would you expect?"

Does not the Senator think that is bad?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no quarrel with the Senator from Kansas on that point. However, I think the course followed by the present investigation is best, and I think the different course now advocated by some for the investigation would cause it to have less value, would cause greater delay to occur, and would cause greater public confusion and dissension to occur.

I believe that the members of the two committees that are exploring this question should be allowed to proceed in their own way, in accordance with the method on which they have already determined, and should be allowed to reach the heart of the problem as quickly as possible. That cannot be the case if there is to be a succession of public hearings, at which, first, one man will express his opinion, and then another man will be called in to express a contrary opinion, and then various shades of opinion will be expressed by other witness—all with the result that the issue will simply be beclouded before the time when the actual nuggets of truth are brought before the members of the committee, so that they can base sound recommendations upon a real knowledge of the facts.

I believe that the method proposed to be followed under the resolution is a wrong and an unwise one, and would cause confusion to become worse confounded, and would not result in having us reach speedy, clear, and sound conclusions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

WELCOME TO REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PRESS OF 14 NATIONS OF EUROPE, AFRICA, AND ASIA

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech,

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am grateful to the minority leader for withdrawing his objection, and I am particularly grateful to the Vice President for taking the chair and permitting me to introduce to the Senate some distinguished visitors in the galleries.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], and I have just had lunch with 35 distinguished jonrnalists who are touring the country as guests of the Trans-World Airlines and are completing a trip throughout the United States. I have been acting as host at the luncheon, and I should like to state to the Senate that my guests have outdone the normal courtesy we expect from guests. I should like to call attention to some of the names on the scroll which they so generously and courteously bestowed upon me, in order to show the wide range of countries from which they come. I read the names of Alexandre Breugnot, Dr. Sayed Abouel Naga, Naguib Canaan, Nicholas Nahas. There are many others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire scroll may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate:

We, the undersigned representatives of the press of 14 nations of Europe, Africa, and Asia, as members of the Trans-World Airlines flight to the United States of America, express our deepest gratitude for your courtesy and hospitality during our visit to the United States. By your efforts you have helped us gain a first-hand knowledge of how Americans work and live in freedom under a system of democratic free enterprise.

We have learned much from you to tell our readers, and we desire by this scroll to honor your contribution to the spread of truth and understanding among the peoples of the world.

Alexandre Breugnot, Dr. Sayed Abouel Naga, Naguib Canaan, Nicholas Nahas, Donald Edgar, N. H. N. Dixon, Stanley Jackson, Norman Cursley, James L. Manning, Charles Eade, Pierre Marschal, James De Coquet, Sam Cohen, Merry Bromberger, Otto Herr, Oskar Reschke, Harris Bousbourelis, Demetrios Yannoukakis, Coryndon Mandy, S. N. Ghosh, Uenkatseha Naik, Peter O'Curry, Michael G. Rooney, Joseph Haim Heftmann, Gino Ben Amozegh, Giovanni Artieri, Ugo Zatterin, Guglielmo Ceroni, Morais Cahral, Armando Ferreira, Jaime Arias, Toccuato Lura De Tena, Georges Rigassi, Albert Muller, Philippe Casanova.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, from the standpoint of the objectives of the people of the United States to achieve an understanding with the people of other nations, I think no group that has visited this country is more important than is this group of traveling journalists. I congratulate Trans-World Airlines on its leadership and generosity in assembling this group and bringing them on this tour of our country.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] described to us a previous trip organized by Trans-World Airlines on which they took a group of American journalists overseas. This, it seems to me, is far-sighted statesmanship on the part of Mr. Howard Hughes, Mr. Ralph Damon, and Mr. Warren Pierson, the three top executives of TWA.

Mr. President, it further dramatizes the fact that private activity in the field of exchange of persons is being conducted all the time on a scale infinitely more vast than anything sponsored or paid for by the Federal Government. Of the 40,000 or 50,000 foreign students now at our universities and colleges, only a tiny percentage, I venture to suggest only 5 percent, are in any way sponsored or underwritten by the Federal Government. Only recently the Ford Foundation, that great new philanthropy which has almost a 90-percent financial interest in the Ford Motor Co., has given a large grant to the Institute of International Education in New York City so that it may expand its office and open regional offices all over the Nation to do a better job on the private level in the exchange of persons between the nations of the world.

Of all persons who come to visit us, I suggest that these journalists are most important, because they will learn that we have nothing to conceal from them. They will, of course, learn that we have things of which we are not too proud. They will learn that we recognize that there are certain aspects of American life which under our democratic processes we hope to improve, correct, and make progress with in the years to come. We have nothing to hide. They can go back to their countries and write as authorities about us, as persons who have been here and have seen us face to face.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will join me in welcoming them today, and I trust they will be the forerunner of many other such groups, representing not only newspapers and journalists, and all other media of communication, but people from the many and varied walks of life, from industry, labor unions, and other groups overseas, upon whose understanding our friendly relations ultimately depend as we look ahead over the next decade.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for giving me this opportunity to advise the Senate of the presence of these distinguished visitors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Florida will permit, the Chair would like to say a word on behalf of the Senate to express our pleasure at having with us and welcoming to this body these distinguished visitors from 14 nations representing the press. Unfortunately the Chair would advise our friends that they have pretty stiff competition today in the matter of attendance of Senators here and elsewhere. As newspapermen they will appreciate that fact.

We are glad to have you not only in the Senate, but to have you visit the United States, and we hope that your sojourn with us will be profitable to you and to us, mutually, in the dissemination of information and understanding among the peoples of all the countries represented by you and, insofar as possible, the people of the world, concerning the real objectives and purposes of democracy here and throughout the world. We hope that however long you may remain with us, you may continue to enjoy your visit and that you will take home with you valuable information concern-

ing our institutions, and leave us with valuable information concerning yours.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Chair.

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN SENATE BILL 271 AFTER RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be permitted to sign the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes after the recess of the Senate.

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

OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES OF ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had hoped that we could have a vote on this resolution early this afternoon, and that after its disposition those who were still in the Senate Chamber might have availed themselves of the opportunity to participate in the MacArthur hearings. That, however, is not in the cards, and at this hour it appears that the entire afternoon will be devoted to the consideration of the motion to consider the resolution.

I presume that in my time I have erred on the side of anything but brevity, but I think there is still some virtue in the New Testament admonition, "But let your communication be, Yea, yea; nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." So I shall not try to detain the Senate long this afternoon, but I believe there are some things which ought to be disposed of.

First, after having listened for the past 2 hours to the constantly recurring allusion to the question of national security, I am wondering whether it does not at times become a smokescreen and something of a fetish, and that it is entirely overdone. I remember that in the days of World War II I could not get into my office in the House Office Building without having a badge and a pocket card and many other things. Every time one went to one of the agencies of Government, even though he may not have been peculiarly invested with security significance, he had to have a badge, he had to know the "high sign" and the password. It was more difficult than getting into a lodge. I think a great many persons, who take a rather rational and common sense view of the matter, have come to the conclusion that, at least in some respects, it has been highly overdone.

But, Mr. President, first I wish to answer the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which left a rather peculiar implication in my mind, when he said that General MacArthur had been queried as to whether he wanted open or closed hearings. I submit that if General MacArthur had undertaken to pass upon that question, he would have been hoist with his own petard, anyway one may take it.

I am going to address a question to my friend from Oklahoma, and I neither mean to be facetious about it nor to take undue advantage, but I am wondering what my friend from Oklahoma would have said had he been in General MacArthur's position and the committee had queried him, and had said, "Do you want open or closed hearings?" I know what I would have said. I would have said precisely what General MacArthur said, namely, that I would leave it entirely in the hands of the committee. Had he for a moment deviated from the line and indicated that he wanted open hearings, then, of course, everyone at once would have come out of his corner and said, "There it is, there is the ostentation, there is the display spirit in the man. There is his love for grandeur and demonstration. He wants an open hearing. He wants a place where, as in the Colosseum, there will be great multitudes to applaud." That would have been the answer on the part of those who today attack him, had he for one moment said he wanted open hearings.

On the other hand, suppose he had said to the Senator from Georgia, "I should like to have the hearings closed." Then what? Then, of course, the same persons would have said, "There you have it. He wants to testify behind closed doors. He does not have a case. He is not willing in public to ventilate his views and present his convictions for all to hear." He would have been caught either way, had he answered that question. So he gave the proper answer, namely, that it was in the hands of those who summoned him, those who invited him to come to testify. So let there be not comfort in that. I am sure that Senators who were listening this afternoon to the observations by the Senator from Georgia probably had not thought through that matter.

When it comes to the question of secrecy, I remember an occasion when General of the Army Eisenhower, General Marshall, the Secretary of War, and a great many others, were called to testify before a closed hearing of the House Appropriations Committee. I was then a very humble member of that committee. I remember one had to have a special card and a special badge in order to get into the committee room. We sat there, seemingly entranced by the disclosures and revelations. We were privileged to ask many questions. It was not a very good show, to say the least, and I do not know that we learned a great deal from it. But only 2 days later, Time magazine came out with a double-page spread which told more in four paragraphs than was revealed in the course of that entire hearing. There we were, adjured and admonished to maintain secrecy in the interest of national security. I wonder if that is not being overdone.

It seems to me that had we had a little more light in other days, some of the young men whose warm blood is ebbing out on the fields of Korea might still be alive. It is strange that other countries and other peoples get to know so much, while the American people are kept in the dark. When it comes to the question of security, one might think from the discussion heard here this afternoon that the witnesses are a lot of imbeciles. When General MacArthur takes the witness chair, he will be able to evaluate for himself whether a particular answer might jeopardize the security of the country. If a Member of the Senate should ask him the question, "How many troops do you have in Korea, and how are the divisions deployed?" certainly he would make no answer that would jeopardize security. He would be indeed a poor soldier if he did. The man who served as Chief of Staff with such glory and distinction, and who served in many wars, has some sense of values, and so he will be able to answer and still abide by all the obligations and responsibilities which are upon him. If I estimate the situation correctly, he is still amenable to the Espionage Act. Under its provisions and under the other obligations which are imposed upon him, certainly, if he should give aid and comfort to the enemy by any answer he might make, he would be subject to a penalty.

I have not the slightest doubt that General Bradley, General Marshall, General Collins, and all the others will not need General Davis and his censorship to indicate to them what is safe to disclose, when the security of the United States is involved. But let us not make a smoke screen of national security for the purpose of preventing the people of the United States from knowing what is going on.

It has been repeatedly stated here today that open hearings might jeopardize the lives of young men in Korea. Let me answer those who have lifted their voices with that kind of argument by saying that even more lives may be jeopardized by the secretiveness which has marked so much of our policy for a long time, going all the way back to Yalta, in the winter of 1945. Yes, I think we have an acute recollection of the secrecy which was practiced in those days.

For the purposes of the record, I remind Senators that I recall, of course, the long-drawn-out Pearl Harbor hearings. Oh, with what convenience and facility remembrance and recollection had suddenly become an outmoded virtue. As a matter of fact the witnesses could hardly remember facts which seemed to have been seared indelibly in the minds of millions of other people; but, week after week, and week after week, Members of this body, in conjunction with the body in which I served at the other end of the Capitol in those days, sought to adduce the truth in the best way they knew how. They encountered first one stalemate and then another, and, to this good hour, the whole story of all the evil and vile secrecy which was involved in the days before Pearl Harbor has not yet been disclosed for the cold print of the history books, where the people of America may soberly and accurately evaluate exactly what occurred. In my considered judgment, it was the fruition of a design which

makes a pretty definite pattern. If anyone wants to refresh himself about it, the Library of Congress and the files of this body and the files of the body at the other end of the Capitol are replete with documentary evidence as to whether there was a design which finally brought us to that ill-fated day, and which ultimately shunted us into the greatest cataclysm which has ever been visited upon mankind.

We remember the secrecy of that day. We remember, Mr. President, the secrecy that enshrouded the conference at Yalta, from which have come so many evil effects which now challenge not only our best thinking but challenge the destiny of young men and the very treasure of our country. As I go back to it, Mr. President, it is with a sense of dismay that I think of a conference in the Crimean Peninsula in the winter of 1945 in which the conferees thought they might carry out a grand design, but in so doing, in the enfolding darkness and secrecy, they led this country down the course of disaster, and today our young men have to pay the bill with their blood and their lives.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does not the distinguished Senator from Illinois feel that unless some of the secrecy is done away with and the people are given an opportunity to know what is going on, the mistakes of the past can be repeated with even greater detrimental effect on the country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, so. I say to my good friend from Kansas that I was positively dismayed by some of the statements I heard this morning. The genial Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said that we winnow out and finally we get to that which we can safely entrust to the people. Is not that wonderful, Mr. President? The Government reaches into the hearts and firesides of the Nation and takes the choice sons of the families of America and says, "We are going to put you into uniforms, give you some training, and send you to Korea. But you must not know what is going on. It is not safe to trust you or your good father, or your good mother who brought you into this world."

Think of all the nice expressions about the democratic process. The Vice President of the United States, this afternoon, as he addressed himself to the distinguished foreign journalists who graced this body with their presence, used the phrase, "democratic process." Is it the democratic process to conceal? Is it the democratic process to withhold? Is it the democratic process to do those clandestine things in connection with which the people of the United States have an interest because this is their country? It is their sons who have to be offered upon the altar. It is their dollars which must be used to fight the wars of the Republic. Their dollars are good enough; their sons are good enough; but the people are not expected to know what is going on. We can call that the democratic process if we like, but I have another name for it, Mr. President.

I go back to the deceitful and infamous undertaking at Yalta in February of 1945. The masters of secrecy were there, Mr. President. Harry Hopkins was there. I knew him. Alger Hiss was there. If there is any doubt about it, read the story of Yalta by the late Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, whom I knew very well.

I say to my good friend from Kansas that it is wonderful to talk about secrecy and about leaks, when Judy Coplon was in the Department of Justice and Alger Hiss in the Department of State. There was Marzani in the Department of State, who was indicted on 11 counts, found guilty, and sentenced to prison for revealing from the records things which should not have been revealed.

Let those in the executive branch clean their own dunghill before they monitor the morals of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to secrecy. Yes, they were in Crimea doing business at Yalta; and what happened? It is an open story. They gave virtual control of the Chinese Eastern Railroad and the Manchurian Railroad to Marshal Stalin. He can use it now to carry tanks and planes and supplies with which to decimate young Americans in Korea.

That happened at Yalta, Mr. President, behind the dark folds of a secret curtain. We were not to know about it. At the same time many naval bases in the Kurile Islands were given to the Soviets. It was a long time before we found it out. They will be useful now for Red submarines and Soviet aircraft. Our representatives at Yalta gave away the north half of Sakhalin Island. There is some oil there. Russia may bring these hidden riches to the surface, and refine them into that high-octane essence which makes a plane whiz through the sky as a vehicle for a bomb which may yet wipe out lives of many young Americans in Korea. We gave those things to Stalin at Yalta. We gave all those rights to Russia, and they were many. It was done with secrecy, and 6 years later young Americans, with the exuberance of life in every fiber, vein, and pore, now pay the bill.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if the American people and the American Congress were not told by the executive department that there were not secret agreements entered into, and if now we do not find that there were.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, so. I want to say to my friend from Kansas that it was diplomatic secrecy. The theory was once expressed by an eastern professor, as he evaluated the Roosevelt policy, that we had deceived the country. That is a fine philosophy, Mr. President, but I do not subscribe to it. To hear the statements today we would think that Members of the Senate had no confidence in the power of the American people to evaluate. I have plenty of confidence in the people, so I believe that in the interest of unity we serve our country best when we take away the shroud of secrecy and let the light shine in.

If there is something of specific moment in a question that might endanger the security of the country, I would not expect a witness under cross-examination by a Member of the Senate to answer the question. I think it would be his responsibility to say, "This involves an element of security which I do not believe should be disclosed on an occasion of this kind." But what we are interested in particularly, Mr. President, is the whole question of policy, and I believe the American people are entitled to get the facts first hand. As it is, they are to be evaluated and they are to be censored, at least to the extent that censorship will be imposed. Then the screened transcript will be made available to the American people. Perhaps the testimony will not be screened; I do not know; but whatever it is, it will be allegedly a screened transcript.

As we think of this kind of secrecy, Mr. President, I wonder why there was not quite the same interest in the days when the Senate and House were dealing with the Amerasia case. A naval lieutenant here and a greeting-card publisher in New York with a definite leftist record entered into a conspiracy. They took more than 1,700 documents from the State Department to their photostating office in New York City. They took what they wanted from the documents. Some of the documents certainly were marked "classified." How much news was there about it at that time? How many persons lifted up their voices and said, "We must do something about this?" Nothing was done, except that one of them got a $500 fine, as I recall. I draw entirely on memory, because I have not looked at the record for years. I believe two of them were scolded. One of them got off with a substantially heavier fine. No one went to jail. If ever I read facts in a case which involved a clear and distinct violation of the espionage laws, in my judgment the Amerasia case did. How much was made of secrecy at that time? It is only because this seems to be a special occasion that there is so much emphasis placed upon it.

I wish to refer again to Yalta, because I believe that the record must be made, and refreshed from time to time. I had a great affection for a man who formerly graced the Senate. He is a man of brilliance and integrity. He has occupied many positions of influence and importance in the Government. I refer to my old friend Jimmy Byrnes, of South Carolina. He was a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations years ago when I was a member of the House Appropriations Committee. We used to cross sabers at times. I had not only affection for him, but I had a great admiration and respect for his ability. When he came back from Europe he did quite a job in writing contemporary history in his interesting book called Speaking Frankly. At page 41 of the book he mentions a cablegram which was sent from Yalta to the White House, allegedly by Mr. Hopkins to Mr. Byrnes, with respect to still another secret of Yalta, namely, the veto.

At page 41 the former Secretary of State quotes the cablegram:

> The President is extremely anxious that no aspect of this question be discussed, even privately.

That is the record, Mr. President. Keep it dark. Do not bring it into the limelight, because people should not know. In the interest of national security, they are not to be trusted with these alleged secrets. I cannot help to recur to the fact that certainly until 9:45 this morning I felt like a class B Senator. Twenty-six Senators were entitled to listen to the testimony, and seventy Members of this body up to that time, certainly under the resolution adopted by the committee, were not entitled to attend the hearings.

It is strange business. I understand that one Member of this body said it would be fatal—fatal, Mr. President—to let the other Senators attend the hearings.

By some strange spiritual alchemy all that was changed this morning at 9:45. At that time a modification was made. Now, instead of only 26, all 96 Senators can attend the hearings. It is a strange business.

I am wondering why such a change of heart took place. There has been much political discussion on the other side of the aisle today. Of course, it has been implied or made to appear that our viewpoint on the matter is a political viewpoint. I wish to say—and I have said it a thousand times in my State—that I am a sort of reluctant Senator. I did not wish to come back, after I had walked out of this man's town in 1949. I was not too anxious to come back, Mr. President. But this much I do know. I have no political skin to protect. I am interested only in my God and in my country. That is all. I will go as far as anyone else in that field.

Mr. President, I think it is a tragic thing when, ever so often, either unwittingly or wittingly, the patriotism of Members of this body is brought into question. I certainly would not question anyone's fidelity to his country, or patriotism, because I cannot imagine that anyone would reach the position of representative of a great sovereign State in the sisterhood of States unless he had long before evidenced a sustained and enduring fidelity to his country which was beyond all question.

It has been said that everyone cannot be admitted to the hearings. Of course, that is true. Everyone cannot be admitted, any more than it is possible to admit all the people who want to buy a ticket to Oklahoma in one of the New York theaters. It is possible to accomodate only as many people as the theater will hold. The point is that the theater is open. If a man will stay in line long enough and take his chance, and perhaps stay up all night and bring his breakfast along, he may be able to get in. It is the chance to get in, and hear what is going on which is important, not whether he actually gets in. I say to my good friend from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] that if the junior Senator from Illinois keeps his position on the floor, he may not get over to the hearings. I hope to be able to do so. It is not important whether I get there; but it is important that I have a chance to get in when I get there, in open competition with all others who would like to get in. That is the important thing.

With respect to open hearings, I affirm and reaffirm that I do not want to say to a father, who has a son in his family about to go into uniform, "By legislative fiat you cannot come in." If limitation of space prevents him from getting in, or perhaps transportation, if he is off in some far corner of the world, that is one thing. At least the opportunity was made available to him.

From time to time over the radio and by means of other forms of communication we have admonished the American people that they must be willing to endure sacrifices in a critical time. We ask them to make sacrifices, but we keep them in the dark. Some time ago when the Secretary of the Treasury was in Paris he was quoted as having said that we must admonish our people to accept a philosophy of austerity. That is all very well. Our people are willing to accept it. But let us say to them, "We will match you in sacrifice. We will play the game. We will be fair. We will let the light shine in so that, as taxpayers, as the fathers or mothers of sons who may be called for military service, you will know, within proper limits, what is going on." That is all I ask. That is the reason why I am in favor of the resolution. I abhor secrecy.

It may be asked, "Well, didn't you serve on committees in the House a long time ago, and didn't you bar people from hearings?" Certainly; but as a matter of fact, if anyone had made the attempt, I am confident he could have gotten into many of the Appropriations Committee hearings.

As I recall, when I was on the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Legislative Branch we fought that issue out for many days. I for one certainly would have gone along with the idea of admitting people to hearings. There was only one reason, after all, why anyone and everyone was not welcome. It was feared that if the general public were admitted they would get an earfull, and then come around the lobby members of the Appropriations Committees for increased appropriations. If that is all the reason that can be cited, it is as good as no reason at all, because a man who serves on that committee and is charged with some responsibility over Government spending is expected to be able to stand up against representations of that kind. That is a rather hollow and pretentious argument.

Mr. President, I desire to be counted upon the side of the people in this argument, because there is nothing I can see to fear. The men who will occupy the witness chair have fine minds. They know what security means, and their answers will be such as to give no comfort or aid to the enemy. Let us treat them as men who have as much interest in the security of the country as has anyone else, and particularly those who are Members of this body.

That is all I have to say on the subject, Mr. President.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have been much interested in the remarks of Senators with reference to the pending motion. I have been even more interested in the remarks of Senators with reference to a vast field of subjects beyond the scope of the motion. I have been much interested in statements from Senators which would seem to express the opinion on their part that the hearings now in progress before the Joint Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate are being suppressed; that the questions and answers are being skimmed off, and that the people are being given only such information as Members of the Senate, or those charged with the responsibility of deleting that which would be of benefit to the enemy, might deem proper.

I am a little surprised at those statements, which amount to accusations against the good faith of the committees now conducting these hearings. It has been made crystal clear by those committees, acting through their chairmen and on their own, that it is their purpose to give to the American people, as fast as it is mechanically possible to disseminate it, every vestige of information obtained in those hearings, save only that which might be of aid and comfort to the enemy.

I have been much interested in the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not catch the last statement, about aiding the enemy. Will the Senator please repeat what he said?

Mr. KERR. I ask the reporter to read it to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not accusing anyone on this side of the aisle of giving aid to the enemy, is he?

Mr. KERR. I must say that if what the Senator has heard, and the question he has asked, together with the reading of the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma would excite his curiosity to the extent that he would listen to the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, this little byplay might be of some service.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I always listen to his remarks. That is the reason I wanted to be sure of what he said.

Mr. KERR. The reporter is about to read it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator does not want to repeat it, it is all right with me.

Mr. KERR. The reporter is about to read it; and if the Senator does not want to listen to it, it is all right with me.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator does not remember it, very well. I doubt if he remembers very much that he says.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that if the Senator desires to have certain remarks read by the Reporter, the Chair will so direct.

Mr. KERR. That is the desire of the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Reporter will read the remarks referred to.

The Official Reporter (Gregor Macpherson) read as follows:

I am a little surprised at those statements, which amount to accusations against the good faith of the committees now conducting these hearings. It has been made crystal clear by those committees, acting through their chairmen and on their own, that it is their purpose to give to the American people, as fast as it is mechanically possible to disseminate it, every vestige of information obtained in those hearings, save only that which might be of aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, that illustrates what has been going on in this debate. The Senator from Nebraska was present in body. I do not know where his mind was. Perhaps that was with his thoughts, and they were far away.

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

Mr. KERR. Let me finish this very eloquent dissertation.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly was not in Oklahoma, where the wind blows.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma has not yielded.

Mr. KERR. But after returning, either to complete consciousness of what was going on, or to some semblance of it, he seemed to have an intimation that something had been said here about aiding and abetting the enemy. I would not say that "the wicked flee when no man pursueth." I would not say that, Mr. President——

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator is charging me with aiding the enemy, I am going to make a point of order. That is what I want to know.

Mr. KERR. If and when I charge the Senator with aiding and abetting the enemy, I will invite him to make the point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly will. The Senator will not have to invite me.

Mr. KERR. But until I do, it seems to me that either the Senator from Nebraska is incapable of understanding, or unwilling to understand, what the Senator from Oklahoma says.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator made that charge about the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] earlier in the day, or one similar to it. Believe me, this is the last time the Senator is going to make it when I am on the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am going to refer to that in a few moments, and then I shall let the RECORD speak as to what was said.

It is amazing to me, Mr. President, that Senators make bald statements with reference to events between which and the actual record there is often little, if any, factual connection, and then beat their breasts in defense of accusations which were not made, or in support of contentions which have not been stated and which could not be substantiated.

I started to say, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska had made the statement on the floor—and I want him to listen, and, if I make an error, I invite him to correct it—that he had been present at much of the hearing this morning and that he was certain that nothing had been said there while he was present which could possibly be of any value to the enemy.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is incorrect. I never mentioned the words "value to the enemy" or "aid to the enemy."

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator state substantially what he did say, if he may do so without my losing the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, sir; I remember what I said, and I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma what it was. I said I attended the hearing this morning for a comparatively short time. I was not there at the beginning and I had to leave at about 11:30; and I said during the time I was present at the hearing there was nothing General MacArthur said which could not have been disclosed to the American people without endangering the national security. That may not represent the exact words, but it is in substance what I said. I said nothing about giving aid to the enemy, nor did I make any remarks of the kind the Senator uses so frequently.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator; but I must say that when he referred to remarks which might endanger the national security, that seemed to the Senator from Oklahoma to have some relationship to words which would give aid and comfort to the enemy. Certainly they have a similar meaning in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma. In order that there may be no doubt about it I want to read what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said about that.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is perfectly agreeable to the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Oklahoma can say anything he wants to about what the Senator from Michigan said. But the Senator from Oklahoma is not contending for one moment, is he, that the Senator from Nebraska is giving aid to the enemy?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am not going to say: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Oklahoma is out of order. He is impugning the good character and patriotism of the junior Senator from Nebraska. I make that point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no power under the rules to pass on that question.

Mr. WHERRY. I make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska makes the point of order that the Senator from Oklahoma is out of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma will take his seat.

Mr. KERR took his seat.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Oklahoma may be permitted to proceed in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware that the Senator from Oklahoma be permitted to proceed in order.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma will proceed in order.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as I said a while ago, if and when the Senator from Oklahoma should choose to impugn the motives or the patriotism of the Senator from Nebraska he will give the Senator due notice and suggest that he make the point of order.

I must say, Mr. President, that I know of no one on this floor against whom I would make such a charge. And among the men on this floor there is none for whose patriotism I have more respect than I do for that of the Senator from Nebraska. Strange as it may seem, Mr. President, and one of the mysteries of my brief experience in this body, I have a great affection for the Senator from Nebraska.

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

Mr. KERR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That has been mutual, has it not?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would like to answer that it is.

Mr. WHERRY. Go ahead and answer in that way. That is perfectly all right with me. I have no objection.

Mr. KERR. I have some feeling of sadness that the Senator from Nebraska has made the statement in the past tense.

Mr. WHERRY. I will include the future tense. I will include all the tenses.

Mr. KERR. I wonder if the Senator from Nebraska will include the present tense.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

(Laughter in the galleries.)

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that this is a "tense situation," and he asks them to preserve order.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma wants to reinforce the remark of the Vice President, because when it gets to the point where the Senator from Nebraska repeatedly expresses fear of the existence of something for which, so far as the Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, there has been neither thought nor contemplation nor the possibility of substance, then the Senator from Oklahoma must say that it is becoming rather tense—but certainly not on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The other day, after a little debate in the Senate, the press, through some quirk of journalistic or photographic curiosity, asked the Senator from Oklahoma if there were those on the other side of the aisle with whom he would be willing to have his picture made. The

Senator from Oklahoma said there were quite a number, but the number one choice of the Senator from Oklahoma would be his delightful and charming, though occasionally misguided, friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. There has been no departure from that attitude on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma insofar as the Senator from Nebraska is concerned. Let me say to him that under no circumstances will the Senator from Oklahoma cast any reflection upon his high and noble patriotism which the Senator from Oklahoma not only acknowledges, but happily confirms.

Now, if I may refer to what the Senator said, without creating any doubt, I will proceed along the line at which I had thought I had arrived when the Senator made the point of order that took the Senator from Oklahoma off his feet.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan earlier today made this statement:

> The Senator from Michigan does not know what the committee has in mind bringing out. The Senator from Michigan can only say what he heard this morning. The Senator from Michigan will say at this moment that he did not hear anything which he believes would affect the security of the United States.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska had made a statement of somewhat similar import on this floor. With reference to those two statements, the Senator from Oklahoma reminds the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the one charged with making deletions from the testimony given before the committees had a different viewpoint.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not charge anyone in the committee with deleting anything intentionally. When the distinguished Senator from Florida was talking about skimming off the cream, I said to him, "It seems to me that if some person is allowed to make public only what he wants to have published, the cream is skimmed off and all the facts are not made available to the public." What the Senator from Oklahoma has said certainly has no reference to my statement because I have not charged anyone with intentionally deleting any evidence.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma did not say so. He did not say that the Senator from Nebraska said that.

Mr. WHERRY. It certainly is possible of being interpreted in that way. Furthermore, I was present at the committee hearing only a part of the time. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma may be of the opinion that during all the time the general testified he may have made some remarks or some observations which the Senator from Oklahoma feels it would not be in the interest of national security to make public. I want it clearly understood that I was not present all the time, as was the Senator from Oklahoma, apparently, nor was the Senator from Michigan. But I reiterate that during the time I was present there was not anything said by the general which the people of America should not know. It would be well if they could know what he said, and it would not violate national security for it to be made public. That is my opinion.

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

Mr. KERR. I should love to yield, but wish to say one more word about the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska. What the Senator from Oklahoma was saying was that the person charged with the responsibility of deleting from the record information which might be adverse to the national security did not agree with the statement of the Senator from Michigan, nor did he agree with the Senator from Nebraska. I understand that a naval commander representing the Joint Chiefs at the hearing is responsible for deleting from the testimony, before it is made available for publication, information which could be of possible value to the enemy or could be of probable damage to the national security. The record shows that a number of deletions were made from the answers of General MacArthur, in which he discussed certain numerical elements of strength and certain probabilities and purposes and programs of our Government and estimates regarding the Soviet Government.

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

Mr. KERR. I have promised to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit me to make a slight correction of the RECORD at this time?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if it is true that the information being presented in the course of the hearing before the committee in the caucus room is available to the press and the public within a very short time after the statements are made in that room, with the exception of matters which may be deleted by a security agent.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for the question. The answer is yes, the information is made available just as quickly as it is mechanically possible to do so.

I shall read to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska a question which was asked this morning of General MacArthur by the chairman of the committee, and General MacArthur's reply:

> The CHAIRMAN. Did the Joint Chiefs ever suggest in addition to the reconnaissance that these bases be attacked?
>
> General MACARTHUR. Not that I know of, Senator; the only order I had was not to attack.

The remainder of the answer General MacArthur gave at that point was deleted, for security reasons.

Mr. President, I became interested in this matter because I sat there during the hearings. I must say that I am aware of my lack of preparation to pass upon the question of just what information might be of value to the enemy or might be adverse to the national security. However, even with that consciousness, I was impressed a number of times with the feeling that certain information contained in the answers given by General MacArthur could not help but be of value to the enemy.

In that regard, Mr. President, let me say that I am advised that this morning the United Press carried a story that Tass, the Soviet news agency, has set up a direct special telephone wire from the United States Capitol to its downtown office. I am advised that never before has that been true in the history of our country. I do not claim to possess sufficient wisdom or ability to be able to analyze and know the reasons for that action, but this question arises in my mind: Is not it possible that Tass thought that certain information which might be available at the hearing would be of such significance or of such value that it should not even be permitted to take the normal routine of transmission, but that special facilities should be installed in order to transmit it—if the information were developed or if it were obtainable—in the quickest manner possible?

Mr. President, I would not be a party to keeping from the people of Oklahoma or from the people of the Nation a scintilla of information which is either of interest to them or is desired by them, unless I was convinced that for their welfare and for the security of my country some part of the information should be kept privileged to the military authorities, who are charged with the responsibility of the national security.

Mr. President, I have been unable to find myself impressed by the impassioned pleas of some Members of the Senate who have indicated that if they are not successful in their purpose, the people of the United States will be kept in darkness. One of my distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle last evening asked me if I did not want the people of Oklahoma to have this information. Mr. President, they are getting it just as quickly as the radio, the teletype, and the telegraph services can take it to them; and for whatever this information is worth, I am constrained to mention the fact that in my opinion they can read and can hear, and every bit of the information with reference to this hearing, aside from that which could damage their security, is being made available to them as quickly as it is humanly and mechanically possible to do so. The committee is charged with that responsibility.

I must say that it was after the committee had seen letters from certain Republican members of the committee, in which some of the most secret documents having to do with our national defense and our national security had been requested, that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], placed those letters in the RECORD. It is beyond my comprehension how men could fail to know that the information requested in those letters would be of the

utmost value to the enemies of our country, and that its publication would be of the greatest and severest damage to our national security.

Mr. President, the distinguished general who now is appearing before the committee has declined to indicate a desire that the hearings be made public, and well he may. He has been given permission by the Commander in Chief to go wherever he wishes to go, in about as convenient and, I may say, as luxurious and as rapid a means of transportation as is available on this earth. If the general has a message for the American people, every television station in the country is available to him, every radio station is available to him.

I must say that he has not hidden his light under a bushel, he has manifested no timidity of expression, no shyness in speaking his views, his recommendations, and his opinions. During such times as he may have been incapacitated or fatigued, I must say that he has had an aide who has shown remarkable facility and efficiency in issuing statements either by or for the general. I doubt whether the sun has set on a weekday since the general was relieved of his command that he has not spoken, and every word that he has uttered, so far as I know, certainly for publication, has been carried by every means of communication available. There has been neither an effort made, nor has there been a lack of effort, to encourage the general to speak his piece and say his words and declare his message around the world. I can understand why he declined to request that the hearings be made public.

Therefore, as I see it, the committee has acted, and by its action it has said that every bit of information brought out in its hearings, except only that which could possibly damage the national security, will be given instant and complete publication. The general has done that heretofore, and he has invited any group across the Nation who wanted him to appear before them to say so. I understand he made a public statement that he was available to go anywhere at any time his strength permitted and the opportunity presented.

In view of the fact that he has declined to indicate that he either wanted or thought there ought to be an open hearing, and in view of the fact that the committee has acted and has taken the position that the national security would be best served by not having an open meeting, and also that all the information, aside from that jeopardizing the national security, be made immediately available, the question comes to the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma. Why the resolution? By its terms, which I must say present contradictions, it provides that "no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings."

The procedure being followed meets both the letter and the spirit of the resolution. That being true, the Senator from Oklahoma asks, Why the resolution? I can see no reason for the resolution other than that, in the opinion of some, it would serve someone else's political welfare. In that regard, I may say that insofar as the political security of those who favor the resolution and those who oppose it are concerned, and aside from the evident damage which I think it would do to the national security, I should like to see it adopted and implemented, and let those who favor it take the responsibility for it. The people of the United States of America are not fooled by these gyrations of the Wherry-go-round.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator can surely trust the people, can he not?

Mr. KERR. Yes, thank God, I can.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why does the Senator not wish to give them the facts?

Mr. KERR. They are getting the facts as fast as they can be gotten, and the Senator from Nebraska knows it.

Mr. President, I now desire to address myself briefly to the accusation made by the Senator from Michigan against the Senator from Oklahoma. The Senator from Michigan, on the floor of the Senate, a little while ago, speaking of the Senator from Oklahoma, said:

> The Senator knows that what he says is an absolute falsehood. He knows it. There is no doubt about it. He accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to the enemy, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I submit that, from the RECORD, that statement is not true.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. I know that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma wants to be fair. Why does he not insert the first part of the colloquy?

Mr. KERR. I am going to.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does he not put in the RECORD what he, himself, said?

Mr. KERR. I am going to.

Mr. WHERRY. Why did the Senator not do it before he began his references to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma realizes that he is a very junior Senator, and that probably, of all the men on this floor, none is so wise, none is so capable of presenting a matter, as is the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska. But he should not expect the Senator from Oklahoma, in the brief time that he has been here, to have developed the efficiency which the Senator from Nebraska possesses in that regard.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. In just a moment. The Senator from Oklahoma wants to say that he realizes that he often stumbles, but he knows what he is trying to do, and he wishes that he could feel that to be equally true of others on the Senate floor, and he assures the Senator from Nebraska that he is going to do the very best he can in this regard.

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

Mr. KERR. He will even enroll in a correspondence course, if the Senator from Nebraska will——

Mr. WHERRY. If I will teach him?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will offer me such a course at a reasonable fee, on the subject of how Senators should present matters they are trying to submit to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to quit stumbling around; just put it all in the RECORD. That is all I want. The Senator knows how to do it. He is an able lawyer, and he knows that many times in the court room things which it is desired the jury should know are put in the record. That is only fair. The Senator said he was going to put the first part of the colloquy into the RECORD, but up to the time the Senator from Nebraska asked him to place it in the RECORD he certainly had not done so. I think it is all right to quote what the Senator from Michigan said. That is the privilege of the Senator from Oklahoma; it is within the province of any Senator. But certainly if the Senator from Oklahoma is going to quote what the Senator from Michigan said, he should also insert what brought about the remark.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as the Senator from Oklahoma said a while ago, he intends to do that. He is in some doubt as to whether the Senator from Nebraska merely wants him to do that, or whether the Senator from Nebraska feels that by insinuation, questioning, and repeating he might throw the Senator from Oklahoma off balance. I want to say to him that so far as it is possible I am going to be like the boy who was asking for a job. A farmer had gotten a little behind with his work and advertised for a boy to help him. A number of boys came and applied for the job. The farmer said, "I am going to tell you boys a story. A while back I heard the hens cackling at the henhouse, and I figured that an owl had been getting some of my chickens, and I went to see if I could get the owl. I eased up as quietly as I could to where the chickens were, and I saw an owl sitting up a little above them, and I knew he was getting ready to swoop down on the chickens. I lifted my trusty old shotgun and fired. Just as I did, lightning struck the barn and set it afire. I rushed into the house and called the fire department and asked them to come out and help put out the fire. The fire department came and neighbors came, and, after a long, hard struggle, we got the fire under control and held the damage down to as small an amount as was possible."

The boys were listening with wide eyes, and one of them said, "Did it burn the chicken house down, too?"

The farmer replied, "Not all of it."

Another boy asked, "Did the fire department get here first, or did the neighbors get here first?"

The farmer replied, "The fire department came first."

There was a little freckle-faced kid there who had not yet said a word.

Then he inquired, "Mister, did you kill the owl?"

The farmer said, "Son, you are hired. You have enough sense to keep your mind on the main business." [Laughter.]

That is what the Senator from Oklahoma is trying to do. I must say he is not interested in watering last year's crop nor in the diversionary tactics of the Senator from Nebraska, although the Senator from Oklahoma does enjoy them. But he wants to keep his mind on the main business of this particular moment, namely, the accusation by the Senator from Michigan that the Senator from Oklahoma is a liar. He wants to refer to the record upon which that accusation was based:

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator has described some tragic events where great effort was evidently made to obtain some of the secret information with reference to the security of this country.

Mr. President, there is nothing in those words that accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to the enemy. Then the Senator from Oklahoma said:

Is the Senator not aware that what he here and now proposes would make it possible for the information to reach the enemy without his having to go to so much trouble?

Mr. President, that is a question; that is not an allegation. That is an inquiry; that is not an accusation.

Then the Senator from Oklahoma said:

I wonder if he is seeking to make it easier for him?

Mr. President, I must say that as I read the RECORD it consists, first, of a statement that did not refer to the Senator from Michigan. Then it consists of a question, and then it consists of the expression of a doubt on the basis of which the Senator from Michigan said:

The Senator knows that what he says is an absolute falsehood. He knows it. There is no doubt about it. He accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to the enemy, Mr. President.

I then tried to interrupt him to correct the impression, and the Senator said:

I will not yield, Mr. President.

I think I know why the Senator from Michigan said what he did. I do not think he wanted to answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not think he wanted to meet the argument of the Senator from Oklahoma. So he took refuge, first, in an accusation which every Senator knows is in violation of the rules of the Senate, but in view of the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma hopes to live a while and remain in this august body a while, and in view of the fact that basing his judgment on what he has seen he is convinced that there will be many times when the Senator from Michigan will have no answer to a question or no argument to give and will take refuge either in refusing to yield or in saying something which differs from the real situation, the Senator from Oklahoma saw no profit to be had in calling the Senator from Michigan to order.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the resolution under discussion could not possibly be of service to the American people, because they are getting every bit of information they would get if the resolution were adopted and carried out in letter and in spirit; in view of the fact that General MacArthur has the opportunity to say what he wants to say at any time, at any place, and in any manner, and in view of the fact that he himself declined to take the responsibility to do that which the advocates of this resolution seek to do, the Senator from Oklahoma wonders why the resolution is pressed.

Because of the fact that there seems to be doubt in men's minds as to what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks the reason is, I should like to explain. I do not think there is a Senator on the floor who would deliberately injure the welfare of this country or give aid and comfort to an enemy of this country. The Senator from Oklahoma gives every Member of the Senate the same high regard with reference to his patriotism as his feelings are with reference to his own. But the Senator from Oklahoma does not have the same high opinion of the judgment of some of the Members of this body. In the minds of those who would be fair there might be justification for the conclusion by the Senator from Oklahoma that he did not think much of the judgment of the Senator from Michigan. I spent some little time last night, Mr. President, addressing myself to a remark by the Senator from Michigan in which he said:

The Senator from Michigan does not know what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks.

He went on to state that he did not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma was "even at this moment capable of thinking."

Then the Senator from Michigan stated:

Judging from what the Senator is saying, there is some doubt about that in the mind of the Senator from Michigan.

Naturally, Mr. President, for a man to make public issue of his belief that the Senator from Oklahoma is incapable of thinking would create some doubt in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma as to the good judgment of the person entertaining a feeling that would lead him to make such a statement.

I remember also when the Senator from Michigan made the positive statement on the floor that during World War II China had attacked and made war upon Japan. I must say that that did not improve my opinion of his judgment. He made the statement, Mr. President, that at that time Russia had a treaty with Japan similar to the one that Russia now has with China. In view of the fact that there is no basis for the statement, I must say that such positive allegation by the Senator from Michigan caused me to have further doubt as to the quality of his judgment. The fact of the matter is that the agreement he referred to was not what he said it was, and was not entered until 1941, which was many years after the war between Japan and China had started and had been going on, as a result of Japan's making aggressive warfare against China.

I submit that it is not unreasonable, in view of such miscalculations or, as the Senator from Michigan has described them, situations in which he misspoke himself under the heat of argument, that the Senator from Oklahoma cannot develop too high an opinion of the judgment of the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Oklahoma wonders just how much heat it takes to get the Senator from Michigan in a state of mind where he misspeaks himself.

It would seem, Mr. President, that a man might not be safe on the floor of the Senate if he disagreed with the Senator from Michigan and asked him a question. I know that if he ever developed any self-confidence he might really be the exception to the rule. But while few generals get to be statesmen, even fewer statesmen get to be generals.

The Senator from Oklahoma is of the opinion that the entire record of the Senator from Michigan is replete with instances which justify lack of confidence on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma in the judgment of the Senator from Michigan. Some day I hope to review the story of the Howard Hughes inquiry. If and when I have the time to water a few of last year's crops, to which so many of our distinguished colleagues on the other side have devoted so much time, I will show wherein my confidence in the judgment of the senior Senator from Michigan was weakened even then.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like again to make the RECORD clear that all my remarks with reference to the Senator from Michigan, aside from the complimentary remarks which I made with reference to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], have been spoken with reference to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

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

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggesting the absence of a quorum so that I may make a short statement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KERR. Without losing the floor and the opportunity to suggest the absence of a quorum, I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator withholds his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have a clipping from today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Drastic Steel Quota Cut Looms for Rail Cars, Other Transport—NPA May Slash July Allocation 35%; Feels Program Unduly Draining Supply." The story goes on to state that the Defense Production Administration was reported to have given preliminary approval to a reduction of 35 percent—more than one-third—in the quantity of steel to be allocated for

freight car production beginning in July.

Mr. President, any such reduction would be ridiculous and short-sighted in the extreme, in my judgment. Without adequate rail transportation, it would be absolutely impossible for this country either to fight a war or rearm to prevent one. The railroads are the backbone of our transportation, and in fact, of our entire economic system. This country simply cannot function without an adequate supply of boxcars.

The news story to which I have referred carries a hint that this reduction in steel for boxcars is being pushed at the instigation of those interested in maintaining production of automobiles at a higher level. If that is the reason, it is certainly a foolish reason. There is today an all-time record number of automobiles in use. On the other hand, the number of boxcars has steadily declined year by year. At the beginning of this year, there were 20,000 fewer boxcars suitable for grain than at the beginning of 1949, 2 years previous.

As the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] reported yesterday, the critical shortage of boxcars in the grain area has temporarily eased up, but we all know it cannot last. We have barely gotten the elevators in the Middle West unblocked, now that a new harvest is about to start. The wheat harvest in Nebraska will start in just about a month. Unless some prompt and efffective action is taken, it is absolutely certain that we shall be confronted with another crisis this summer and fall during the harvest season, with elevators blocked and grain lying in the fields because there is no place to put it.

The only solution to the boxcar situation is to construct more boxcars. That will take steel and other material, but there is no more essential industry in this country.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago I submitted Senate Resolution 89, authorizing the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a full and complete study in order to make sure that sufficient materials were available for the production of 120,000 railroad cars during the calendar year 1951, or 10,000 a month. That is the absolute minimum that we need. In fact, even that will not be nearly enough to meet the critical situation we are facing.

Mr. President, I urge in the strongest possible terms that the committee proceed with such an investigation. It is becoming apparent that some of those in the emergency agencies do not realize the seriousness and importance of the railroad problem, and I believe it is time for Congress to take a hand.

I might add, Mr. President, that the other problem on which action should be taken promptly is an increase in the per diem rate. Under present conditions, a railroad which has cars constructed is likely to lose money on them by being forced, in effect, to rent them out to other railroads at the standard per diem rate of $1.75 a day. So long as the per diem rate is so low, it is not surprising that there is a chronic shortage of boxcars.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the clipping from the Wall Street Journal.

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

DRASTIC STEEL QUOTA CUT LOOMS FOR RAIL CARS, OTHER TRANSPORT—NPA MAY SLASH JULY ALLOCATION 35 PERCENT; FEELS PROGRAM UNDULY DRAINING SUPPLY

(By Max Barnes)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The Defense Production Administration was reported today to have given its tentative approval to a ruthless paring of July steel allocations for several special programs, as exclusively revealed in yesterday's Journal of Commerce.

The allocations are being prepared by the National Production Authority.

The freight-car program, it was disclosed, probably will be the hardest hit; it faces a 35 percent reduction from the 308,000 tons of steel allocated for June.

OTHER PROGRAMS AFFECTED

Other big programs, including barges and possibly other transportation items, also are threatened with sharp reductions, according to informed officials. The final decision, however, has not yet been made.

Behind the threatened cuts is the growing belief among Government planners that special programs for defense and defense-supporting industries are taking too big a chunk of the Nation's steel production.

While these programs theoretically will be under the Controlled Materials plan starting July 1, officials said that specific July allocations must be made in routine fashion to assure deliveries. Later, when CMP starts functioning, the CMP allocations will be superimposed on these special program allocations.

The sharp cutback for freight cars has been under consideration for several weeks, but supporters of the program were able to maintain the 10,000-car allocation rate for June.

If the reduction is approved, it will be on the theory that the pinch according to some officials, would be felt only in period of peak transportation demands, such as for moving the grain crops.

The April freight car production is estimated at 8,200 cars and officials anticipated that the May program will be higher with the 10,000-car goal possible in June providing the steel already allocated is delivered on schedule.

Strong pressure for the reduction reportedly has come from automobile manufacturers who will be cut back to 70 percent of their 1950 production rates starting in July. Steel manufacturers also reportedly would favor reductions in special program requirements that would ease the pinch to their longtime customers.

Meanwhile, the Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co., one of the Nation's largest car builders, reported today that it will build 2,667 new freight cars in April for the highest production in 3 years. It estimated that May production will be up, possibly close to 3,000.

Champ Carry, chairman of the board, said in making the announcement that the April production could not have been achieved without the steel allocation program.

The total announced allocation to special programs for June was just under 1.4 million tons of processed steel, but officials admit that total programing runs above the 2 million-ton mark. The May allocation was about 200,000 tons less.

Any cut in the freight-car program is sure to touch off a wave of protest in Congress as well as in the railroad industry. Farm-State Congressmen have been pointing out the dangers of a serious freight car shortage in the grain and cotton belts this year, and have backed the 10,000-a-month car-building program.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

OPEN HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS—RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have a notation before me which I am informed is correct. It comes over the news ticker. It reads as follows:

> Senators reported that the committees agreed to suspend questioning of General MacArthur at 6 p. m. today, with no session Friday.
>
> After some discussion, the general said he could return some day next week.

I see no purpose in the Senate working through another night session, when there will be plenty of time to do business tomorrow. If we should call Senators back into the Chamber at this time, it would only interrupt the work of the hearing. Senators are in attendance at the hearing, not here. So I make the motion——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will not the majority leader permit us to get a vote on the motion tonight?

Mr. McFARLAND. In view of the announcement which I have read, I cannot see that it would serve any purpose for the Senate to have a second night session. I have no objection to a vote this afternoon, but I do object to remaining in session for another night. That is what insisting on a vote today would mean.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to interrupt the distinguished majority leader. I realize that, now that he has been recognized, he can make a motion to recess or to adjourn. However, I appeal to the distinguished majority leader. I am sure that the debate on the motion is over. We have debated it for a couple of days. If we could have a vote on this issue we could decide it once and for all. I appeal to the distinguished majority leader to let us have a vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. If it would accomplish anything, it would be different; but I cannot see how we can accomplish anything by having a night session.

So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Dworshak	Langer
Bennett	Ellender	McCarran
Brewster	Frear	McFarland
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Malone
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Martin
Carlson	Hill	Millikin
Case	Hoey	Monroney
Clements	Holland	Neely
Cordon	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kerr	Underwood
Douglas	Kilgore	Wherry

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. IVES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. MCCLELLAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a further delay, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIXON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent. If present, the previously listed Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Monroney
Byrd	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
Gillette	Long	Smathers
Green	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McFarland	Sparkman
Hennings	McKellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Underwood

NAYS—39

Aiken	Ecton	Millikin
Bennett	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Kem	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cain	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Lodge	Thye
Case	McCarran	Wherry
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Capehart	George	O'Conor
Chavez	Hunt	Taft
Duff	Jenner	Tobey
Eastland	Lehman	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Welker

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 4, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be captains

Margaret K. Aldrich, ANC, [redacted].
Elizabeth R. Perry, ANC, [redacted].

To be first lieutenants

Dolores L. Evanson, WMSC, [redacted].
Genevieve Lescsak, WMSC, [redacted].

To be second lieutenants

Jean C. Altenburger, WAC, [redacted]
Clarissa L. Aping, WAC, [redacted]
Alice M. Barr, WAC, [redacted]
Eva M. Benson, WAC, [redacted]
Frances J. Biddle, WAC, [redacted]
Patricia L. Bouldin, WAC, [redacted]
Barbara J. Brown, WAC, [redacted]
Eva M. Burgess, WAC, [redacted]
Salona Butler, WAC, [redacted]
Helen R. Coplen, WAC, [redacted]
Vivian E. Davis, WAC, [redacted]
Irene S. Ebel, WAC, [redacted]
Irene Evans, WAC, [redacted]
Pola L. Garrett, WAC, [redacted]
Irene S. Gulledge, WAC, [redacted]
Ruth Holland, WAC, [redacted]
Janet A. Jawelak, WAC, [redacted]
Shirley J. Justice, WAC, [redacted]
Esther E. Lenox, WAC, [redacted]
Sonja G. Lunoe, WAC, [redacted]
Kitt M. MacMichael, WAC, [redacted]
Phyllis J. Morsman, WAC, [redacted]
Patricia J. Pomeroy, WAC, [redacted]
Dorothy Sherba, WAC, [redacted]
Jacquelyn R. Sollars, WAC, [redacted]
Barbara J. Wardell, WAC, [redacted]
Helen A. Way, WAC, [redacted]
Martha L. Weeks, WAC, [redacted]
Elizabeth A. Whitaker, WAC, [redacted]
Kathleen I. Wilkes, WAC, [redacted]
Sadie E. Yoshizaki, WAC, [redacted]

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Robert M. Griffin, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Alfred E. Montgomery, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Miles, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Most merciful and gracious God, who art the source of our material and spiritual blessings, grant that daily we may be strengthened within in order that we may cope victoriously with all circumstances and conditions without no matter how trying and difficult they may be.

We thank Thee for the priceless principles of our democracy, the authority of conscience, the sovereignty of the people, the equality of all men, and many others which we have received as a glorious heritage.

Make us more eager and able to retain these principles and to safeguard them against all enemies whether within or outside the borders of our beloved country.

May our chosen representatives and all our citizens discharge their duties intelligently and faithfully, fill us with desires to widen the horizons of our sympathy and understanding and deepen within the heart of humanity, the spirit of good will and brotherhood.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

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

GEN. MATTHEW RIDGWAY

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest fighting men we have produced in this age, a man who is filling the biggest single job in our Military Establishment, is still wearing only three stars and he is clearly doing a four-star job. Lt. Gen. Matt Ridgway went to Korea, took a beaten army, regrouped it, reforged its fighting spirit, led it to triumphs which

every American should be and is proud of. Now he is supreme commander of all our vital and far-flung Pacific enterprises. For either he deserves a higher rank, that of full general. I sincerely hope that rank will shortly be forthcoming.

THE JENSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the majority leader is here today as he usually is, at his post.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, accused the gentleman from Minnesota, now addressing the House, of being in a disturbed frame of mind. I believe a reading of the RECORD this morning will show that it was the gentleman from Massachusetts who was disturbed and rightly so. On eight successive roll calls the majority of the Members of the House failed to follow his leadership. In fact, the gentleman from Massachusetts was so disturbed that he repeated twice the allegation that the gentleman from Minnesota had suggested that bureaus inconvenienced by the Jensen amendment should come to the Appropriations Committee for a deficiency.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, may I call attention to my statement on page 4745 of yesterday's RECORD, which reads as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island does not bring out the fact that if any of these bureaus do find themselves in difficulty this coming spring, they can come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations affected and state their case. We can then put them under that particular class of exemptions, if we so wish. I think we will be very foolish if we do not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. Speaker, we will, as the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested yesterday, let the Members draw their own interpretations.

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] makes the remarks he does today shows that the statement I made yesterday that he was disturbed is correct. I will quote just what the gentleman said:

> Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island does not bring out the fact that if any of these bureaus do find themselves in difficulty this coming spring, they can come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations affected and state their case.

Well, what are they coming before them for except for a deficiency appropriation? We all know that they cannot come before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations unless they are seeking a deficiency appropriation. There is only one construction that can be placed upon that language, and that is that they could not come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations unless it was in connection with a deficiency appropriation.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal from our good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] about the importance of TVA and how the power generated does not cost anybody anything. If you will turn to page 34 of the independent offices appropriation bill, which we will soon consider, in regard to the Tennessee Valley Authority, you will find that this uncalled-for monstrosity costs every taxpayer in the United States plenty to operate. Each year the Federal Government appropriates a few hundreds of millions of dollars for replacement, repair, operation of aircraft, and so forth, for this most inefficient and socialistic agency—the deficit in this bill for this year alone being $236,139,600, which the Government must borrow in order to keep this spendthrift organization in operation. For efficiency and economy, it should be turned over to private enterprise to operate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we are taking care of ourselves in the Tennessee Valley, but the rest of the people are being shut out from these public power projects, as I showed on yesterday. They are all entitled to the benefits of the cheap electricity produced at these Government dams on our navigable streams.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of peace and harmony, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very important announcement by a little Quaker college in Ohio, Wilmington College, for the promotion of a plan that college education may be put within the reach of all.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of informing the gentleman——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi is clearly out of order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded, therefore the gentleman cannot proceed under a reservation of objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

BRITISH DISLOYALTY

Mr. BENDER. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Great Britain stopped playing games with us. It is incredible that the British Government would permit the sale of 40,400 tons of rubber to Russia since the beginning of the war. But it is absolutely fantastic that the British would sell 120,000 tons of the same rubber to Communist China. This is a time when soldiers of the British Commonwealth in the forces of the United Nations are fighting Communist Chinese alongside of us.

We have always been loyal to our friends, but loyalty is a two-way street and the British have clearly been disloyal to us. They have been giving lip service to the United Nations' decision to fight in Korea, but they are working both sides of the street. For the sake of British trade in Hong Kong, the Labor Government is playing the shabbiest kind of immoral dishonesty and incredible politics. If anything should bring the Labor Party to defeat, this shocking demonstration of duplicity is it.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks which I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am going to include certain material and data regarding the problem of veterans in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. I think the Members will admit that there is a shortage of beds, particularly in the NP and TB hospitals. The Army and Navy and National Defense have requested of the Veterans' Administration beds for men still in service who have NP and TB disabilities. The overcrowding in those hospitals is extremely dangerous. There will be a great many accidents and the men are not getting the proper care due to shortage of personnel.

Also, there must be a military status of the doctors in the veterans' hospitals, otherwise you will have practically no doctors and nurses to take care of the patients, for many already have been drafted for the armed services. It was necessary in World War II to do this.

AID TO INDIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor simply to warn the membership of this body not to be caught in the trap that the so-called India wheat bill has set for them. This bill is simply a softening-up process. It simply makes way for other countries that are coming for a hand-out. The advocates of a further, or new ECA thought it best to bring this bill up because of the so-called humanitarian element involved. A vote for this bill will be a vote of confidence in Dean Acheson, and it will be committing us to another little ECA that will be known as the Javits plan, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been doing the thinking and the planning for the group interested in bringing into existence this additional little ECA, that will in the total call for approximately $7,000,000,000.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MEN IN UNIFORM

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, a few days ago I received the shock of my life when I learned that certain railroads are discriminating against our boys in uniform. I quote from a letter I received from the mother of a GI:

> Last week my son, a member of the United States Air Force, was coming home on leave before reporting to a port of embarkation base. He was traveling from Chicago to Binghamton. When he and several other members of the Armed Forces started to enter the club car, they were told by the conductor that the car was only for Pullman passengers. Do you know if this is a standard policy of all railroads?
>
> How I wish my son and all other sons of mothers the world over could be turned back from battle zones because they are not Pullman passengers.

Such discrimination is an outrage. A GI should be able to move freely from car to car on any train just like any other citizen. Is this the practice going on all over the country, on our railroads or in other public places? I mean to find out. This form of discrimination against our gallant fighting men had better be stopped before it is too late.

All the more reason why Congress should wake up and pass the Hall free furlough bill now languishing in the hands of a House committee. While railroads discriminate against servicemen who are lucky enough to dig up the money to travel second class, thousands of GIs now dog the dusty, dreary highways of our Nation on their long journeys home during furlough.

I might add, the boys tell me it is increasingly difficult for them to thumb and bum their way home. Does not our country's uniform mean as much to the civilian as it did before? Let us stop this discrimination against our servicemen. If Dean Acheson can ride in a limousine, if the General Staff members ride in Cadillacs and Lincolns, if our generals in the East ride in rickshaws carried by Chinese coolies, why draw the line on our GI's? Let us approve the Hall furlough bill, issue free passes to soldiers who want to visit their homes and forget there was anything like barring men in uniform from club cars or anywhere else in the good old United States of America.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Anderson, Calif.	Gregory	Murray, Tenn
Barrett	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Havenner	Passman
Brooks	Hays, Ark.	Patman
Buckley	Hébert	Powell
Burton	Hinshaw	Price
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Rains
Case	Irving	Redden
Chatham	Jarman	Ribicoff
Cole, N. Y.	Jenison	Rivers
Cooley	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Curtis, Mo.	Kee	Shafer
Dawson	Kersten, Wis.	Stockman
DeGraffenried	Klein	Vail
Dingell	Mansfield	Vinson
Evins	Miller, N. Y.	Watts
Fallon	Morrison	Whitaker
Gillette	Moulder	Widnall
Gore	Murdock	Woodruff
Gossett	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 401)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vermont, for agricultural purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising nine hundred forty-two and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vermont, and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of transfer.

"The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) relating to the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted an amendment in lieu thereof. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The provisions of the conference substitute are the same as the provisions adopted by the House, except as explained below:

The measure as it passed the House would have required the deed of conveyance to contain a provision reserving any minerals that might be found to exist, including the right to enter, remove, and extract same, and a provision which would cause the title to the lands to revert to the United States if the property was put to any use other than for the benefit of agriculture.

These provisions have been eliminated in the conference substitute. The conference substitute, however, provides that the real and personal property and research records are to be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture, for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of the transfer. This language will give the Secretary of Agriculture somewhat broader authority and will provide greater flexibility in the negotiations that must be conducted between the Secretary of

Agriculture and officials of the Vermont Agricultural College in connection with the transfer of the properties. It is the belief of the committee that the language of the conference substitute is ample to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the intent of the Congress and to protect fully the interests of the United States.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 220) providing for the waiving of points of order against H. R. 3880, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill or any provision contained in said bill are hereby waived.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later of course, as usual, I shall yield 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from my State [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I am presenting this rule, House Resolution 220. Personally, I am opposed to this rule which provides for the waiver of points of order against legislation which has been inserted in this appropriation bill by the Committee on Appropriations. This rule is unnecessary as far as consideration of the bill itself is concerned. The committee has already agreed on 4 hours of general debate. This resolution, if adopted, will protect those sections which materially alter general legislation already adopted by the Congress which, under the rules of this House, are the direct responsibility of several of the important standing committees of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does this rule waive points of order against amendments?

Mr. SABATH. It waives points of order on the 12 or 14 items of general legislation that are in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I mean amendments offered from the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can answer that question; the answer is "No."

Mr. SABATH. Thirty years ago, as some of you will recall, the legislative committees also had the power to appropriate. This power was taken away from them and made the sole jurisdiction of the great Committee on Appropriations. Now the Committee on Appropriations comes in and insists on usurping the prerogatives of legislative committees.

The tendency in recent years has been to increase the amount of general legislation in appropriation bills. If this door continues to be widened we can say goodbye to the legislative committees and turn over all legislation to the Committee on Appropriations. This is very bad practice. I have always opposed it. As an old Member, one who has been here for many years, who has stood for orderly procedure and tried to protect and defend the rights of the membership, I feel this rule should not be adopted. You Members with years of service on important legislative committees, as well as you younger Members who have assumed responsibilities on these committees, have a vital concern in what transpires here today. By voting to adopt this rule you are abrogating the prestige, the power, the responsibility embodied in the committee on which you serve. I feel certain that if you fully realize the import of this resolution, you will vote "no" and thereby protect your own committee. A vote to defeat the motion on the previous question is only a vote against this usurpation of power by the Committee on Appropriations. It is not a vote against the appropriation bill itself.

Under the pretense of economy or reducing certain appropriations the gentlemen who will speak for the rule will undoubtedly employ their worn-out argument that their motives are in the interest of the taxpayer—that great economies will result from the reduction in certain appropriations—but, unfortunately, this will not be borne out by their votes on the real economy bills which come before this House. Some day I shall call attention to their votes on legislation that will place these gentlemen in a rather embarrassing position. They talk about saving thousands in this measure, but when it comes to legislation that means millions upon millions to their friends in big business they are strangely silent with their economy pleas; they go right down the line for them.

Here are some of the important changes in existing law contained in this appropriation bill which this rule proposes to protect:

On page 24, lines 17 to 19: This provision suspends the advance-planning program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency under Public Law 352, which authorizes $100,000,000 for this program. This proviso limits the total advances for the program from its inception to $27,000,000. This will seriously cripple the housing program at a time when our defense effort creates a greater demand than ever for housing for defense workers.

Page 25, line 17 through line 7, page 26: The limitations embodied in these paragraphs constitute a change in existing law. The Housing Act now provides for 135,000 dwelling units each year to 1954. This proviso limits it to 50,000 units in any 1 year.

Page 30, lines 2 to 6: This proviso virtually suspends section 507 of the Housing Act, which provides administrative funds for the National Capital Housing Authority. The committee allowed $32,800 for maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the act. Present law permits the National Capital Housing Authority to use funds derived from leases, sales, and so forth, under title I for this purpose without limitation.

Page 53, lines 14 to 16: This section amends title III of the National Housing Act by limiting authorizations for administrative expenses for the Federal National Mortgage Association. It cuts the present authorization for administrative purposes by $540,000.

Page 54, lines 3 to 8: This provision rescinds the authorization of funds for prefabricated housing loans. In effect, it terminates the program authorized by section 102 of the Housing Act of 1948.

Page 55, lines 16 to 19: These lines constitute a change in existing law. They amend the Home Loan Act by inserting a limitation of $1,664,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Examiner's Division of the Home Loan Bank Board.

Page 57, lines 11 to 14: This section amends the National Housing Act by cutting authorizations for nonadministrative expenses to $22,320,000.

Page 58, lines 13 to 16: These words change section 303 of the Lanham Act, by limiting authorizations for nonadministrative expenses to $33,000,000.

All of the above involve serious infringement on the responsibilities and duties of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The following two provisions infringe on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Page 45, lines 12 and 18: This limits the number of voyages to be made by subsidized ships flying the American flag, now in operation and/or hereafter contracted for. This is certain to interfere with the proper development and expansion of our American merchant marine; it plays right into the hands of the foreign-registry shipowners, many of whom are American citizens or large corporations.

Page 46, lines 9 to 12: This proviso limits the administrative expenses under our ship-construction program to 5 percent of the total cost of such construction.

There are a number of other provisions of general legislation which I have not touched on which trespass on the jurisdiction of other important legislative committees. Chairman HART, of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; Chairman SPENCE, of the Banking and Currency Committee; and several other chairmen of legislative committees will undoubtedly give you more detailed information concerning the encroachment upon their respective committees if this rule is adopted.

No single appropriation bill in my memory has endeavored to legislate in

so many instances. Again I repeat, this is entirely contrary tc the rules of the House. It is a highly dangerous practice to permit the Committee on Appropriations to legislate in appropriation bills. This rule should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I have so many requests for time I shall ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for so much of 30 minutes as he may use.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as our distinguished chairman has said, this rule waives points of order.

Since I have been on the Rules Committee I venture to say that sometime or other every chairman of a standing committee of this House has come before the Committee on Rules and asked that points of order be waived on certain legislation sponsored by their respective committee.

The reason my friend from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] is opposed to this rule is because the main object is to save the taxpayers some money. To some Members this appears to be a crime. The reason the Appropriations Committee came before the Rules Committee asking for a rule waiving points of order was because they want to save the American taxpayers from one and a half to two billion dollars and that committee knew if it did not make the request for a rule waiving points of order against certain language that constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, the Committee on Banking and Currency would continue to demand 25,000 housing units costing $9,000 each or a total of $225,000,000 in order to subsidize low-cost housing at a time when we are probably in the greatest emergency since the War Between the States. It may be even greater. The object of the rule is to defer the building of these subsidized housing units and save a total of $225,000,000.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not the sole purpose of this rule to usurp the functions of the other standing committees of the House by legislating on an appropriation bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say definitely not. The sole object is to save taxpayers' money at a time when we are taxing the people $55,000,000,000 and, in fact, the Congress is now trying to bleed ten or twelve billion dollars more out of them. So I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] chairman of the subcommittee and to the members of the Appropriations Committee that they have my congratulations for bringing this bill before the House in this manner. Never in all history is it as important to practice economy.

Another group particularly interested in this bill and against waiving points of order is the Maritime Commission. We all know that after the last war our Government, after having paid a million and a half dollars each for thousands of ships, sold approximately one thousand of these ships to American citizens for about one-third of what they cost; in other words about $500,000 apiece. The Government feels now that it might be necessary in the present emergency to charter these ships. Those boats which were sold for $500,000 are now worth approximately two and a half million dollars. The present bill provides that in the event the Government charters these same ships and they are sunk that the Government will pay the owner the amount the Government received for them plus the cost of improvement minus the cost of any depreciation. The owners feel that they should receive the present valuation which is at least four or five times more than they paid the Government. Could anything be more mercenary?

Mr. COX. And plus improvements that are made.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Another reason why the Maritime Commission and the ones who have purchased these boats are objecting to this rule waiving points of order is because it has placed a limitation on subsidies. As you know, the Government is subsidizing these boats that cost the Government one and a half million dollars, later sold to American citizens for a half million dollars, for a certain number of voyages. This limits the subsidized voyages to 1,450. These same ship owners desire that all voyages be subsidized although shipping is enjoying one of its greatest prosperities in history with corresponding high profits. This bill provides $20,000,000 for subsidies. I can understand that because our seamen receive higher wages, because it costs more for their maintenance than the seamen of foreign countries than occasionally in the present emergency that it might be necessary to charter one of the ships for a voyage which would necessarily have to make the run at a loss. The 1,450 subsidized voyages allowed in this bill will take care of these emergencies. The Appropriations Committee, in my opinion, should receive the congratulations of the Members of this House for bringing in a bill designed to save the taxpayers some one and a half billion dollars.

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

Mr ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will take the floor in a few minutes and if the Members will listen to what the gentleman has to say they will find complete justification for the action of the Rules Committee in bringing this entire question in here in order that the House might have the opportunity of passing upon the identical question the gentleman has been discussing. In other words, the House is deprived of nothing. These committees that are complaining have been deprived of no rights. Their views may be stressed here with amendments that they have the privilege of offering to the bill. The Rules Committee, in the interest of giving the House an opportunity to effect economy, saw fit to report this rule and they will find justification for that action in the statement that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will make very shortly.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his always sound remarks.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Bills from the Committee on Appropriations are privileged, are they not?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. So if you were to vote down this rule the committee could still call the bill up under the rules of the House; is that not correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The rule is merely designed to waive points of order.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that the will of the majority will decide this issue. When we vote on the previous question the will of the majority is not denied one thing under this rule. If the majority do not want this rule, then, of course, it will be turned down. So, I say the Committee on Rules has not denied the majority membership of this House the right of final determination, because they will have the opportunity of voting the rule up or down.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there has not been an important committee of this House that has not been before the Committee on Rules asking for the waiving of points of order on their bills. The Committee on Appropriations came there and in the judgment of the Committee on Rules made a good case, and the committee reported the bill and ordered to give the House the opportunity to now pass upon the important questions that are dealt with in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. And that is all that is dealt with?

Mr. COX. That is all.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In conclusion I want to say this: Yesterday the House did a great job in regard to cutting down nondefense expenditures. I have repeatedly stated we should also more carefully scrutinize actual military expenditures. Frankly, I think the House can do an even greater job when we come to reading this bill for amendment and that they can cut down this bill many millions of dollars. I refer especially to the TVA, which I have previously mentioned today. This Congress has a great responsibility. Our chief one is to keep the Nation solvent. In my opinion we cannot do so unless we cut every appropriation to the bone and in addition completely eliminate the scores of governmental agencies now in existence which are not needed and which in no way benefit our people—that is, with the exception of those who are on the taxpayers' payroll.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if permitted to do so, I would like to yield to the gentleman the 5 minutes reserved for me.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Georgia relinquishes his time, then it reverts to the gentleman from Texas. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SABATH. I promised the gentleman from Georgia 5 minutes, and if he desires to do that, it is all right with me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois yields 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] for his generosity, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] also.

I do not think there is much room for any heat here. I cannot quibble with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]; we all admire and love him too much to do that. Fundamentally he is right that the Committee on Appropriations ought not to do any legislating, and as a general rule we do not, and the only reason we are here today is purely on account of an emergency, wartime condition, and if that condition did not prevail we would not be here asking you to waive points of order. I hope and pray that you will waive these points of order because this language that we are asking you to waive points of order upon is worth a bare minimum to the taxpayers of this country $750,000,000 over and above the reductions already made in the bill, and I will give the details to you word for word if you will give me the time. That is a very conservative estimate. It can ran much greater than $750,000,000.

We do not like to be placed in the attitude of encroaching so to speak, on the jurisdiction of the great Committee on Banking and Currency on the housing unit item here. We all respect that great committee and its great chairman. They are fine, patriotic men, and they have done a splendid job.

This is what we have done. You passed a bill in 1949 calling for the construction of 810,000 publicly subsidized low-cost housing units, at an individual cost of about $9,000. The President reduced it for this year to 75,000 units. All you could start was 75,000 units, on account of the war, the scarcity of material, the scarcity of manpower, and to hold down inflation.

The committee, after thinking it over, decided that figure should be reduced to 50,000 for the fiscal year 1952; for the same reasons: to hold down inflation, and because of the scarcity of materials and manpower, steel bathtubs and cookstoves.

Why does the Committee on Banking and Currency now come here and say we are trespassing on the jurisdiction of their great committee? Because that committee did what? It legislated authority to the Housing Agency to issue notes and other obligations in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000,000. You did not appropriate it. You do not get to pass on it, and your servant, the Committee on Appropriations, does not get a chance to pass on it. That great legislative committee, whom I admire, wrote into the bill that you go to the Treasury, not to this House, you go direct to the Treasury for $1,500,000,000.

Is that all? No. The Banking and Currency Committee also said that when you build these 810,000 units the taxpayers of the United States shall pay each year in the form of a subsidy what amount of money? $308,000,000. We have no discretion in that appropriation. You do not actually get a chance to decide on the amount and neither does your Committee on Appropriations because the amount required automatically becomes an obligation of the Government. That great committee in effect legislated and appropriated all at one time, and for how long? For 40 years. That is the life of it. It is a debt against the taxpayers of the United States, and they can go into court and obtain a judgment against the Government.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. The House passed that bill. The House was "over 21" and knew what it was doing.

Mr. THOMAS. I doubt if the gentleman or most of his committee fully understand it, much as I admire you.

Mr. JAVITS. I am not on that committee, but I understand it, and I think the committee did, and I think the House did.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, we understand it. You dump into the lap of the Committee on Appropriations every year for 40 years a mandate to appropriate $308,000,000 a year. Does not the gentleman think, in all fairness to this House, that it is the duty of this little, humble subcommittee to come in here and point that out to you? All that amounts to for 40 years is approximately $13,000,000,000 of your money.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room for heat. When you go into the Committee of the Whole, if you adopt this rule, you can amend that language. The only purpose of asking for the rule was that one person could knock out that item on a point of order, without giving the other 434 Members a chance to express themselves. They can knock it out, amend it, or change it in any way they want to. When the war is over you can go back and build every one of these units. We are not taking them away from you; we are just saying they ought to be deferred.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Apropos of the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], while the House was "21" when it passed that authorization, at the same time we did not know then that we had to fight communism all over the world and would need our resources for that.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Let me speak for one moment on the maritime question. We have some language in here that applies only to what price the taxpayers are going to be called upon in case of an all-out shooting war to pay for ships that the taxpayers have heretofore bought and paid for 100 percent with your money—your money, now, make no mistake about that—and which the Government sold, as far as replacement value is concerned as of today, at 15 cents on the dollar.

In other words this language will not apply until we get in an all-out, shooting war. There are about a thousand ships involved. The Government is forced to take them back, after they have sold them, for 15 cents on the dollar and then they are sunk. This language says, "All you can get is what you paid for that ship, minus depreciation and charter hire that you have received in the meantime."

You talk about not making any millionaires out of the blood, sweat, and tears of these boys who are fighting and dying for $50 a month. Here is your opportunity. We are just trying to correct a mistake that was made in World War II. Gentlemen, that mistake was—it is almost—I want to use moderate language—I think it is revolting what the Maritime Commission paid for some of those ships after they were requisitioned and used by your Government to supply your troops who are fighting for $50 a month. I am not going to call the names of the ship companies, but I have the names of the ships and their age and what the ship operator paid for them, and I have the figure as to what the taxpayers had to pay back when they were sunk, and in addition to that we have the figures here to show how much they were paid for charter hire, rent, so to speak, before they were sunk.

Incidentally there were 754 of these cargo ships sunk during World War II. Here is one, the *Alcoa Leader*. It was built in 1919. It was sunk on June 30, 1944. That would make the ship about 25 years old when it was sunk. It had been depreciated at the rate of 5 percent for every year for 20 years. So it had been paid for a long time before it was ever sunk. The operator paid $210,000 for it, and the amount paid by the taxpayers was $435,307 when it was sunk. That is for a 25-year-old ship that was depreciated.

That is not all. During the time that the Government used that ship the Government paid him $1,048,000 charter hire.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] yield me 3 minutes? I just want to read two or three more of these figures.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this table of information I have here is prepared by the Maritime Administration. It is just a sample of the information they usually give out. I have never heard of the Maritime Administration giving you their best or their worst. They usually just go down the middle. These are the commission's figures, and not mine.

Here is another ship, the *Tachira*. That ship was built in 1920, it was sunk

on July 12, 1942. The acquisition cost to the owner was $45,600. When it was sunk the taxpayers of the United States paid $256,200 for a ship that was 22 years old, and for which the owner only paid $45,000. That is not all. The Government operated it for only 2 months and paid them an additional $47,800. That is the sum total of the cost for a 21- or 22-year-old ship.

Here is another ship, the *Hon Omu*. That ship was built in 1919. It was sunk on July 5, 1942. That makes the ship 23 years old. The acquisition cost to the owner, according to the Maritime Administration, was $127,000. The Maritime Administration says that when it was sunk the owner received—how much? $768,000. Let us see how much the Government paid in addition to that for charter hire and fees during that time. The Government only chartered it for about 4 months and they paid $129,615 extra beside that $768,000.

Mr. Speaker, all this language does is to seek to prevent that happening again. That great committee is headed by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey. He is a great American, the head of a great committee. Their committee had 5 years to do this, and they have not seen fit to do it. That is their business and not ours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to submit a consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

The appropriation bill should of course, come before the House, and it will come before the House anyway. The only question is whether you are going to vote for a rule waiving points of order. As has been stated repeatedly, this would oust the appropriate standing committees of the House of their jurisdiction. No matter how good you may conceive the legislation in this appropriation bill to be, it is not the way to legislate; it is not a desirable thing to oust legislative committees from their appropriate jurisdiction.

I have very little to say about the housing legislation. The point is that surely you can control the amount of housing to be constructed by the quantum of the appropriation you allow. I do not see why the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency should be done in this bill, although I did not agree with what the Committee on Banking and Currency did in the first place and I did not vote for the housing legislation which I never considered good legislation.

Now, coming to this merchant-marine provision on page 49, we find a particularly striking case. I was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when in the Seventy-ninth Congress we passed the ship sales bill which passed the House almost unanimously. It may very well be that if the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, when it was considering the ship sales bill, had realized the tremendous increase in price that was going to occur, it would have fixed a different formula for the selling price of ships. But we fixed the statutory selling price in good faith. Surely, nobody who bought a war-built ship at the statutory price can be criticized for doing it. You will have in mind that we deliberately fixed a statutory sales price that we thought would move these ships. A provision closely resembling that found in H. R. 3880 was offered as an amendment to the Ship Sales Act and was rejected.

The provision on page 49 of the bill not only is new legislation; it also amends the Constitution of the United States, because the Constitution of the United States provides that property shall not be taken without due process of law. It provides for a fair value to be paid to the owner whose property is involuntarily taken. This is true in war as in peace. Ship owners, like other people, have suffered a great appreciation in the value of their property. You could, of course, pass legislation providing that nobody in the District of Columbia should sell a house for more than he paid for it 5 or 10 years ago, but I do not believe you would want to pass such legislation, and I do not believe the courts would concede the constitutionality of it or give it effect. Why should you confiscate the property of a shipowner more readily than that of a home owner.

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

Mr. HALE. I yield briefly.

Mr. JAVITS. I just want to ask the gentleman whether he does not think that all we are trying to pass on is whether or not the Committee on Appropriations shall be a superlegislative committee over every other committee.

Mr. HALE. Exactly. That will be the effect if you adopt this rule. Not only that but in this case you will, as I say, amend the Constitution of the United States, which the Congress cannot do by ordinary statute even when emanating from a committee having jurisdiction.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this rule subject to amendment before it is voted on?

The SPEAKER. Not if the previous question is ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the previous question is ordered, it is subject to amendment, is it?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois yields for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield? I would like to submit an amendment and ask a question to go along with it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that if he yields to the gentleman from Mississippi to offer an amendment, the gentleman from Mississippi will control an hour.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a plea of guilty by Members of the Committee on Rules and my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee. They have made the same defense that the old colored man made when he was accused of stealing a pair of pants. He said, "If the motive is right, where is the sin? I stole the breeches to be baptised in."

I would be recreant to my trust if I did not protest against this invasion of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the other committees. The parliamentary rules have been built up by experience of mankind, by trial and error, like the common law which Blackstone is the perfection of human reasoning. They are a wise code of rules and those who have served here long are constantly made conscious that they are fundamentally sound. One of the most important of these rules is that no legislation shall be written on an appropriation bill.

The Appropriations Committee does not have to have a rule for the consideration of its bills. These bills come here ordinarily without a rule for their consideration. However, in this case they went before the Rules Committee and got a rule which provides that no points of order may be made against the bill or any provisions of it. Thereby they invaded those committees which had jurisdiction under the rules of the House in reference to legislative provisions incorporated in the bill. Rules prohibiting points of order may sometimes be justified when applied solely to clerical errors or technical objections; but they should not be made to invade the fundamental principles and the fundamental rules of the House.

In order to proceed under orderly processes, we must have legislative committees. The jurisdiction of those committees is as well defined as the jurisdiction of the courts. Those committees have a peculiar knowledge of the subjects that come before them because of the constant hearings and the constant experience with those subjects.

The gentlemen favoring the rule by their debate here miss the fundamental question of violation. They are justifying their action in overriding the legislative committees in a way that makes me feel like saying: "Upon what meat have these our Caesars fed that they have grown so great?" They have not denied that this is a violation of the fundamental rules of the House. They have said, "We did violate them, but we know more than the committees that have jurisdiction over these matters, we know more than the committees that have considered these things; therefore, we substitute our judgment for their judgment."

They have looted our committees today, they will gut yours tomorrow if you establish this principle. Have you any feeling of interest in your committee? Do you want to see the integrity of your committee preserved? Do you want to see it retain its jurisdiction? If you do, you had better vote down this rule.

The legislation here involved is immaterial. The fundamental question is whether you are going to let the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee take over the legislation of the House. If you want to do that you may make an easy life for yourself, but it seems to me it will be a retreat from the duties that are imposed upon you.

I ask the Members to vote down this resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the House created the Appropriations Committee, within the memory of many people now sitting on this floor today, to keep Members of the House out of trouble. I think this is one time when the Appropriations Committee has been diligent by the action it has taken in reference to this bill to keep the Members out of trouble.

We are going to answer, by our vote upon the rule, and I personally hope it will be a vote in favor of the rule, five very simple questions. Those questions are: Do you believe this is an emergency? Do you believe that this is a war? Do you believe that money should be spent for the defense of the United States and that, therefore, all other expenditures of the United States domestically should be reduced as much as possible? Do we believe that the unlimited expenditure of Federal money has a direct effect toward inflation, and, in very simple language, do we believe in economy? Those questions you will answer by yes or no by your vote upon the rule. As long as I have been upon the Committee on Appropriations, which is 5 years, subcommittees have come before the Rules Committee asking for closed rules. I think in the session before last, the Eighty-first Congress, a majority of the Appropriation Subcommittees asked for rules waiving points of order, and it gives me a certain slight amusement to hear the gentleman from Kentucky object to this rule on the ground that it waives points of order when the Committee on Banking and Currency has itself frequently gone before the Committee on Rules and asked for rules waiving points of order.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not at the moment, but I will later. If you wish to discuss jurisdiction, in which I have no particular interest, the Committee on Banking and Currency took jurisdiction from the Committee on Appropriations when it passed the housing bill and bypassed the Committee on Appropriations and gave a blank check upon the taxpayers of the United States for a period of years amounting to about $17,000,000,000. That is a point where jurisdiction was seized by the Banking and Currency Committee and not by us.

We do not want particularly to make legislation; I do not think any Appropriation Subcommittee does, but there are times when a legislative committee does not have time; perhaps, for some reason it has not been able to meet and to do those things which should be done in this bill and which are necessary in the emergency which faces the United States. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, that is going to prevent the Committee on Banking and Currency from meeting and working out some of the things they want or the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries from meeting and working out some of the things it wants, but the fact remains that those committees have not met to do the things that are done in this bill. This is your chance to answer the questions which I asked: Are you for economy? Do you believe that Federal spending increases inflation? Do you believe this is an emergency and do you believe that in wartime we should limit domestic spending and spend for the defense of the country? Those are the questions before us.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART].

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, as my very good friend from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, has stated, there is no reason for heat being employed on this occasion. The proposition involved here is a fundamental one, and that is whether the rules of the House and whether the jurisdiction of the legislative committees of the House are to be suspended by the House or whether encroachments upon those several jurisdictions and violations of those rules are to be condoned by the House.

The only purpose of the rule upon which we are soon to act, the rule which waives points of order on H. R. 3880 is to validate what is admitted to be legislation contained in an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. I do not desire to go into the merits of the legislation, particularly. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] stated that the purpose of the Committee on Appropriations was to get Members of the House out of trouble. If rules of this nature are to be continued, if there is to be a continuous ouster of jurisdiction of legislative committees, then the Committee on Appropriations is going to get the country into trouble, and if the legislative provisions of H. R. 3880 prevail, at least with respect to the operations of the Maritime Commission, our country will be in trouble. The gentleman from Texas fulminated against the prices paid to many people who had bought ships from the Government. Under previous legislation the Maritime Commission was permitted to enter into negotiations with the ship owners on the question of just compensation. Under the previous law and existing law they were permitted to offer larger amounts to those owners than would be permited under the provisions of H. R. 3880. But, the question of just compensation cannot be defined by a legislative body. The Constitution of the United States and the fifth amendment say that everybody shall be given just compensation for private property taken or requisitioned by the Government.

What does the record show? The record shows even in the light of larger sums that were offered by the Government in the negotiations, when the ship owners refused to accept such sums and brought their cases into the courts, the courts in the over-all picture awarded the owners 161 percent of what the Maritime Commission had offered.

You cannot take away the jurisdiction of the courts by a provision of this nature. This not only seeks to oust the legislative committees of their jurisdiction but the courts of the United States of their jurisdiction. If by any chance it should be passed, the courts will repel it as being completely unconstitutional.

The gentleman from Texas never referred at all to another provision in this bill that limits the number of voyages in the fiscal year 1952 that may be authorized by the Maritime Administration to 1,450.

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

Mr. HART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That particular point is not subject to a point of order. It does not come under the rule.

Mr. HART. That is the opinion of the gentleman from California. That may be the reason the gentleman from Texas did not mention it. Nevertheless, there is some doubt as to whether a point of order could be made against that provision because, if enacted into law, it would result in the violation of contracts already existing between the Maritime Administration and the shipowners and operators of the United States.

The Maritime Administrator requested that there be authorized in this appropriation bill sufficient funds for a minimum of 1,523 voyages. Even then it is questionable whether 1,523 voyages would satisfy the contractual commitments of the Maritime Administration.

But arbitrarily and without recognition of the request of the Maritime Administrator, the subcommittee has cut down the number of voyages authorized to 1,450, an increase of 16 over those which are estimated to take place in the fiscal year 1951.

I talked this morning on the telephone with the Administrator of the Maritime Administration, Admiral Cochrane. Admiral Cochrane has been commended by the gentleman from Texas as one of the finest administrators in the history of the country. With that estimate of him I fully agree. Yet, he casts aside completely, and his subcommittee casts aside completely, the recommendation of Admiral Cochrane with reference to the number of voyages that will be required in the interests of the United States and the United States merchant marine in the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous principle, this business of permitting continual and ever greater encroachment upon the legislative committees of the House by the Appropriations Committee. It is a fundamental principle. It is the only real principle involved. I appeal to those Members who do not approve of the continuance of that practice to vote down this rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the few minutes allotted to me I may be able to discuss the rule

which is before us, and perhaps clarify some of the misunderstandings which seemingly are apparent here today.

In the beginning, may I point out that when this bill and the application for this rule were before the Committee on Rules we were advised there were eight provisions in the bill which would be subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriation bill? Of course, under the rules of the House, legislation cannot be made a part of an appropriation bill unless points of order are waived. The waiving of points of order, as provided in this rule, does simply one thing—and I wish to make this very clear—it permits the membership of the House to pass upon each of these eight provisions upon its merits. The rule does not provide these eight provisions shall be enacted into law. Voting for this rule does not approve a single one of these provisions. The rule simply sets aside the right of one individual Member of the House to prevent, by his objection, or by the making of a point of order, the majority of the House of Representatives from working its will on that particular section of the bill.

I have the highest regard and the greatest respect for our legislative committees. In the long years I have served on the Committee on Rules, I have usually opposed the granting of rules carrying a waiver of points of order. Yet I am not unmindful of the fact that every legislative committee of the House, almost without exception, and I dare say without a single exception, has come before the Committee on Rules and requested a waiver of points of order. I am not unmindful of the fact that when the great Committee on Banking and Currency brought in the housing bill, which is dealt with in this appropriation bill, it had been so written as to entirely bypass the Committee on Appropriations, so that the money was appropriated at the very same time the authorization was approved. Therefore, the only way in the world the House of Representatives can pass upon the particular housing question involved in this bill is through the adoption of this rule. Otherwise, we will never have an opportunity to pass upon it.

It is exactly true, as the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky said a few moments ago, the House did approve the legislative bill to which he alluded, and of which mention has been made here, but it is equally true that after the present great conflict developed in Korea, and we realized we might have to fight a war for survival, and his committee brought in another bill for another great housing project and spending program, the House of Representatives voted it down, or rather flatly refused to even consider that legislation. And it has not been brought back to the floor yet. The House of Representatives, like everyone else, certainly should have the right to change its positions and opinions in view of changing conditions. That is all this rule permits. It simply gives to us, the Members of the House of Representatives, the opportunity to determine for ourselves whether certain expenditures for certain purposes should be made, or whether they should be turned down; whether there should now be some restrictions placed on them, whether we should go ahead with these gigantic building programs which were barely approved when we thought we had peace, and perhaps might face a depression; or whether we should suspend that program for the present, at least.

I am sure the members of our different legislative committees who have spoken here today are able men, honest and sincere men. But they can present their points of view on these different sections of the bill to the House, providing we adopt this rule. If they can convince the House their position is right, the House will go along with them and strike such sections from the bill, or amend them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield just for a brief question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield at this time and I will appreciate it if the gentleman will observe the rules of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the members of the different legislative committees who have spoken here today think they are correct in what they have said as to the provisions of this bill, certainly, with all of their ability and great oratorical prowess, they can convince the majority of the House to vote with them; and if the majority of the House desires to place any limitations upon these Government expenditures in view of the great national emergency with which we are now faced, that it is right and proper we should be just a little careful as to how we spend our public moneys, that we ought to postpone some of these great projects which have been authorized in the past for a while, then the House can and will so vote.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I am addressing the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee). The gentleman from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I have not even had an opportunity to ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman cannot contribute anything worth while to this discussion or debate, and I refuse to yield.

Mr. Speaker, the question is whether you want to save at least $750,000,000, at the minimum, and the savings may go to as much as $2,000,000,000, if this rule is adopted, or whether we want to go ahead and spend these vast sums.

If those who oppose this rule can convince us that we should go ahead and spend this money, if they can convince us by logic, the Members of the House, a majority of us, that we should strike out of this bill these provisions, then these provisions can and will be stricken. But unless they can convince the majority of the House that it should have no right to pass upon these special provisions in this bill, then vote "No." All the Committee on Rules is giving in submitting this rule, the right for the House to decide for itself what it wants to do. A vote of "Yes" will give each of us that right. A "No" vote is a vote against permitting the House to work its will on these important questions—a vote against economy, a vote for waste and extravagance—at a time when our country must conserve its strength in the face of great peril.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

STAND BY STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the views of the chairmen of the Committees on Banking and Currency and Merchant Marine. Today their jurisdiction is invaded, and tomorrow the Appropriations Committee will poach on the preserves of Judiciary and next day Foreign Affairs. Precedents have a habit of begetting precedents. Finally the Appropriations Committee becomes the arbiter of our fate—becomes the congressional pooh bah.

It is not a question of economy or otherwise. The vote is for the sanctity of the jurisdiction of standing committees. That is all.

We inveigh against the habit in the other body of placing legislative provisions on our appropriation bills. We cannot complain, if we pass this rule. The other group will say: Before you take the mote out of my eye look to the beam in your own. We become guilty of the abuse against which we usually inveigh.

There were no public hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee. Disinterested witnesses were not heard. Only Government witnesses appeared. Before standing committees both sides of a controversy are heard. In the interest of fairness and orderly procedure vote down this rule.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously interested in the rights and prerogatives of the legislative committees of this body, and I think all Members should be interested in that subject. I have no difference with the Appropriations Committee for the amount of money they bring in to carry out legislative items that have been authorized.

The gentleman from Ohio is very ticklish about the rules of the House and the prerogatives that he enjoys on the floor of this House, but he does not seem to be interested in the prerogatives and rights of the legislative committees of this House.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that

the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has said that it is the right of every man to change his mind. I am changing my mind and am going to vote against this rule.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask just one very brief question? Is it not a fact that the Committee on Rules reported out this rule by a vote of 6 to 5?

Mr. BONNER. I so understand.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the legislation carried in this bill there is the directive to the Maritime Board with respect to contracts that have been made, contracts that run for 10 years. These contracts are not made from year to year; they are made over a period of 10 years with shipping companies to provide service just like the railroads provide service between Washington and New York.

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

Mr. BONNER. I cannot yield.

I leave to the Members who are constitutional lawyers and know more about contracts than I whether or not the United States Government would not get into serious trouble over these contracts that are worked out, if the provisions in this appropriation bill are adopted?

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have ever raised my voice against a rule. In this case I believe and feel positive I am correct. Therefore I hope the House votes down the rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on a resolution which, in many respects, may seem routine and on which many Members may base their vote on partisan considerations or on the narrow issues relating to the independent offices appropriation bill which House Resolution 220 involves. Much of the debate has centered on those factors. I want to express my own very strong feeling that the basic issue involved in House Resolution 220 is not a matter in which the partisan conflict nor monetary expediency should dictate a choice of position.

The issues involved here are far larger than that. House Resolution 220, by waiving points of order against the legislation written into H. R. 3880, violates a principle upon which the entire legislative organization of Congress is based. It also violates a basic principle of plain common sense. Congress has always recognized that no one Member, nor any small group of Members, can hope to fully understand and cope with the details of the innumerable matters that come before us for action. It was on the basis of that common-sense principle that the committee system was established both in the House and in the Senate. The Committee on Appropriations was established to deal with the allocation of funds for Government activities; it was not established to legislate the details of how the expenditure of funds should be administered and regulated. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was set up to recommend legislative action on administrative and regulative matters pertaining to the maritime affairs of the United States; it does not and should not presume to encroach on the money-spending functions of the Committee on Appropriations. The same considerations apply to every legislative committee established under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, that is not simply a matter of courtesy or formality. It is a dictate of absolute necessity. When the Committee on Appropriations presumes to encroach on the legislative jurisdiction and prerogatives of other committees of the House—as it does in many instances in H. R. 3880—its members cannot possibly have a full understanding of all the factors involved in the legislation they write. I know that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and other members of his subcommittee have stressed the point that all they are trying to do is to save money for the Government in this time of financial strain. I submit that when they write hasty and ill-conceived legislation into any appropriation bill, without full knowledge of the background situation, they open wide the door for the expenditure of much greater amounts of money than they save. In many cases they make inevitable the wastage and loss of sums already spent. You cannot prevent inefficiency when the people laying down the rules are like fish out of water. No Congressman can familiarize himself with all the details of all the vast operations with which this Government concerns itself, any more than a fish can learn to breathe air. No member of the Committee on Appropriations can hope to know as much about any particular legislative matter as the members of the committee which deal with that particular problem every day. When a committee steps out of its own field it can only create chaos, confusion, and cross-purpose. It certainly cannot save money in the long run.

It is true that I am opposed to some of the legislation written into the independent offices appropriation bill. I particularly oppose certain features applying to the work of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of which I am a member. I also oppose the legislation on public housing which has been taken out of the hands of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Some of the legislation introduced into the bill may be sound. Regardless of that fact, I am frank enough to admit that I do not feel capable of passing judgment on all of it. I am also frank enough to say I do not believe the members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee are capable of passing sound judgment on all of it without the advice and studied consideration of members of the separate committees which should have written the legislation.

I appeal to my colleagues in the House to base their vote on this resolution, not on the basis of party but on the basis of partnership in a common effort which is bound to suffer if the dictates of common sense and the rules of organization of this House are discarded. The continual waiving of points of order against legislation in appropriations bills carries an inherent danger which should override any other question in our minds. Now is the time when we should all stand together against that danger. I ask that the rule be refused by vote of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 220, nays 159, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—220

Aandahl	Evins	Meader
Abbitt	Fellows	Merrow
Abernethy	Fenton	Miller, Nebr.
Adair	Fernandez	Mills
Allen, Ill.	Fisher	Morano
Allen, La.	Ford	Morton
Andersen, H. Carl	Forrester	Mumma
Anderson, Calif.	Fulton	Nicholson
Andresen, August H.	Gamble	Norblad
Andrews	Gary	Norrell
Angell	Gathings	O'Hara
Arends	Gavin	Passman
Armstrong	George	Patten
Auchincloss	Golden	Patterson
Ayres	Goodwin	Phillips
Baker	Gore	Pickett
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Potter
Bates, Mass.	Graham	Poulson
Battle	Grant	Radwan
Beall	Gross	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Gwinn	Reed, Ill.
Beckworth	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Reed, N. Y.
Belcher	Hall, Leonard W.	Rees, Kans.
Bender	Harden	Regan
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Riehlman
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Mass.
Berry	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Tex.
Betts	Harvey	Sadlak
Bishop	Hays, Ark.	St. George
Blackney	Hedrick	Schwabe
Boggs, Del.	Herlong	Scrivner
Bolton	Herter	Scudder
Bow	Hess	Shafer
Bray	Hill	Sheehan
Brehm	Hillings	Sheppard
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Short
Brownson	Hoffman, Ill.	Sikes
Budge	Hoffman, Mich.	Simpson, Ill.
Buffett	Holmes	Sittler
Burleson	Horan	Smith, Kans.
Busbey	Hunter	Smith, Miss.
Bush	Jackson, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	James	Smith, Wis.
Chenoweth	Jenison	Springer
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Stanley
Church	Jensen	Stefan
Clevenger	Jonas	Sutton
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Mo.	Taber
Colmer	Jones, Hamilton C.	Talle
Cooper	Jones, Woodrow W.	Taylor
Corbett	Kean	Teague
Cotton	Kearns	Thomas
Coudert	Kilburn	Thompson, Mich.
Cox	Kilday	Van Pelt
Crawford	Lantaff	Van Zandt
Crumpacker	Larcade	Vaughn
Cunningham	LeCompte	Velde
Curtis, Nebr.	Lovre	Vorys
Dague	Lyle	Vursell
Davis, Ga.	McConnell	Werdel
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Wharton
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Wheeler
Dempsey	McGregor	Whitten
Denny	McMillan	Wigglesworth
Devereux	McMullen	Williams, Miss.
D'Ewart	McVey	Williams, N. Y.
Dolliver	Mack, Wash.	Willis
Dondero	Mahon	Wilson, Ind.
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Tex.
Eaton	Martin, Mass.	Winstead
Ellsworth	Mason	Wolcott
Elston		Wood, Ga.
Engle		Wood, Idaho

NAYS—159

Addonizio	Green	O'Konski
Allen, Calif.	Greenwood	O'Neill
Anfuso	Hagen	Ostertag
Aspinall	Hale	O'Toole
Bailey	Hand	Perkins
Barden	Hart	Philbin
Baring	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Blatnik	Heffernan	Polk
Boggs, La	Heller	Preston
Bolling	Heselton	Priest
Bonner	Hope	Prouty
Bosone	Howell	Quinn
Boykin	Hull	Rabaut
Breen	Jackson, Wash.	Ramsay
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Rankin
Bryson	Javits	Reams
Burdick	Johnson	Rhodes
Burnside	Jones, Ala.	Ribicoff
Butler	Judd	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Camp	Keating	Roberts
Canfield	Kelley, Pa.	Robeson
Carlyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Carnahan	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Case	Kerr	Rooney
Celler	King	Roosevelt
Chelf	Kirwan	Sabath
Chudoff	Kluczynski	Sasscer
Clemente	Lane	Saylor
Combs	Lanham	Scott,
Crosser	Latham	Hugh D., Jr.
Deane	Lesinski	Secrest
Delaney	Lind	Seely-Brown
Denton	Lucas	Shelley
Dollinger	McCarthy	Spence
Donohue	McCormack	Staggers
Donovan	McGrath	Tackett
Dorn	McGuire	Thompson, Tex.
Doyle	McKinnon	Thornberry
Durham	Machrowicz	Tollefson
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Towe
Elliott	Madden	Trimble
Feighan	Magee	Walter
Fine	Marshall	Weichel
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Fogarty	Miller, Md.	Wickersham
Forand	Mitchell	Wier
Frazier	Morgan	Withrow
Fugate	Moulder	Wolverton
Furcolo	Multer	Yates
Garmatz	Murdock	Yorty
Gordon	Nelson	Zablocki
Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.	
Granger	O'Brien, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—54

Albert	Halleck	Patman
Bakewell	Havenner	Powell
Barrett	Hébert	Price
Bramblett	Hinshaw	Rains
Brooks	Holifield	Redden
Buckley	Irving	Rivers
Burton	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Cannon	Kee	Sieminski
Chatham	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Steed
Cooley	Klein	Stigler
Curtis, Mo.	Mansfield	Stockman
Dawson	Miller, N. Y.	Vail
DeGraffenried	Morris	Vinson
Dingell	Morrison	Watts
Fallon	Murphy	Whitaker
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Widnall
Gregory	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Price against.

Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Havenner against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Burton for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bakewell.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Vail.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSECUTION OF PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, has taken occasion to, from the well of the House, or by the insertion of matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, make reference to certain court proceedings involving Edward Rumely. On several occasions reply has been made to those statements by me, but notwithstanding the fact that the unfairness and injustice, at least in my opinion, of the statements of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been pointed out, he continues a course which begins to have the appearance of a persecution. I do not actually know why Mr. PATMAN follows this course which he certainly must know does not accurately portray the activities of Mr. Rumely.

Mr. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, has long circulated books and statements made by Members of Congress, including some made by your humble servant which tend to support our form of government. Some who evidently do not believe in our form of government, who apparently would, by force or otherwise, change that form of government, have over the years consistently endeavored by false statements to discredit Mr. Rumely which does Mr. Rumely a grave injustice.

Mr. Rumely is an officer of an organization—the Committee for Constitutional Government—which is endeavoring, by printing and distributing speeches, documents, pamphlets, and books, to maintain constitutional government. It is a nonprofit, educational organization.

Mr. Rumely was recently convicted of contempt of Congress because he refused to give a House committee the names of individuals who contirbuted to his activities. In my humble judgment, as long as the publications sent out by an individual or organization are informative, educational, truthful, and tend in no way to encourage subversive activities, their publication and circulation is no concern of the Congress. Efforts which tend to prevent their publication or circulation tend to a denial of a free press, of free speech.

To state the proposition in a different way—as long as no fault can be found with the contents of the publications sent out by the Committee for Constitutional Government, what right has the Congress to insist that it be told who pays for the publication or circulation of these books or documents?

The House Committee on Lobbying, before which Mr. Rumely appeared, apparently confined its inquiries as to lobbying to organizations which advocate constitutional government, or government under the Constitution. It apparently made little, if any, attempt to inquire ir to the actiivties of so-called subversive organizations, who financed those organizations, or who was back of them or their purpose.

To state the situation in other language—apparently, the committee was on a "witch hunt" for three organizations which had effectively taught Americanism, was not interested in unpatriotic groups. In my humble judgment it is a sad, sad day when a committee of Congress follows a course which tends to discourage the teaching of Americanism; which by its inaction, encourages those who apparently do not believe in the Constitution, who do not like government under the Constitution as strictly construed. The activities of those who guided the House Committee on Lobbying seem to be a sort of hang-over from the outfits which, not so many years ago, resented any criticism of Communists or of communistic doctrine.

I recently received a letter from the Committee for Constitutional Government which reads as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR
CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
New York, N. Y., April, 1951.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Several Members of Congress inquired some time ago whether Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of this committee, had any comment upon charges made in the House on March 7 by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. I did write a reply but inasmuch as Dr. Rumely was to go on trial on a contempt charge, I withheld my letter on advice of his counsel.

I now find that all jurors connected with Dr. Rumely's trial have received a pamphlet, containing charges by Mr. PATMAN similar to those he made March 7.

In my letter, I raised the question whether those charges were made to influence a Washington jury. The fact that the jurors received this pamphlet strengthens that surmise. My letter, as originally written, follows:

"In response to inquiries whether Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of this committee, has any comment upon the charges made in the House on March 7 by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, Dr. Rumely says: 'I will uphold even Mr. PATMAN's right to say anything so long as it is the truth and not libelous. Beyond that, I prefer not to comment.'

"As you doubtless know, Dr. Rumely is scheduled to go on trial before a District of Columbia jury on a charge of contempt of Congress in refusing to comply with a demand by the political majority of the Buchanan lobby committee that he reveal the names of bulk purchasers of this committee's literature. This is no ordinary contempt of Congress case in which defendants have been indicted for not answering questions about Communist affiliations or for refusal to answer on self-incriminatory grounds. Dr. Rumely's forthcoming trial ranks in importance with the trial of Peter Zenger which established in America the legal principle of freedom of the press. For the issue at stake in the Rumely trial is whether a factional majority has the right to compel a publisher to name the purchasers of books, containing views opposed to those of that faction.

"The place and timing, then, of Representative PATMAN's attack upon Dr. Rumely have greater and more sinister significance than the purport of his semipsychopathic

remarks. For Mr. PATMAN spoke in the District of Columbia. Dr. Rumely will be tried by a jury composed of residents in the District of Columbia. What other purpose had Mr. PATMAN than the possibility of prejudicing those who might be called as jurors? That he had a planned purpose is obvious, for his unfounded charges have been picked up by the more radical of the labor press with a unanimity that can scarcely be a coincidence.

"Our examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveals that during the last 7 years, Mr. PATMAN has delivered in the House of Representatives a total of 29 attacks upon Dr. Rumely. Once he worked himself up into such a state that he made three attacks the same legislative day. Should this curious persistence come under examination of a psychiatrist, an expected diagnosis might be megalomania.

"In his 29 diatribes, Mr. PATMAN has termed Dr. Rumely a Fascist, a German spy, a superinternational lobbyist, a traitor to the Nation, a diabolical operator, a despicable character, and an American Judas Iscariot. Although such invective and grave accusation pepper his remarks with what appears to be reckless abandon, Mr. PATMAN has exercised extraordinary caution: not once, so far as we of this committee have been able to discover, has he made his now familiar speech outside the comfortably safe shield of congressional immunity. We doubt that he ever will.

"One gathers from Mr. PATMAN's privileged remarks that he considers Dr. Rumely far beneath association with upright men. This is a reflection that such men as Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Ford, and William E. Borah are unable to return from the grave to refute. With these men and many more of similar uprightness Dr. Rumely has worked in closest association and confidence.

"Mr. PATMAN describes Dr. Rumely as a German spy trying to direct thought control in the United States. Time was when he pronounced Dr. Rumely's work a great service. Before the Committee for Constitutional Government was organized, Dr. Rumely was the organizer and executive secretary of the Committee for the Nation, an organization of businessmen, farm leaders, and economists which was in high favor at the White House before the New Deal went chasing butterflies and socialism. And some of the most appreciative letters written from Congress to the Committee for the Nation came from Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. 'I am reading all the information you send me,' Mr. PATMAN wrote Dr. Rumely's organization. 'You are rendering the Members of Congress and the country a great service.'

"Dr. Rumely and other members of the Committee for the Nation held frequent meetings in Mr. PATMAN's office. Then that committee was fighting for a stable dollar and the principles of the Goldsborough bill and Mr. PATMAN gave all-out support. Today the Committee for Constitutional Government is fighting for the identical dollar stability to which PATMAN at that time gave all-out endorsement, and Dr. Rumely, as executive secretary, is acting in the same capacity as he acted for the Committee for the Nation.

"The 29 diatribes of Mr. PATMAN center around the trial of Dr. Rumely and two partners of the law firm of which the well-known liberal Arthur Garfield Hays was a member on charges of concealing German Government ownership of the New York Evening Mail. The circumstances of the trial and its aftermath help to explain Dr. Rumely's dedication to the cause of upholding constitutional rights.

"Back in 1915, Dr. Rumely bought the Evening Mail and was indebted for some of the purchase money to an American citizen then living in Germany. It was then during World War I, which the United States had not yet entered, that funds from private persons were transmitted to this country through the German Government.

"After the United States became a belligerant, Dr. Rumely reported to the Alien Property Custodian indebtedness to the individual in question. The Government maintained that the money was furnished by the German Government, and Dr. Rumely and his two legal advisers were indicted for conspiracy to violate the Trading With the Enemy Act.

"The trial involved this technical charge. It was long and complex, and a jury found Dr. Rumely and his codefendants guilty. In a subsequent statement, a majority of the jurors declared that 'it was our disposition to give the Government the benefit of whatever doubt existed' and that had they known of evidence that was suppressed at the trial, 'this new evidence would have altered our verdict.'

"The jurors also petitioned to have their verdict set aside. Both the trial judge and the chief prosecutor recommended a pardon. The facts of the case were studied by Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone, later Chief Justice of the United States. Mr. Stone wrote President Coolidge to the effect that in his opinion there was absence of adequate evidence of criminal intent in the case, that the defendants had been gravely prejudiced in their trial and that they were in fact innocent, notwithstanding the judgment of conviction and its affirmance. The President issued unconditional pardons to all three defendants.

"All Dr. Rumely's civil rights were restored, but the two lawyers were still disbarred. Leaders of the Bar Association pressed their case, and the lawyers were reinstated by Chief Justice Cardozo of the New York Court of Appeals, who sensed 'an abiding and reasoned distrust of the verdict.'

" 'A pardon may in some conditions be a warning,' said Judge Cardozo, 'as significant as a judgment of reversal that the looms of the law have woven a fabric of injustice. The very case at hand is indeed an apposite illustration. The record makes it plain that the pardon was granted because the President of the United States was advised by his Attorney General that the petitioners were innocent.'

" 'But you do not say a person is not guilty because he was pardoned,' Mr. PATMAN insisted in the House, March 7. 'There is no reason to pardon unless guilt is involved.'

"Such reasoning in the face of the Cardozo opinion that the defendants were wrongly convicted belongs with the wonderful nonsense of Alice in Wonderland and Alice Through the Looking Glass. It reflects the logic of the Mad Hatter, the jurisprudence of the Red Queen. 'When I use a word,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.'

"If Mr. PATMAN is right about Dr. Rumely, then the trial judge, the chief prosecutor, the jurors, Chief Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Cardozo of the Supreme Court of the United States were wrong."

Very truly yours,

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
SUMNER GERARD, *Trustee.*

P. S.—I attach hereto an office memorandum that contains the quotation from the court record for April 25, while tampering with the jury—by distributing the WRIGHT PATMAN statement—was under investigation.

Mr. Speaker, that memorandum reads as follows:

MEMORANDUM

APRIL 27, 1951.

The proceedings to investigate the mailing of the WRIGHT PATMAN smear material to all jurors brought out some interesting facts.

On April 25 the judge called the jurors together, found that all had received a copy of the Patman smear booklet. The court clerk had identified a man who attended all the sessions of the Rumely trial as the one who asked how he might get a copy of the names and addresses of all the jurors. Said clerk directed the inquirer to the proper source and later saw the man with a young woman copying the names.

The clerk also identified the man as one with whom he had seen Mr. Hitz, the Government prosecutor, in conversation.

"Mr. HITZ. I remember that and I would like to describe him; maybe you would recognize him from the description. He was short, about 5 feet 6—I don't remember that he was stocky; I would say just small; and he had medium-colored brown hair; he had eyeglasses and he had quite a Jewish cast to his face, and that individual is named Goodman or Goldman, but in any event he is the local lobbyist for Walter Reuther.

"I remember a conversation of that sort or in that place, so that this also might mean something to Mr. Fitzgerald. The conversation concerned the desire of Walter Reuther, in the event the Government should convict in this case, to be allowed to file a brief amicus curiae in the court of appeals in support of the conviction, and in that conversation I said that if they made any effort to do it, I would oppose it. There is a possible party who was there throughout the trial and who I do remember talking to; that might be of some help.

"Mr. BURKINSHAW. May I express an opinion on the record? The girl involved is the reporter for the CIO newspaper."

It seems very likely that this Mr. Goodman is none other than the Leo Goodman, director of the CIO National Housing Committee, who testified before the Buchanan committee and attacked the CCG and its activities, including our sending out franked material.

Louis Little, the first counsel to the Buchanan committee, on his first visit to our offices said, "If you're going to publish a book, Why the Taft-Hartley Law? and if the labor leaders do not like that, why shouldn't they know if their bosses, in a city like Milwaukee, buy that book in quantities and distribute it?"

During the whole proceedings the labor press, directly informed by Buchanan, had carried on, week by week, a bitter campaign, featuring attacks upon us. Frank Edwards, A. F. of L. radio commentator, gave up part of his radio time for Frank Buchanan's libelous attacks upon us, charging that our book sales were a phony sales dodge the night before Dr. Rumely's first appearance before the Buchanan committee. This showed a carefully planned campaign, worked out in advance, centering upon book sales because of the mass distribution of The Road Ahead.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday and Tuesday next, after the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes on each occasion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus,

boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 4 hours, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and half by the majority on this side.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3880, with Mr. CHELF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for 2 hours.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me discuss the high points in the bill for just a few minutes. I respectfully ask the membership to turn to the report of the committee. Our clerks, Mr. Duvall and Mr. Skarin, have worked hard upon this report. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], myself, and other members of the committee have changed and revised, changed again and revised further, and we commend it to you; we think it is complete and that it will give you a lot of meat, particularly the facts and figures in most, if not all, of the big items.

If you will turn to the tabulation in the back of the report you will find two plus items over the 1952 budget estimates. But that is misleading as to the item for the National Capital Housing Authority. The budget left that item out. As well as I remember it was only $32,000 for operating expenses, and the way the budget had set it up was that it would bypass the Congress and use its own funds. Therefore when the committee got a look at its operating expense it changed the budget language and put it back in the hands of the House, as formerly, where the Congress could appropriate the Housing people's own money, so technically it is carried as a plus over the budget when in truth and in fact it is not. In effect, you do not appropriate additional money; you merely give them authority under direction of the Congress to use funds deposited by the Authority into the Treasury.

There is another item in the tabulation which has a plus sign, and the remainder of the 40 or 50 items have minus signs under the budget estimates. The committee after much friendly argument, and I might say that there is not any partisanship on this committee because it deals with independent agencies purely—90 percent of them—boards and commissions on which both parties are represented; therefore we do take a nonpartisan attitude. But as I say we compromised our differences and we went above the budget in allowing $65 a month to about 800 cadet midshipmen in the Merchant Marine School at Kings Point, N. Y. Outside of those items there were no increases.

We think the language in the bill saves many millions of dollars. This bill, of course, is made up of a great many items, some 35 agencies, and some of the agencies consist of two or three parts. Take, for instance, the Housing and Home Finance Agency which is made up of the Office of the Administrator, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Home Loan Bank Board. And while I am mentioning HOLC, let me give you this news, if I may. In 1934, if my memory serves me correctly, the Congress created the old Home Owners Loan Corporation. Mr. Chairman, you are through with it now. We wound it up this year and you will not have to look at it any more I hope. What a grand job they have done. When it is all wound up you will find it has not cost the taxpayers of this country one red cent. On the contrary, it has turned back into the Treasury, after doing this magnificent job, a profit of $15,000,000.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition to that, it saved thousands and thousands of homes.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Which is not only valuable from the material angle but also from the spiritual and the governmental angle because family life is the basis of society.

Mr. THOMAS. They did a magnificent job for thousands and thousands of home owners.

Mr. McCORMACK. All under Democratic administrations.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are three big items in the bill. One of them is for the Veterans' Administration. There has been a big reduction from last year amounting to about $1,832,095,000. Appropriations for 1951 amounted to nearly $6,000,000,000 and next year they will be about $4,000,000,000. That comes about in spite of the fact that we are going to put in operation in 1952 10,250 new hospital beds and, incidentally, we grant them 10,895 new employees, more than one new employee to every bed. So we are taking care of our sick veterans. The reduction comes about by virtue of the fact that the training programs are gradually getting lower and lower. We still have a remnant of the 52–20 group, but that will be wound up, too, very soon.

Another big item is the Atomic Energy Commission. They requested about $1,200,000,000. We have required a reduction of nearly $70,000,000 and I think they could stand a little further reduction, but it is a very vital agency and we hope they will economize. The Atomic Energy Commission is made up of grand, patriotic men. They have a difficult job. I do not want to minimize their effort. They are surrounded with secrecy and it may be sometimes that the secrecy detracts from their efficiency rather than adding to it, but, still, they must obey the secrecy rules written into the act. I think they do, by and large, a good job but we do hope they will watch their construction costs. They are spending more money than anybody in the Government for construction outside of the armed services.

The other big item is the Civil Service Commission. Of course, the lion's share of that is for an item, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] well knows, we cannot do very much about. That is the retirement fund for civil-service employees. However, we did reduce that $20,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee brings this bill to the floor with considerable pride in its accomplishments, in which pride the minority concurs, at least in the attempted accomplishment of keeping down the expenses of Government from year to year. As you follow the suggestions of the gentleman from Texas and look at the requests and the cuts which appear in the back of the report you will find we have done what I think should be considered a credible job. I think also I should say that we take considerable pride in our chairman. We have a chairman who has the ability to grasp and to retain in very great detail the figures which are brought before us in the justifications. I doubt if many of you know that this particular subcommittee has the budget requests of 35 agencies of Government, each having a separate objective and, therefore, a separate type of work, and that, in addition to all the material presented to us in the original bound document, we have a supplementary pile of justifications in mimeographed or typed form which would extend that high from the table. It is a very arduous job, it is a job which takes practically all of the time of the Members from the middle of January until we come to the floor of the House with the bill.

It has been a pleasure for me to work on the subcommittee in the 5 years that I have been there; first under the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and now under the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and with the other Members on both sides, minority and majority, and with two very cooperative and able members of the staff, William Duvall and Homer Skarin. I think you should share our entitlement to a certain amount of pride in the results when you compare the figures which we set up for this year in the bill with the requests made by the Bureau of the Budget.

I am, however, more and more firmly convinced as the days go by that this is not the entire comparison we should make, and if we are to do anything about the rising costs of Government and the rising centralization of power, we have to make other comparisons of figures. Therefore, if you were to take the expenditures of the departments and agencies, the costs to the taxpayers for the year 1939, and then take them for the year 1947, if you wish, as I have them on this sheet, and then the requests which those agencies made for fiscal year 1952, and then, of course, the fourth column would be the amount that we have allowed them out of those requests, you would be somewhat concerned as I am somewhat concerned. The Civil Service Commission, of which the gentleman from Texas just spoke and with which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is personally familiar, had an appropriation of $78,000,000 in 1939. In 1947 that had jumped to $236,500,000, and for the current year the Commission asked for $343,000,000, and we allowed them $321,000,000. That is an increase of 339 percent in the 12-year period and an increase in the 5-year period of 45 percent. The Federal Power Commission jumped from $1,900,000 to $3,735,000 and in 5 years to $4,338,600. The recent 5 years is the comparison we should make, because that is the postwar comparison. That is the period in which the present occupant of the White House has been the President of the United States, and he was the postwar President. I have not included in these figures the figures for the war periods except as they might have jumped from prewar to the immediate postwar period.

Next is the Federal Trade Commission which jumped from 2.1 millions to 2.8 between 1937 and 1947 and then jumped a cool million in the last 5 years.

General Services Administration is difficult to figure, because it is a combination of other agencies. I have attempted in this analysis to take those agencies which are now in the General Services Administration and show that those same agencies in 1939 received $480,000,000; in 1947 they had jumped only to $578,000,000, but in the intervening 5 years they have jumped to $1,650,000,000, which is an increase in 5 years of 244 percent. So, you go on down, and if any of you have any special interests I will be very glad to tell you the figures. These are only in our subcommittee bill, and outside of that you have the same thing. Federal Security jumped from $758 million to $928 million and then in 5 years made an enormous jump to $2,154,483,011. Commerce jumped from $239,000,000 in 8 years to $368,000,000, and then doubled to $761,000,000, a 218 percent jump. This does not include the Atomic Energy Commission, and I have not included the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, both of which are defense items.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to explain the item on page 37 regarding strategic and critical materials. Have they been eliminated?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, they were not eliminated. They came up and got the money in advance of this bill. They received from us last year $3,038,548,370. Presently they have on hand $1,623,543,734. We are very sensitive on the subject of strategic material and have never denied them any money.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is a very able member of that subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON. I did not think that they had abandoned the efforts that they are making.

Mr. PHILLIPS. They are not abandoning them. The gentleman need have no concern. We are glad to follow the advice of his subcommittee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I call the gentleman's attention to a proviso that has already been referred to, on page 45 of the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman permit me to finish the thought I was just concluding and then come back to that and answer the question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will be very glad to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Before I am questioned on other matters, my thought is that we have come to a place in the history of the Congress when we must recognize that something more must be done to save the integrity of the dollar, to save the economy of the United States, than just a nominal cut in the requests which come to us from the President through the Bureau of the Budget. As I see it, that can be done only in some three or four ways, other than we are doing now.

The first of those ways obviously is to improve the procedures of government. There is no excuse in the world for asking for 450,000 additional employees, as I read in the paper the other day, until we have exhausted every possibility of improving the procedures of domestic government so the same number of people can do a greater amount of work.

As I remarked, to the surprise of some of my colleagues in the full committee when this was brought up, it so happens that this is a very personal matter with me. For a year and a half in World War I, I was on duty in the Ordnance Department, attempting to change the procedures of that department in such a way that the same number of people could do an increasing amount of work. You see how old-fashioned we were. This year we would have rushed up to the Appropriations Committee and asked for 10,000 additional employees. But we did not know that was the thing to do. We thought then it was the desirable and economic thing to use the same number of people to a greater possible usefulness.

The second thing we can do is being partly done, but it can be carried out more broadly; that is, if this is a war emergency, we should not confine ourselves still to the 40-hour week. Just a 44-hour week would make unnecessary about 5 percent of the people who are currently being asked for.

There is a third thing we can do. I shall offer one amendment, when the bill is read for amendment tomorrow, which will test the desire of the House for economy by lifting out from the Federal Government a complete function, a very minor function, a very simple little function which involves only $150,000, but a function which is a recognized duplication of work presently being done better and more economically in every State of the United States.

Finally, we should say, I think, to all the States of the United States, "We are $257,000,000,000 in the red. Every one of you is boasting that you have money in your treasury." My State has announced to the world that it will finish this fiscal year with $51,000,000 surplus. So there is absolutely no excuse for the States' coming to us, even under normal circumstances, and asking us to pay for things which from time immemorial have been done by the States or have been done by business or have been done by individuals. This is not a normal time. This is an emergency, when the children in the family must assume some of the obligations and the debts and the expenses of the parents, who are so deeply in debt. That, I think, we must put across to our own States first, and we may as well begin now.

Those are things that I do want the House to think about.

Now, may I come back to the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I call the gentleman's attention to the proviso on page 45 of the bill, which limits the payment of operating subsidies to not exceeding 1,450 voyages, including the number of voyages under contracts hereafter awarded.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There has been a great deal of discussion about that. I think there is argument on both sides. The committee feels that that number should not be in excess of the actual number of voyages which will be undertaken, and therefore for which an operating subsidy will be required.

The gentleman will remember that I, myself, was on the floor a year ago in behalf of the inclusion of vessels which had filed applications for voyages, but those applications had not yet been acted upon. I still feel the same way. I am hopeful that before we come to this in the bill an exact figure may be obtainable which will tell us whether or not 1,450 is correct.

That was the figure this committee had to work. The figure of 1,434 voyages were given us as the voyages contemplated during the current fiscal year. The committee raised that to 1,450. If there is a technical point involved that that money may not be used for these not-yet-contracted voyages, then I think we should learn that and make some correction of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I notice on page 1464 of the hearings, pursuant to the request made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] of Admiral Cochran, a table indicating that there

is contemplated an average number of voyages to the number of 1,523 in the fiscal year 1952; and that if applications pending but not included in the fiscal 1952 budget be considered, there would appear to be another 300 voyages in the picture. Does not the gentleman think that the number of voyages provided for in the bill should be increased?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that is a possibility and I think the gentleman's point is worth exploring. All I can say at the moment is that some very distinguished members of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce are presently being quoted with differing figures and we should determine that before tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was interested in the gentleman's statement that there was a situation there to correct and on which he proposed to offer an amendment, but I do not think he specified just what portion of the bill was involved.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was going to indicate that when I offered the amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. At the bottom of page 37 of the report appear two items with a minus sign before them. One is for the Federal court building in the District of Columbia, and the other for the General Accounting Office building. Do I understand from reading those figures that both of those buildings have now been completed and that no further money is needed?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is "Yes." The distinguished gentleman from Michigan has a natural interest in these outstanding public buildings. The authorizations came from the Committee on Public Works, in the session when he served as its chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to join with my colleague on the subcommittee, the ranking member, Mr. PHILLIPS, in paying a well-deserved tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas.

This was the first chance I had to observe the chairman of our subcommittee in action. I was constantly amazed by the experience, the perspicacity, and the complete knowledge and thorough understanding with which the gentleman from Texas attacked the problem before us of obtaining the facts with reference to the justification for appropriations of the 35 agencies appearing before our subcommittee. As the gentleman from California pointed out, the justifications presented to our subcommittee, if laid end to end, would stack up about 5 feet from the floor, and the gentleman from Texas painstakingly and diligently analyzed each of those appropriations so that when testimony was taken, he was thoroughly conversant with the material and able to direct the examination in order that maximum benefit could be derived.

I want also to thank very much the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and Mr. PHILLIPS for their cooperation and friendship in making the difficult job of understanding the appropriations not as difficult and not as complex as it would otherwise have been, and I know that Mr. COUDERT, of New York, and Mr. COTTON, of New Hampshire, who like myself were newcomers to the committee, share my viewpoint on this.

On the whole, there was basic agreement between the members of our subcommittee on the appropriations. There were some differences, and rather sharp differences. I personally disagreed with the other members of the subcommittee on the appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I disagreed with the members of the subcommittee with respect to the appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission for another, and there were other differences, as there are bound to be in an appropriation bill of this size.

For the first time, our subcommittee went into a new question, the question as to whether or not there should be charges and fees made by regulatory agencies of the Government for many of the services which they render to those who come within their jurisdiction. One of the great problems that faces our country is the difficulty of the regulatory commissions to cope with the complexities of our growing industrialized society, to deal with the regulatory problems for which they were created and with which they are confronted. A realistic appraisal of their function requires increased appropriations, because their problems and difficulties grow as our economy grows. As an example I cite the Federal Communications Commission. The Federal Communications Commission grants franchises, licenses, certificates of convenience and necessity, if you will, to all broadcasting stations upon application for such licenses, franchises, and certificates. The Commission undertakes extensive hearings first in connection with a construction permit; secondly on the question as to the allocation of the position of a particular broadcaster in the spectrum of megocycles over which the Federal Communications Commission has control. That is a pretty difficult job and a complicated job, and entails extensive hearings by the Federal Communications Commission. The taxpayers pay every dollar of the charges and of the costs that go into that hearing. The companies pay nothing, other than taxes, and I think it is only fair that in exchange for the franchise that the Government gives the broadcasting company and the protection which the Government affords to such broadcasting company to assure its freedom from interference in the operation of its broadcasting facilities in the particular point of the spectrum which it occupies, that it should pay some of the costs of the hearings. It is perfectly proper that the franchised company make a profit, and there has been much profit making. Such companies should assume a greater share of the costs, because regulation is necessary. I think also that the Government should be able to recapture some of the costs that go into the hearings of the other regulatory agencies. Such fees are appropriate for many of the hearings which take place before the Interstate Commerce Commission. I know that in my home city of Chicago the city requires the owner of every building which operates a passenger elevator to obtain a license for that elevator, and in order to recoup the costs for inspection in such licensing it requires a rather nominal license fee.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is required to inspect locomotives of railroads, safety appliances, signaling systems, various facilities of that type. The Government pays every cent for this operation. In addition to that, much of the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission is involved with hearings on applications for certificates of convenience and necessity for bus lines and other common carriers. The Government assumes the complete cost of such hearings in spite of the fact that here again it grants a franchise which is very valuable to the company making the application, and in the operation of which franchise it is protected from competition.

Each of the Commissioners who appeared before us was asked his opinion as to whether or not it was feasible to charge for a portion of the operations of the agency, and in each event the Commissioner thought that it would be practicable. Not only that, one Commissioner expressed the viewpoint that such a practice would not only be feasible, but would deter and do away with many superfluous applications. Therefore, the subcommittee in its deliberations decided to put a new legislative section into the bill which would permit each of the agencies to appraise its own operations to see whether or not it would be possible to recapture for the Government some of the costs that the Government incurs in connection with this regulation through the establishment of a schedule of fees.

The second point that I would like to discuss is the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission. I have no quarrel with the appropriation as such, but my disagreement with the others on the subcommittee relates to the portion of the report which states that the item of $25,000 for an index of the concentration of wealth has been stricken from the bill. I do not know what effect that statement in the report has. I do not believe it is legally controlling upon the Commission, but I believe that if the Commission disregarded it, it would be criticized, to say the least. I believe it is extremely important, particularly at this time when we are moving into a period of rearmament that we know the direction in which industry is moving in this country. Is there increasing monopoly growth? How much? We know that in the last war, in World War II, the Government concentrated the awarding of the major portion of its

prime contracts in the hands of relatively few big businesses, and I think that the work of the Federal Trade Commission at that time in bringing forward the facts showing the number of contracts that went to big business, the number of contracts that went to small business, the direction in which industry in this country was moving, was a very valuable survey. I think that now as we move into this period of rearmament, as we appropriate billions and billions of dollars which will go into the industrial output, into the industrial building up of this Nation, it is necessary for us to know where that money is going. We must have facts in this Congress if we are to legislate intelligently. The Federal Trade Commission is responsible for presenting us with facts on monopoly growth, and if we refuse to give them funds with which to do our work, we are not only being recreant, but foolhardy. It is necessary for us to be able to determine whether big business is snuffing out competition, to determine whether small business is destined to be excluded entirely from the economy of our country.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, all of us agree that the greatest weapon we have in our fight against an enemy and against communism is the industrial potential of this country. To my mind one of the most vital parts of that industrial potential is the tremendous number of small businesses that are scattered throughout the length and breadth of this Nation. If we find that more and more Government business is being channelled into big business, and that just cannot be avoided, small business will fall by the wayside and, to use a phrase of the Senate Small Business Committee, our pathway will be strewn with their corporate corpses.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I came in touch with this problem that the gentleman is talking about when we drafted the termination of war contracts bill. In the last war out in my area we had the small businesses out there form pools in the city of Stockton and in the city of Sacramento and they would handle the business for 8, 10, or 15 companies. We must take the latent ability, experience, and ingenuity of these small businesses and use it. Some of the small-business men are the smartest businessmen in the country although they do not make the most money.

I want to mention one instance. I was out in Chicago looking into the termination of war contracts in connection with the Ordnance Division out there and I found a little man from St. Paul who started with 40 employees. At the end of the war when we talked to him he was trying to terminate contracts and paying a $12,000,000 income-tax return. So it shows what can be done by small business if it is properly organized and given the right kind of work to do.

Mr. YATES. I agree with what the gentleman has said and I thank him for the statement.

The point I am making, and I plead it with utmost earnestness, is that it is vitally important that we know what the condition of big business and small business is in this country. We must have facts. It is necessary that we be able to trace any concentration of wealth toward monopoly because unless we do that we have no basis upon which to draft legislation in this Congress and we have no basis upon which to protect the small business of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON. I concur heartily in what the gentleman has said. We want to find out if there is a concentration of wealth and we ought to know the tendency and the direction it is going.

Mr. YATES. Of course, we have to have those facts. Here we are appropriating in excess of $6,000,000,000 in the pending bill. Twenty-five thousand dollars is all that will be required to permit the Federal Trade Commission to continue with its study of the concentration of wealth in this country. In my opinion, it would be foolhardy, it would be false economy, if we did not permit that agency to continue that study at this particular time.

Let me cite in support of my point what the Hoover Commission has said on what should be the proper function of the Federal Trade Commission. It is directed right to this particular point:

> In addition, the Federal Trade Commission can and should constitute a reservoir of information on the structure of the economy and of specific industries. This information should be available to the antitrust agencies and to other Government agencies, such as those concerned with defense. By its reports to Congress and the public, the Commission should keep them abreast of changes in the structure of the economy and aware of needed legislative action.

Mr. Chairman, that is an eminently correct statement. Only the Federal Trade Commission can make a survey of this type; there is no other agency in the Government that can undertake it. Every agency in the Government is required to file an annual report, but there is no central agency that I know of, with the exception of the Federal Trade Commission, that can collate this material, that can join it together, so that we in the Congress may be made aware of the direction of business growth in this country.

My other major point of disagreement with the other members of the subcommittee is in connection with the provisions relating to the Public Housing Administration.

Under the terms of the Housing Act of 1949 the Public Housing Administration was given the responsibility of constructing 135,000 units per year. In view of restrictions on building materials, in view of the demands for the use of building materials for defense purposes, the Bureau of the Budget cut that number to 75,000 units. I insist there is no justification in the hearings which warrant a further cut; however, this subcommittee arbitrarily and without reason cut the number of these units to 50,000. What this does, in my opinion, is to upset the schedule for public housing in all cities throughout the country, and every metropolitan community desperately needs housing.

The chairman stated, and I think his statement was accurate as far as it went, that under the Public Housing Act of 1949, in the event that all of the 810,000 are constructed, there might be a maximum contribution demanded of the Federal Government of $320,000,000 per year. That would assume, however, that all of the units provided for under the Housing Act of 1949 were constructed before that maximum guaranty went into effect. That is the maximum amount which the Federal Government would be required to pay under any consideration. But let us look at the facts. The Chairman's statement should be compared with actual facts relating to the Housing Act of 1937 under which the Federal Government also was required to make a similar contribution. Under previous Federal housing acts the actual contributions of the Federal Government were as follows:

Relationship of actual contributions to contract contributions, United States Housing Act program

Fiscal year—	Public Law 412			Public Law 671			Total		
	A/C paid	Contract A/C	Percent	A/C paid	Contract A/C	Percent	A/C paid	Contract A/C	Percent
1940									
1941	$4,747,176	$4,747,176	100.0				$4,747,176	$4,747,176	100.0
1942	9,925,891	11,258,951	88.2				9,925,891	11,258,951	88.2
1943	9,882,882	13,049,252	75.7				9,882,882	13,049,252	75.7
1944	10,129,997	14,436,885	70.2				10,129,997	14,436,885	70.2
1945	8,681,923	14,477,969	60.0	$40,377	$6,615,569	0.6	8,722,300	21,093,538	41.4
1946	7,091,344	14,501,979	48.9	45,391	6,615,569	.7	7,136,735	21,117,548	33.8
1947	5,612,387	14,509,187	38.7	54,243	6,615,569	.8	5,666,630	21,124,756	26.8
1948	3,810,872	14,519,550	26.2	129,533	6,615,569	2.0	[1] 3,940,405	21,135,119	18.6
1949	3,842,417	14,770,515	26.0	452,663	6,615,569	6.8	[1] 4,295,080	21,386,084	20.1
1950	5,839,040	14,855,753	39.3	679,692	6,615,569	10.3	[1] 6,518,732	21,471,322	30.4
1951 (estimate)	6,348,921	14,855,753	42.7	1,151,079	6,615,569	17.4	7,500,000	21,471,322	34.9
Total	75,912,850	145,982,970	52.0	2,552,978	46,308,983	5.5	78,465,828	192,291,953	40.8

[1] Includes retroactive pilot as provided by Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171).

This shows no payment of the maximum contributions, and I hold that these figures are indicative as to what the contributions would be under the Housing Act of 1949. The Bureau of the Budget cut the number of units to 75,000 rather

than 135,000. That in itself cut the amount of contributions from the maximum amount, so that we know that under no possible interpretation would the Federal Government ever be compelled to pay the maximum amount to which the chairman referred in his principal address.

Leaving that point, I would like to ask for clarification of page 58 of the bill, and I should like to have the viewpoint of the chairman on this. Line 16 refers to an amount of $33,000,000 and is a part of a proviso which says:

That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed $33,000,000.

What does that item refer to? Does it refer to the actual operating expenses of the Public Housing Administration?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from Illinois that this expense is broken down into two parts: administrative and nonadministrative. The administrative expense is that expense that is incurred primarily for salaries and expenses in the District of Columbia. The items that are pointed out on line 16 amounting to $33,000,000 is what we call the nonadministrative expenses. That is all of those operating costs that are incurred in the field, plus interest, and so forth, and so on. We were advised this morning that the figure of $33,000,000, nonadministrative expense, is an error; that it is about $15,000,000 more, making a total of approximately $49,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses. But those are the items covered in that figure.

Mr. YATES. In other words, the items included within this appropriation are the items for direct operations, site inspections, and direct disposition expenses. Certainly it is not intended to include, for instance, amounts necessary for funded expenses.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. What we have done, as the gentleman well knows, since they are spending in 1952 not $33,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses but possibly $49,000,000, the committee has requested them in the future to break that expense down and submit it to the committee so that we can pass judgment on it and in turn submit it to the House for its judgment and consideration. That has not been done in the past.

Mr. YATES. I thank the chairman. I certainly hope that the 25,000 units that were cut from the act by the action of the subcommittee will be restored. I know that as we move into this war period, housing in my own city of Chicago is becoming critically more and more in short supply. The buildings that have been built under section 608 of the housing law have not provided the type of dwellings necessary for the war workers, for those who are employees and laborers in the defense plants. I think it is vitally essential; I think it is fundamental that the housing program should be permitted to continue so that as workers move into defense areas like Chicago there will be some provision made for housing them. Already overcrowded, teeming cities cannot absorb additional workers without more housing accommodations.

I should like to refer the attention of the House to the committee hearings. Look at pages 1769 and the following and read what Rev. Thomas B. Keehn of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, and Rt. Rev. John A. O'Grady of the National Conference of Catholic Charities had to say when they appeared before the subcommittee. They pointed out the dire necessity for continuing the housing program at this critical time. Buildings are getting more and more crowded. They need rehabilitation. Slums are growing. The only thing we can do is keep up with the evergrowing problem. I hope that when we come to a consideration of this point the House will see fit to restore the additional units that are needed.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], a member of the committee.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any group of men in whom I have greater confidence than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and his subcommittee, who have brought this bill before us. I am confident that feeling is generally shared here.

I have just listened, as you have, to an able statement by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I was particularly impressed with him as a new member of this great committee. He talked with wisdom, he showed a soundness and thoroughness and a conscientious approach that anyone could be proud to show. It does not follow that I necessarily agree with all the points that he raised, but I am profoundly impressed with him as one of my colleagues in this House.

I rise to discuss with complete frankness the increase in the amount of money proposed for allocation to the White House offices. I am not going to offer an amendment on this subject, but I do want to focus attention on it. In fiscal 1951 the White House offices received an appropriation of $1,585,000, whereas in fiscal 1952 it is proposed that they receive $1,883,000, an increase of $300,000.

Three hundred thousand dollars is not a lot of money as we think of money and as we appropriate it nowadays, but a $300,000 increase in this item is 20 percent more than was appropriated last year for the same purpose. It provides for 35 additional employees in fiscal 1952, more travel money, and more odds and ends of expenses, where we had hoped to see savings. If you break it down to a per capita basis, it means that this is going to take the tax payments of many persons each year for this one item of increased cost of Government.

The record shows it was passed over by the committee without a great deal of discussion or comment, I presume largely out of respect for the office of President of the United States. I do not quarrel with that. I think it is understandable. But I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the President himself stated in his budget message to Congress:

In order that our resources can be diverted to meet the demands of national security, strict economy in nondefense spending is required.

I have seen nothing in the justifications to indicate that the increase proposed in this item is dictated by considerations of national security or defense, or that it would even operate to relieve the President of any of the tremendous burden which we know he must personally carry.

In the great effort to achieve economy which the Committee on Appropriations and the House as a whole is making this year, we should not consider the White House staff or the Congress or any other agency of Government as exempt from efforts to economize. Instead, the head of the Government should lead and should set a pattern to hold down costs in every possible way.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GORE. There is much merit to the suggestion of the gentleman from Florida in the opinion of the gentleman from Tennessee, but does not the gentleman realize with what reluctance a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations would recommend cuts in the staff of the office of the President? Is it not on all fours with the institution of cuts in the expenses of the other body by a House committee?

Mr. SIKES. I think I pointed out, as I went along, that I recognize it is difficult for one of us in the House of Representatives to overcome our reluctance to point a finger at an office that we respect as greatly as we respect the office of the President and it is with reluctance that we point a finger at the Senate and say "We find it necessary that we tell you how much money you can use or should use to run your own personal business." While it is difficult for us to do that, we at the same time are not prevented from saying, "We urge in greatest sincerity that you, Mr. President, and you, the Senate, as well as we, the House of Representatives, make every effort that can properly be made to hold down expenses."

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman very highly on the observations that he has made. I hope he offers an amendment to trim those added expenses from the President's budget. Certainly he ought to be held to what he had last year and perhaps cut some from that. He has been doing a lot of talking about belt tightening and sacrifices. He should share in it, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if it is agreeable now to the gentleman from Alabama, I will yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG]. I believe the gentleman has consented also to yield 10 minutes to him. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman,

that the gentleman may proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the kindness of the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Alabama in yielding this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have been attempting to make this brief report on my trip to the Far East since my return some 2 weeks ago, when the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, and I returned after visiting Japan, Korea, Formosa, and other points in what I might term a "spirit of bipartisan cooperation." The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I made the trip as individual Congressmen and American citizens. We were privileged to inspect most of our military installations in Japan and to visit the bases, camps, and the fighting front of the Korean war. We made an intense and earnest study of the conditions and problems confronting our commanders, our troops, our sources of supply, and civilian activities in that troubled area of the world.

My distinguished colleague from South Carolina is a veteran of World War II, while I am a veteran of World War I. We hoped that we might find and bring back to our colleagues in the House of Representatives such information and reports as would be helpful to all of us, whether in the majority or in the minority. We hoped to help shape the course of legislation for the defense of the free world. I am happy here to say that no one could have devoted himself more wholeheartedly to this task than the honorable young Member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. I hope that he, too, may soon have time to make a report on his observations.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are agreed on the danger that we face, and with the realization of what is before us there can be no partisanship. I am concerned that in the discussion of foreign affairs there shall be no partisan words. My party has a duty to perform in offering constructive criticism and the majority party has a duty to perform in offering leadership and in accepting constructive criticism when it is due. But we are certainly united in our desire to win this war in Korea as quickly as possible with the loss of as few lives as possible. On that score there can be no debate. There can be differences of opinion in regard to the proper method of winning the war as quickly as possible. We have been hearing some of those differences of opinion. But we are united, whether of the majority or minority, in the spirit of helpfulness to all of the people of our country. I emphasize that because I have been asked why this member of the majority party and I made a trip as individual Congressmen and American citizens without committee authorization and paying our own way. I say to you that we did it for the same reason that any of you would, in order to try to find the answer to some of these grave problems confronting us in the Far East.

I believe my distinguished colleague will back me up in reporting that the Korean engagement has demonstrated the success of the unification of our armed services. There are still many problems to be worked out, of course; but we contacted many of the commanders of our land troops, of the Marines, of our naval forces, and most frequently those commanders who were our hosts on this trip, the Air Force. Everywhere we asked the question in regard to how unification was working. Everywhere we received the same answer, that our armed services are now working as an efficient team. That team is well coordinated in combat as well as in the supplying of ammunition and other materials of war, and in all operations necessary to such an engagement as that in Korea.

There is an unfavorable note, however, and I report it to you frankly. As we talked to the commanders in Japan and then in Korea, we sensed a very grave feeling of unreality. We had the opportunity of talking to General MacArthur, then the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers. Right on the battle line we had the very unique privilege of talking to the commander in Korea, General Ridgway, General Stratemeyer of the Air Force was our host. We talked to many others, I would say 50 of the high-ranking officers of all of the armed services. Not only that, we talked also to the high-ranking commanders and officers of our brave allies, including the British, the general commanding the Turkish troops, the leaders of the French, Canadian, and Australian forces, and so on. We talked to officers and men of most of the United Nations who are fighting with us, even though some of them have only token forces in Korea. Everywhere we reecived the information that there was a feeling of unreality on the part of the troops because of the handicap under which they are fighting this war in that they have not been permitted to attack the bases of enemy supply, their communication and transportation lines. They told us that this was the first war in history where men fighting in the field were denied this primary action necessary to victory.

Let me leave that for just a moment to present this map of the Far East. First I shall mention Formosa, since this island is very much in the minds of our military leaders at the present time. I am sure its strategic importance has been discussed by the distinguished members of our Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees. Formosa lies right in what we might term our line of defense in the Far East which extends from Japan down this chain of islands to Formosa lying off the coast of China, on down through various islands to those of the South Pacific, to Australia, and New Zealand. It is obvious that if that line were broken at any point, all the other points of the line would be jeopardized. That is why General MacArthur in appearing before the Congress emphasized what he considered to be the strategic importance of Formosa. I may say that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], and I sitting before him just a few days before he was relived of his duties, heard him say what he later said to the Congress, except he expressed it to us in more emphatic terms.

General MacArthur said that some of our allies are not united with us on the importance of Formosa, referring doubtless to the fact that the British Government has proposed that it be turned over to the Red Chinese. He said, "Formosa is of such importance that we cannot lose it without jeopardizing Japan, the Philippine Islands, and even Australia." Formosa commands a strategic spot for Indochina and for all of the rest of the Far East. That certainly is true.

Let us then consider what we have on Formosa by way of potential allied strength. Bear in mind that China, meaning, of course, free China—anti-Communist China—is not only our ally, but also a member of the United Nations. Not only is free China a member of the United Nations but it is a permanent member of the Security Council entrusted with the major responsibility for the peace of the entire world. After that tragic march of the Communists down across China beginning about 18 months ago and culminating in the defeat of the troops of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the loyal troops fled to this island of Formosa. There they have been what might be called bottled up, due to policies not fully explained.

When the Korean engagement began the generalissimo and his staff offered to the United Nations a force of 30,000 men. He said, "Let us stand with your troops in the fight for freedom." That offer was refused. Every offer he has made since that time has been refused.

So I wanted to look into the matter of how much strength there might be there available to be utilized in the defense of the free world. I regarded that as important. My colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], could not go to Formosa, but I went there and spent nearly a week. I was shown every courtesy by our American civilian and military authorities, and, of course, by the Chinese Government and its military commanders. It was my happy privilege to have dinner with Generalissimo and Madam Chiang Kai-shek. For several days I rode by plane, in jeeps and trucks, to inspect with my own eyes the strength of the Nationalist Chinese forces on Formosa. I had heard speculation in regard to how much strength there might be there and as to whether or not it would be effective in warfare. I think I can report to you a fairly accurate figure because I checked not only with the staff of the Nationalist Chinese forces but also with members of our very small military mission in Taipei, the capital.

The Nationalist Chinese have 360,000 effective fighting men now on Formosa. It is true that these men would need a great deal of conditioning. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I asked General MacArthur what would be the need before the forces on

Formosa could be utilized. We asked him what would be their needs that must be made available and for which we in the Congress might be responsible. General MacArthur's answer to us was the same as the answer of retired General Chennault and many others we consulted.

First of all, the Chinese Nationalists need equipment. The planes that I inspected on their air fields were those we gave them during the recent war or not later than 1946. The equipment they have is pitifully small because so much has been denied them. For most of one day I was the guest of their naval leaders. I conferred with their admiral and his staff. I inspected nearly all of their ships in harbor. The biggest ships they have are the two destroyers we gave them. They have a lot of little ships. There in the distance was a row of Japanese ships which we captured and which we could turn over to them but which have been denied them.

The free Chinese are ready and eager to accept new equipment, new armament, new ammunition, new airplanes that they must have if they are going to help us in this fight. I was astounded to find that because of an edict—I do not know who issued it—perhaps the Armed Forces Committee would know—on many ships were vacant spaces where guns should be. The biggest naval guns they are allowed to have are 3-inch guns. I wish I knew why. Their commanders could not answer the question. They just smiled when I asked them why. Everywhere I found they were restricted.

They need equipment. Then they need supervision. We must take action pretty soon to equip these forces to fight for freedom, for us and for themselves. But we must not make the mistake that obviously was made and which some of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's military men told me in confidence, of turning the equipment over to them without proper American supervision. They will welcome that supervision. Lots of that equipment we sent them before undeniably was lost to the Communists. Perhaps some of it was even sold to them. But what the free Chinese want is a strong military mission in Formosa, not just a few hundred men, but something perhaps on the order of 1,500. Then let us equip them so that they will be ready to take their place with us.

What then should the plan be? Some would deny the use of these Nationalist troops, they fear that would involve us in a war with Red China. I respectfully call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that we are already at war with Red China. Communist China has by its aggression declared war upon us. Now if we are going to admit the help of the Nationalist Chinese, let us face the fact that we are at war and let us plan accordingly. But let us not—I emphasize not—send out our land troops into the mainland of China. These Nationlists say, "If you give us the equipment and the supervision, we will do the job ourselves without calling upon a single American soldier."

Now, the plan contemplates five things.

First, not an invasion off Formosa, but down at the little island of Hainan, which the Japanese seized early in the recent war and from which they began their excursions northward upon the south part of China. That is exactly the tactics that should now be used, say the military men, American and Chinese, because Hainan is only just a few miles away from the mainland. Furthermore, the southern part of China is filled with guerrillas ready to spring to arms if they can get arms and to help bring the downfall of the Red regime in China. We could help them seize Hainan quite easily now, despite the fact that the Russians within the last few weeks have begun the building of five different military installations on the island. They could not hold Hainan under a devastating attack.

Second, let them make their invasion from there with the help of guerrillas.

Third, and this is tremendously important, we should blockade the entire Chinese coast.

Fourth, we must bomb the enemy bases in Manchuria. Mr. DORN and I asked General Ridgway his opinion. I would not want to quote by name any other military man for obvious reasons, but out of the 50 or more high-ranking officers of all the branches of the service which we queried on the matter, everyone gave the same answer as General Ridgway: "We do not consider it possible to end the Korean war in victory under the handicap of not being able to strike the enemy where he is." One commander went so far as to say we could have prevented the building up of the forces in North Korea, which are now engaged in this offensive, simply by bombing not the Manchurian people, not the people of China, but the enemy military targets. There are five railroad lines coming into Mukden, the capital of Manchuria. There are transportation lines spanning down to the Yalu River. If we could bomb those military strategic targets and then follow up by the bombing of the supply line that comes down the Chinese coast, we would halt the march of the Red Chinese from the mainland into Manchuria and from Manchuria into Korea. What stands in the way of that, I ask you?

Here I turn to a report that was given me by the intelligence officers of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's army and I have excerpts from it. A part of this is my own opinion to go along with it. But I learned that the British Government stands in the way of putting into effect a plan that would permit us to end this Korean war in victory. The British Government has actually furnished the two items necessary either for Communist victory or at best a stalemate. First, they have given assurance that the Red bases and supply lines will not be bombed with their consent. Second, strategic materials needed for the conduct of the war have flown in a steady stream through Hong Kong and into China and Russia. From these intelligence sources, both Chinese and United States, I was informed in Taipei that the Russians are supervising the construction of an atomic bomb plant in northwestern China, and that much of the strategic material needed for this plant came into China through British hands during the last 3 years. Since the war in Korea began, imports of all sorts of implements and material of war, such as transportation equipment, rubber, steel, and other metals, airplane engines and parts and machine tools have poured in a steady stream through British Hong Kong for use by the Chinese Reds or by the Soviet Union itself.

A naval blockade by the United States, with the British helping us, if they will, and any other fighting ships made available by members of the United Nations, is imperative if we are to win the war in Korea. With the cooperation of the British, if they decide to cooperate fully, and by blockading the Chinese coast, by bombing the Chinese military bases and supply lines, and by the use of the Nationalist forces when they are equipped and prepared to join us in the struggle, I say to you, and I measure my words again, Communist China could be quickly defeated and the war in the Far East ended. Soviet Russia would not intervene at the present time. That is the almost unanimous opinion of all the military men we talked to.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman is making an extremely important contribution, for which I am sure he ought to be applauded by all the Members of the House.

The gentleman's reference to the Chinese Nationalist forces landing forces on the mainland of China is extremely interesting. I wonder if the gentleman recalls that in World War II, in order to help the Chinese forces the American Navy did exactly that same thing, which could now be done by the Chinese Nationalists. The project was at that time secret, called "Miss X," under which only a few well-equipped Navy officers were dropped by parachute into the hinterland and on the island of Hainan, which the gentleman mentioned, and there they were able to give advice and material and use certain electronic aids. They were removed from China with comparative ease and with very little loss of life. It was an easy proposition. Does not the gentleman agree it would be easier now, with the light control with which China is held by the Reds, than it was in World War II?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I agree with him entirely.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. May I ask the gentleman one more question: I also have had the privilege of talking with General MacArthur, on two occasions, the last one in September. Did I understand the gentleman correctly that from every officer or GI with whom he talked there was complete disagreement with the idea of a limited war which would prevent us from using the military means at our command to bomb enemy bases across the river?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman that not only was the opinion unanimous, but when you get down to the level of the GI I can assure the gentleman that it is very bitter. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DORN]

and I talked to men who were climbing out of their planes after bombing raids. We talked to five airmen just returned from flying their jet-fighter planes up to the Yalu River. If you want to hear bitter talk, hear them comment on the fact that they must fly up there and wait for the enemy. They cannot attack the enemy base. They watch the Russian-made planes rise to the attack, come across that river from the sanctuary, shoot down our planes and retreat behind the sanctuary where they cannot be pursued.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. May I conclude with this comment: I had exactly the same experience myself, even to the point where some of the GI's would say to me, "Who is this guy Acheson, anyway?" When I undertook to tell them, they would look at me and say, "Well, is he on our side?" I wondered whether the gentleman had some such experience.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I correctly understand that the information secured on Formosa was to the effect that our American officers would have supervision at all times of any action that might be taken by Chiang Kai-shek? Was that what the gentleman found out there?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman that the opinion I gained was that that supervision should be given in immediate training of those troops, in air power particularly, because to my way of thinking air power is of greatest importance in this war.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman spoke of guerrillas on the mainland ready to come to the aid of Chiang Kai-shek's forces. It is my information that throughout the mainland of China, now overrun by the Communists, Chiang Kai-shek is still the symbol of strength, and that if he should be permitted to return to the mainland with any degree of support on our part manifested, millions of Chinese now under Communist domination would rally to his side. Has the gentleman any information on that or any opinion about it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is my opinion that Gen. Chiang Kai-shek is still the symbol of the leadership of free China. I would not want to say that he should remain the leader forever, but at present he has the confidence of his people.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. DORN. May I say to the gentleman. I think he is making a very interesting contribution. I would like to say this, it is true that they have probably 1,500,000 Nationalist guerrillas on the mainland of China. But if we follow our present pro-Socialistic policy, these guerrillas will be liquidated if we have a truce in Korea, and they then will build the atomic bomb plant and in 10 or 15 years they will come back so strong that we cannot do anything about it. That is just plain common sense. There was not one single difference of opinion in the front-line troops and the generals, all the way from private first class to General MacArthur in the Far East—there was not any difference of opinion whatsoever. This is a silly, stupid policy which has been concocted by some people that I wish I were at liberty to tell the committee about.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. It is following a policy of confusion made by confused people.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman, and his observation is correct.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. LANTAFF. I commend the gentleman from Missouri on the excellent and very fair presentation that he has made. With reference to the guerrilla activity on the mainland, is it not true that there are very little if any communications existing now between those groups?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman there are good communications existing. I know of one harbor which they use that the Communists have never seized. As late as 3 days ago I received, through one of their emissaries here in Washington, news directly from the mainland.

Mr. LANTAFF. How many of the guerrilla leaders, if the gentleman knows, are loyal to Chiang Kai-shek, as opposed to him?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot say, but I am sure they are all loyal to the ideal of toppling over the Red regime and winning freedom for their country.

Mr. LANTAFF. The gentleman mentioned that there have been some 30,000 troops offered by Chiang Kai-shek for use in Korea. Is it not true that all military leaders, including General MacArthur, turned down that offer because they did not want to use those troops in Korea and in the hopes that they could subsequently be used to better advantage to go back into China?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know who is entirely responsible for that policy, except to say that those troops were refused by United Nations' directive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I want to compliment the gentleman and thank him for going to the Orient at his own expense and getting this information and presenting it so well to us today. Is this what the gentleman is saying? You are not recommending that we tie ourselves exclusively to Chiang Kai-shek or the Nationalist Government. Rather it is your concern that we get effective help to all the forces opposing our mortal enemy in China. We ought not deny ourselves the benefit of the leader who has the largest following and the most forces under his control. But at the same time, does not the gentleman agree, that we should with imagination and vigor support every single group or force on the mainland of China which is making trouble in the rear of the Communists, seeking to make them fail in their aggressive plans, discrediting them and their whole movement in Asia and diverting some of their strength from Korea where they are killing Americans.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman is exactly correct. Let me summarize the advantages of this plan: It does not require the use of American ground troops on the mainland of China. It would permit the people of free China to regain their homes and liberties. It would save countless lives that will otherwise be lost in this stalemate war in Korea. It would reverse the tide of the Communist aggression and put us on the offensive and the Kremlin on the defensive. I say to you in this closing word, that since there is no substitute for victory, we cannot stop to negotiate with these Red Chinese aggressors. We have to go ahead to victory. In China we find a people who are ready for revolution against Communist aggression. If we win back China, it would give us the first victory over communism since 1945. The courage and strength of freemen in the world are on trial today. I beg that we move quickly to give these freemen the leadership they need.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Some people are saying that if we do the things you have urged it will lead to all-out war with Communist China. Is it not rather a fact that this is the best hope we have of preventing all-out war with China; because if they win in China, they would be able to fight in the Philippines and fight in Japan and fight in Indochina, and then we would be in trouble? Whatever the risks of the proposals which the gentleman has presented, the risks of any other alternative are infinitely greater.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The gentleman from Missouri has very well summarized the question that I originally intended to propound of the gentleman who is making such a fine contribution to the thinking of the Members of the House on this subject. But is not Russia and has not Russia from the very beginning been doing the things for Communist China that the gentleman from Missouri is suggesting that we do for our allies in the Pacific who are in a position to help us and without which the Communists in China never could have risen to the position of power in the Pacific?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman is correct, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I refrained from making any public comment on the Far East because 2 years ago I strongly supported Chiang Kai-shek. I reached the conclusion then that the people of China had lost confidence in him and the will to fight. I would like to ask my friend—he made reference to Hainan, and I am refraining from making statements now because I want always to look at the national interests of our country—the gentleman referred to the island of Hainan. Some several months ago Nationalist China had that island, did they not?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it was captured by the Communists?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many Communists captured the island? Does the gentleman remember?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry; I cannot tell.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not more than twenty or twenty-five thousand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I believe the Nationalist troops were ready to abandon it and move to Formosa.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; they had 130,000 troops there, the Nationalists. I would like to know how many Nationalist troops there were on Hainan and how many Communist troops invaded it and captured it, this island that the gentleman named here.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think I can answer the gentleman from Massachusetts. It had been decided in about December of 1949 by the Nationalist forces in Formosa that they would withdraw from Hainan, but before they could withdraw the first Communist attack came across the little gap of water between the mainland and Hainan, and the generalissimo, so I am advised reliably, did not want to pull out immediately under pressure but withdrew gradually. His men stood off 11 attacks in the process of evacuating. When the twelfth attack came it was accompanied by the infiltration and defection of one Nationalist regiment in Hainan. It was the break-up of that regiment which brought the end.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I want to know how many Nationalist troops there were there.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman has correctly stated, about 130,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many Communists were in the attacking force?

Mr. JUDD. That is hard to say; I do not think there is any reliable information.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I remember the figure it was about 25,000.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think the gentleman can substantiate that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be so, but the number of Communists was considerably less than the number of Nationalists; and the Communists won because the Nationalists had somehow lost the will to fight.

Mr. JUDD. And why should not they after our repeated announcements that they were finished? Originally the Nationalist troops had plenty of will to fight, but we insisted they cease fire instead. Marshall's criticism when he went over there was because they had too much will to fight. He helped destroy their will to fight, although I do not suggest he realized what he was doing. If you will help the Nationalists a little again, especially with moral support, you will find the will to fight will come back almost overnight.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise or to fall to such mundane subjects as this appropriation bill after the interesting remarks of the gentleman from Missouri on the very dramatic subject that he dealt with. Unfortunately, however, we do have to have appropriations and that means appropriation bills, and that means that some of us have to sit here and suffer through them.

Let me say at the outset as a member of this committee that I have enjoyed enormously working with this group of delightful, distinguished, and, high-minded gentlemen who compose its membership on both sides of the aisle; in fact, I may say that in the committee under the genial chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and the able minority member from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the ranking Republican member, there is no aisle.

I am not going to make any attempt to review this enormous budget for 25 or 26 agencies; I want to confine myself to one single point, a point as to which this Congress, can really do something and do something constructive. Anyone who sits in a subcommittee of this character, and I think this subcommittee has the largest budget of any except the armed services which, of course, now dwarfs everything else, must feel as I do. We have had the experience of listening to the budget demands of the sacred cows, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Veterans' Administration, Maritime Commission, and others, all of these sacred agencies vested with the aura of national defense, agencies that come in blithely, happily, uninspected and unsupervised by Congress, lay down their budgets for billions and billions of dollars and expect to have them granted and they generally are. The member who sits there and feels this flood pouring over him is in very much the same position as a man at the foot of Niagara Falls with his mouth wide open. There is nothing you can do about it. There can be no more helpless feeling.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in his remarks made a number of points directed to Members of Congress, members of State legislatures and municipalities as to what each in his particular situation can do to try to save the United States from bankruptcy through unlimited appropriations, which lead to inflation and disaster. Here is one thing that the Members of this House can do and as to which, in my humble judgment, we have all be recreant and derelict in our duty.

All I ask is that we see to it that the committee is properly equipped and staffed to do the job that has to be done and can be done. Mind you, we could not have better men than these gentlemen who serve us as executive secretaries, such as William Duvall. There is not a better or abler man for the job, there is not a better assistant than Mr. Skaren, who works night and day on this bill, as do their associates on the other subcommittees. But, Mr. Chairman, the executive secretaries to these committees are only individuals, one or two of them, and they are not in position to investigate as should be investigated the great agencies over which we have jurisdiction.

Now, what we do, what Members of Congress do, in allowing this Appropriation Committee to face the Executive forces, so to speak, across the table, wholly unequipped, wholly disarmed, is really a dereliction of a fundamental duty; that is, to keep alive and effective the one real constitutional power remaining in our hands through which we can keep control of the Government of the United States and protect our freedom. I refer to the appropriation power. It is the fundamental power, it is the heart of our representative free system of government. We have let it fall into a very sad state, Mr. Chairman, when we let an appropriation subcommittee sit across the table without having had the benefit of a searching and comprehensive investigation of those great agencies all through the year, 12 months of the year, so that when they appear before your subcommittees the members would be armed with reports from reliable experts as to what is going on in those agencies, how efficiently they are operating, how economically, or the reverse, so that we have something to go on.

It is easy enough, perhaps, for men of usual industry and intelligence to deal with smaller agencies with a six or seven billion budget, such as the Federal Trade Commission or the Security Exchange Commission. That amount is without comprehension. That kind of operation can be reduced to a standard, to work loads and all those other criteria. But what about the Atomic Energy Commission that spends $1,200,000,000 operating the greatest industry in the United States, spending billions and billions of dollars in great new construction work? What about the Veterans' Administration that spends five or six billion dollars in every known form of expenditure? What about the Tennessee Valley Authority that runs a great power plant, that runs navigation controls and builds dams, that is now building enormous new facilities?

Who investigates them? Who can come to us and speak as agents of the Congress and say: Here is how your money is being spent. Here is where you can save.

Mr. Chairman, in the Eightieth Congress we did begin to set up such an investigatory staff. I sat on two subcommittees where important agencies, the Veterans' Administration, Maritime Commission and Public Housing, were being considered. We had the benefit of a careful, searching 12 months' investigation right on the ground by experts who came to us and said: Gentlemen, here is the story on these agencies. This is where they are wrong, this is where they are wasting your money and the taxpayers' money. This is what might be done about it.

It gave that committee a chance to go to work. I say, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of this House should seriously consider this proposition. Everyone should insist upon providing this committee with the kind of a staff of experts that can cover all of the big agencies of Government on a 12 months' basis, so that when your subcommittee and your subcommittee members come to meet these great budget requests they will be able to do so with some semblance of intelligence.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Utah.

Mrs. BOSONE. I should like to say that the gentleman from New York has, to my mind, made sense out of his argument today.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOSONE. Is it not true that if we follow the gentleman's suggestion, we would not need these expensive klieg light and other special investigations? Would this not bring the facts 12 months out of the year to the people who should have them? In that way you would get at the real facts and probably save millions of dollars.

Mr. COUDERT. The distinguished gentlewoman said it better than I could. I think that is undoubtedly true. Particularly with the membership of this committee, you would have certainly businesslike and serious approach; kind of a continual year-round investigation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman from New York. I believe he has touched on one of the greatest challenges to the survival of our free economy. Time after time I have contended congressional appropriation committees could save millions through constant surveys of Federal spending agencies by specially trained experts.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations at any time in their endeavor to save the funds of our National Treasury, and to protect the taxpayers; in fact, I am greatly interested in their efforts along that line. I think in considering the legislation that the Committee on Appropriations now offers in this appropriation bill, some of the history of the merchant marine should be reviewed. It so happens when I became a Member of the Congress I was placed on the Merchant Marine Committee of this House, along with other Members who have left that committee and gone to the Committee on Appropriations and various other committees. If we recall the situation we found ourselves in in 1916, it would be interesting to enlarge upon it, but time does not suffice. We found ourselves in a position where we could not transport our troops abroad. We had to appeal to our allies to transport our armies and our supplies across the Atlantic Ocean. I know one man personally who went to France in a British ship, a freighter, sleeping in a hammock. The hammocks were 12 high and 12 deep. The ship had a Chinese crew and five or six British citizens for officers. During the war we built many types of ships and the question of the disposal of the war fleet after the armistice arose and there was a great controversy, and it is said and the record shows that a great scandal occurred. With that history before them the Merchant Marine Committee of the House began hearings on a bill that eventually became the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, declaring that the American flag should still fly on the high seas and at least 50 percent of the commerce of the United States should be carried in American bottoms. That great Virginian, that great American who has gone on to his reward, the Honorable Otis Bland, championed this bill and brought it to perfection; perfection at that time, so the House said and so the Congress said, because it passed the House and passed the Senate and became the law of the land. That bill was to foster and perpetuate the American merchant marine to carry our commerce and for aid and assistance of the national defense. It was recognized at that time that the American merchant marine could not live and could not survive in competition with the types of seagoing vessels that were furnished by foreign nations with cheap labor, with no protection for life at sea, and with no comforts for the men that go down to the sea in ships. In that bill certain provisions were written for the American sailor, for the American man that made his life at sea, to protect and carry on his vocation and to carry on the history that had been written down through the years in brilliant feats of the American Navy and the American-flag ships of commerce. Then we began subsidies and then we began aid to construction. Then we gave aid to competition with foreign ships.

At the approach of the Second World War we had quite a reserve fleet in this Nation. The question arose, Would we help those in Europe who were fighting what we said at that time was the battle of civilization, the battle of Christianity, the battle of freemen to live on the face of this earth, and worship as they pleased and participate in democratic governments, and so forth. This country gave aid to the British Government, and to the French Government. We gave ships and we gave other materials.

Then the German submarine hordes destroyed great numbers of the foreign ships then plying the seas, and this caused the rise in value of the American reserve fleet. We, desiring to keep these ships under the American flag, did sell them very cheaply to the operators, to operators who were willing to venture in business, to operators who were willing to send their vessels into the submarine zones, to operators who were enticed by high freight rates at a peril not only of the vessel but to American sailors.

At that time the Committee on Merchant Marine of this House called the then Administrator of the Maritime Commission, Admiral Land, in executive session and in open session, and questioned him about the sale of these vessels; yes, the sale of these vessels at $5 per ton, and so forth.

I remember the remark Admiral Land made to a question of mine. I said, "It is known, and we know, that eventually we will be drawn into this conflict, yet we are selling ships here at $5 and $6 a ton." He said to me, "Why, they are nothing but old crates." They were 10, 15, 20, and 25 years old. For a substantial purpose, for substantial and far-reaching and lasting commerce, no operator with any vision of business would have bought them and put them in the trade. Only did they purchase them on account of the times and the risks that the ships would incur. The price was cheap but the risk was great.

So we were drawn into the conflict. The conflict was pushed on our shore, on the coast of North Carolina, and on the northern coast. Ships were sunk right off my congressional district day after day. Then we went into the war. The President of the United States or someone in authority called Admiral Land and said, "We must have ships. Get them." What provision of Congress was made to get the ships? We were in an emergency. I am not trying to defend the Maritime Commission of that day; I am thinking that in justice and in fairness the history should be here reviewed. Jerry Land went out and produced the ships. He made some terrible bargains, as we see them today. He made some terrible contracts for ship construction, as the committee saw at that time, and we called him in on the carpet.

Then the war was over. We won this last war just as much through the efforts of the American seaman as we did through any doughboy or any infantry soldier or aviator or anybody else that fought in France or fought in Italy or fought in Africa. The men that carried the supplies on the Murmansk run were continuously under attack, and history will show it. History will show how many vessels and men we lost. We are beginning to forget it.

Then the war was over and we had more ships than we knew what to do with. Nobody was interested in them. Just like the supplies that were left in Europe by the Army and the Navy. Then your Merchant Marine Committee of the House had before them the problem of the preservation of this fleet and the writing of a Ship Sales Act. To the credit of the men who served on that

committee, they labored long and hard. The testimony lasted for months. It was months and months before the bill was written and submitted to the House. The House passed the bill, the Senate passed the bill, and the bill became law—to sell and preserve the American fleet which we had created then for the future protection of the national defense.

At the time we discussed the rule I expressed myself only, and only arose in opposition to the rule because of my interest in the prerogatives and the jurisdiction of the legislative committees. I have a great deal of sympathy with what the gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations are endeavoring to do. This question of fair compensation in the act of 1936, section 902, I think it is, has always provoked and worried me. Nevertheless you gentlemen who are constitutional lawyers will have to decide that question yourselves. I am greatly interested, if possible, in some way to amend that section of the 1936 act, for I do not think—and I cannot get my mind and heart and soul to believe that where we sold these ships at such marked-down prices those who bought the ships should not be willing to make some concession in the resale or charter of these ships to the Government in case of emergency.

It must also be taken into consideration that in this ship subsidy construction program we required the companies to put in certain facilities that are applicable to the national defense and which are not necessary or usable in commerce. That point is overlooked. Other features have to go into the ship that the commercial operator does not desire. So much for that phase of it.

About the investigation that was carried on by the Merchant Marine Committee of the House which I sat on for months. We completely annihilated and routed the old Maritime Commission. We exposed many things that they should never have done, but which at the time I know because of their doing was the emergency that the country was in, at the time that the shortcomings or mis-administration was carried on. That should be taken into consideration in condemning the old members of the board. I think Admiral Jerry Land is a fine American citizen. It worried me and it hurt me at that time to see him so maligned and abused. But yet we did find things which showed the admiral was very negligent in his administration and that his office was very negligent in their administration and that other men connected with the old Maritime Commission were either ignorant or very negligent.

Now we come to the proposals in this bill, not only in the bill itself if it becomes law, but in the report, which the officials of the Maritime Commission advised the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries this morning would be a directive to them in carrying out the provisions that were written in the bill with respect to contract sailings. These contracts that are made by the Maritime Commission are not made for a year. They are long-term contracts—5 and 10 years. They are contracts that a ship operator must prepare himself for; contracts that require him to make scheduled sailings back and forth to European, Pacific and Asiatic ports. There have to be special arrangements made by the transportation company to fulfill the contracts. There are all kinds of considerations and conditions beyond, I expect, the knowledge of the average Member of this House; some of them were surprising to me. As you will see from the report, the committee requests the Maritime Commission as follows: "To distribute the number of voyages equitably among all shipping interests in order that each company may have a fair share of the subsidies provided by the Administration."

Mr. Chairman, that is simply impossible. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] at this point wants to challenge that statement I yield to him.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not desire to challenge the gentleman's statement, but I do desire to make these observations, that this act has tended to develop a monopoly in the shipping industry.

Mr. BONNER. I will answer that in just a minute. You are going to have a monopoly by this very provision.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a minute, now; let me make my observation, then the gentleman can controvert them.

When this act went into effect in 1936 you had 15 or 16 subsidized operators, and it all boiled down to what we now refer to as the Club 13. You have fewer today than you had when it first went into effect, and will as long as the gentleman's great committee fails to amend the Shipping Act of 1936, whereby you give to the shipping interests every conceivable fair advantage at the expense of the taxpayer in the form of 10-year contracts. Now getting back to the gentleman's statement, they are now engaged in the making of those contracts.

Mr. BONNER. The contracts are already made.

Mr. THOMAS. No; wait a minute; they are expiring all the time, are they not?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Just pass it around to somebody else; that is the way to break them.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, there is the answer, pass them around to somebody else. Who can you pass them to? Who has the facilities? Who has the ability? Who owns the ships? Does any Member of this House own a fleet of vessels that they can pass around to you? Or do you know anybody that it can be passed to other than operating people in the shipping industry?

It is true—and I regret that I have not my table with me—that some companies have two and three hundred contract-sailing voyages; but the reason they have got them is because they have the ability and facilities to contract for them. You will notice another company that has only 5, 10, or 25 contracts. The reason they have no more is because they have neither the ships nor the facilities to contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BONNER. I know time is so valuable here this afternoon; nobody seems to be asking for it. I merely wanted to make my position clear and I appreciate the gentleman's efforts.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for his fine words.

Mr. BONNER. I really think the House ought to know something about what the merchant marine is for. Can the gentleman from Texas spare me any time?

Mr. THOMAS. We have already yielded to our distinguished friend 20 minutes on this side. We have only 2 hours and the time is allocated.

Mr. BONNER. Can the gentleman from California yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Our time is committed.

Mr. BONNER. Well, I am through, let it go at that.

I hope the House uses the full time this afternoon because there are many facts that have not been developed, and I do not think it ought to be passed over and let it be said there is not some virtue and value and merit in the merchant marine of this country.

I think it is a slap in the face of the fine gentleman who made a sacrifice to come to Washington, Admiral Cochrane, to take over the maritime affairs and clean up what has been done in the past and show that it can be operated in a commendable manner—as it should be. And I am confident Admiral Cochrane will if given the proper opportunity.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I can let the gentleman have a couple of minutes. When I said our time was committed I meant that the time was allocated. We can give the gentleman time by taking it away from somebody else but we gladly squeeze out 3 minutes for him.

Mr. BONNER. I had understood that all the time was not going to be used.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would the gentleman like 3 minutes?

Mr. BONNER. I would appreciate it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. We yield the gentleman another 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it certainly is not my pleasure to get up here and try to defend what has been done in the past by the Maritime Commission. I am just as critical of them as is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] or anyone in the House, and I know he is honest about that. But there is something to be said in their defense.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is quite a fine gentleman. He is fair, he is one of the most able Members of the House, he is honest, he is rendering a great service to this Nation. I am in favor of economy. I have given a lot of my time in the last 2 months or more pointing out some of the terrible

negligence on the part of the leaders of our national defense. The committee I am a member of, and which I have the honor to head, has certainly pointed out conditions that should be corrected by legislation prepared by the Armed Services Committee of this House, or the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

It was pointed out this morning what these ships were bought and sold for and every word the gentleman said was true. It is revolting. But I want to point to another thing.

Here is a long list of vessels and companies that made claims against the Maritime Commission for losses. First, here is the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. that made a claim for $1,300,000. The Commission offered to settle with them for $776,000, which was refused. The matter went to the courts and the courts awarded them $983,000. Of course, the Government had the expense of the court litigation.

Here is another company with a small claim, only $50,000. The Commission offered $15,000. The courts awarded $25,000.

Here is another case where the company requested $766,000. The Commission offered $72,500. The courts awarded $142,500.

There are some here that are much higher than that. Here is one, for instance, where the company requested $1,498,000. The Commission offered to settle for $400,000. The courts awarded $825,000. They run all the way through on about that percentage basis. The complete table is as follows:

Just compensation cases decided by the courts, Sept. 1, 1950

Vessel	Court citation	Owner's claim	Just compensation determined by WSA	Just compensation determined by court
Alaskan	*American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.* v. *United States*, Southern District of New York, No. A 133-397, decided Jan. 21, 1949; 85 F. Supp. 815 (D. C. N. Y. 1949).	[1] $1,350,000.00	[2] $776,003.00	[3] $983,250.00
Cheerio	*Shain E. Baitary* v. *United States*, eastern district of South Carolina, Civil Action No. 1138, decided Nov. 28, 1944.	14,400.00	11,500.00	14,400.00
Dona Aurora	*De La Rama Steamship Co.* v. *United States*, southern district of New York, No. A 134-158, decided July 27, 1950.	1,960,000.00	[4] 1,333,333.33	2,082,000.00
Elna	*Ramselius* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 48538, decided May 19, 1950:			
	Value		[5] [6] 147,700.00	[2] [3] 188,025.00
	Charter hire		[7] 49,512.04	[8] 139,138.50
Gene	*Kendall* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 46199, decided Apr. 7, 1947; 108 Ct. Cls. 497 (1947).	50,000.00	15,000.00	25,000.00
Geoanna	*Seven-up Bottling Co.* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 45868, decided Dec. 2, 1946; 107 Ct. Cls. 402 (1946); cert. den. 332 U. S. 757 (1947).	175,000.00	20,000.00	30,000.00
George Washington	*Eastern Steamship Lines* v. *United States*, Circuit Court of Appeals, First Circuit, No. 4366, decided Dec. 31, 1948; 171 F. (2d) 589 (C. C. A., 1st, 1948)	1,739,872.00	667,500.00	1,100,000.00
Governor Cobb	*Trailerships, Inc.* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 45923, decided Apr. 1, 1946; 106 Ct. Cls. 215 (1946)	600,000.00	100,000.00	125,000.00
Hourless	*Wilson* v. *United States*, District Court, Massachusetts, No. 2237, C. A. decided Nov. 12, 1943	12,500.00	4,000.00	4,000.00
International	*Smith-Douglas, Inc.* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 46289, decided Dec. 6, 1948; 81 F. Supp. 215 (1948)	586,592.05	[9] 236,018.78	[10] [11] 290,000.00
MacArthur	*Richard S. Cors* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 46796, decided Jan. 5, 1948; 110 Ct. Cls. 66 (1948); 337 U. S. 325 (1949) Commissioner's Report, July 12, 1950 (rehearing).	20,000.00	9,000.00	15,500.00
Maitland No. 1	*Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Nav. Co.* v. *U. S.*, Court of Claims, No. 46435, decided Dec. 6, 1948; 112 Ct. Cls. 240 (1948); 338 U. S. 396 (1949); 116 Ct. Cls. —; 1950 A. M. C. 681	766,128.00	72,500.00	[12] 142,500.00
Mariner	*Charles Zubik* v. *United States*, Western District, Pennsylvania, No. 2815, decided June 22, 1945; 61 F. Supp. 4 (W. D. Penn. 1945).	15,000.00	7,000.00	10,000.00
Mary Kay	*Hugo Menke* v. *United States*, Northern District, California, No. 22447-R, decided July 21, 1943.	17,000.00	6,500.00	6,500.00
Mayflower	*Broadfoot* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 47091, decided Mar. 7, 1949; 113 Ct. Cls. 280 (1949).	300,000.00	12,670.00	30,000.00
Mizpah	*McDonald* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 45876, decided June 5, 1950	435,750.00	116,000.00	175,000.00
N. G. Arfaras	*John E. Green* v. *United States*, Southern District, Florida, No. 818-T, decided July 1945	14,426.00	9,050.00	11,500.00
Norfolk	*United States* v. *Buxton Line*, 165 F. (2d) 993 (C. C. A. 4th 1948)	9,960.00	399.28	4,000.00
Off Duty	*Victor F. Sheronas* v. *United States*, District Court, Delaware, Civil Action No. 367, decided August 1946.	11,500.00	5,000.00	6,000.00
P. Kremasco	*John E. Green* v. *United States*, Southern District, Florida, No. 819-T, decided July 1945	12,168.00	8,195.00	9,500.00
Pacific	*Turkington* v. *United States*, 108 Ct. Cls. 571 (1947)	47,500.00	11,500.00	25,000.00
President Warfield	*Baltimore Steam Packet Co.* v. *U. S.*, 112 Ct. Cls. 469 (1949)	1,934,905.00	525,000.00	990,000.00
Robert Henjes	*Helen K. Henjes* v. *United States*, 115 Ct. Cls. 264 (1950)	91,900.00	51,781.00	60,000.00
State of Delaware	*Wilson Line, Inc.* v. *United States*, 111 Ct. Cls. 764 (1948)	642,068.00	275,000.00	488,400.00
State of Maryland	*Baltimore Steam Packet Co.* v. *United States*, 112 Ct. Cls. 448 (1949)	1,448,000.00	400,000.00	800,000.00
State of Virginia	*Baltimore Steam Packet Co.* v. *United States*, 112 Ct. Cls. 433 (1949)	1,498,000.00	400,000.00	825,000.00
Stella Maris	*Brunson* v. *United States*, Southern District, California, No. 3659, O'C Civil, decided Oct. 30, 1944.	22,000.00	13,500.00	15,000.00
Virginia	*National Bulk Carriers, Inc.* v. *United States*, 169 F. (2d) 943 (C. C. A., 3d 1948)	3,800,000.00	2,100,339.04	3,584,000.00
William C. McTarnahan	*National Bulk Carriers, Inc.* v. *United States*, 82 F. Supp. 495 (D. C. Del. 1949)	2,612,696.04	1,619,591.07	2,273,502.61
Yorktown	*Baltimore Steam Packet Co.* v. *United States*, 112 Ct. Cls. 458 (1949)	1,237,100.00	425,000.00	815,000.00
Zoric	*Robert Capoit* v. *United States*, Eastern District of Louisiana, No. CA 667, decided May 11, 1945.	15,625.00	7,500.00	15,000.00
Total			9,436,092.54	15,282,216.11

[1] $130 per dead-weight ton.
[2] $75 per dead-weight ton.
[3] $95 per dead-weight ton.
[4] No determination made. This figure is based on amount paid on account.
[5] WSA determination was based on a dead weight of 2,082 tons; the court's on a dead weight of 2,507 tons.
[6] $71 per dead-weight ton.
[7] $1.25 per dead-weight ton.
[8] $3 per dead-weight ton.
[9] $54 per dead-weight ton.
[10] The Commissioner found that the value of the vessel as of September 1939 was $88,800 or $18 per dead-weight ton.
[11] $66 per dead-weight ton.
[12] The court originally determined $161,833.72 but on rehearing reduced the amount to $142,500.

NOTE.—The court's determinations in the 31 cases amounted to 161.95 percent of Administrator's determinations.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Is the gentleman able to tell from his memoranda there what court made the award? Was it the Court of Claims or was it another court?

Mr. BONNER. I do not happen to be a lawyer. I am one of the few laymen in this body and I am proud of it. I respect the great ability of the legal fraternity here and I want to see the courts sustained and so forth. The gentleman can examine this himself. The Court of Claims I imagine.

Mr. JONAS. I thought the gentleman might have that knowledge.

Mr. BONNER. I will say, since the gentleman asked me that question, if that provision in this bill becomes law it will be a heyday for the lawyers because I have asked the Commission myself what they would do with respect to contracts already made. You gentlemen who are attorneys know more about contracts than I do. But certainly a contract with the Government is a pretty sacred sort of thing, I would think, stronger than any contract with an individual in all probability. The Government is going to have an awful job getting away from these contracts.

Mr. JONAS. With reference to the gentleman's statement about the possibility of the lawyers having a heyday, as the gentleman probably recalls he and I served on the same committee together and took up this subject matter. If there is to be a heyday, judging from what little knowledge I gained in serving on that committee, by the action of the Maritime Commission it is merely switching the heyday away from the Maritime Commission and putting it in the hands of the legal profession, neither of which appeals to me very much.

Mr. LONNER. The gentleman rendered distinguished service on the committee, and his feelings and my feelings are not so far apart, not at all. I regret and I am sorry that all these things transpired, but I must be charitable and say that some of the charges made against the Maritime Commission, which look so awful now, reflect a picture of the time that the contracts and the transactions were taking place as against another time when the picture is entirely different.

Mr. JONAS. In that respect the gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the committee for the privilege of addressing them, but I must say that when the bill is read for amendment I shall offer an amendment which I hope will meet the approval of the committee and the membership of the House.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

GRAIN FOR INDIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am informed, that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] said that an effort was being made to put something over in respect to the bill for grain aid to India—giving India and in the present overhanging famine situation there—and that I was trying to work out some plan of mine for another ECA under the guise of that particular bill.

I think the gentleman gives me much too much credit. I happen to be far down in seniority on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and not at all the master mind he wants to make me out to be. Though, I would like very much to be considered as a leader in respect to this India grain bill. Now the reasons why this bill has not been brought to a vote as yet have not been much discussed on the floor and probably the question would not have been raised today had the gentleman not raised it, but it having been raised, I think it is very worthy of the consideration of the House.

We today hear speeches about how our position has suffered in Asia; that the cause of the free peoples has suffered the most damaging blows in Asia, yet we apparently fail to observe that while the Congress is not taking action on this grain aid to India, we are suffering added serious damage to our position there which might well prove to be irreparable.

What is said to deter certain Members is what Mr. Nehru says about his position between the east and the west. Well, I think we know enough about political life in this House so that we can cut through political situations like that in India and get at the heart of the reason for this measure, and that is that this aid to India must come as a good will gesture from one democracy to another, regardless of who heads it. Let us remember, too, that the measure is now before us as a repayable loan and that India is known for paying her debts.

The riots that have taken place in India recently and the enormous advantage which the Communists take from them is at least in material partly due to the fact that India is not yet getting aid from us in grain, which we have the capability to send them. That is what is proving to be so damaging to our position in the Far East currently.

Let us not forget that there are 600,000,000 people in south and southeast Asia who are not in the Communist column, and two-thirds of those are in India. Yet, so far, we stay our hands from aiding these people contrary to the great democratic and humanitarian traditions of the United States, and at the same time we talk about building up our position in Asia.

Competition is what counts in this world, as well as other factors, and we have competition in respect to giving food aid to India, because the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Russians are moving in where we are leaving a vacuum. They are trying to make their deals with India today, Communist China for 100,000 tons of rice, and Soviet Russia for 1,000,000 tons of wheat. And what kind of deals are they making? We know that people who are desperate for food will make any kind of deals in order to get them food. The Communists will fasten the halter right around the neck of India if we let them. Russia is now trying to tie up all the burlap available in India, and thereby depriving us of one of the most vital materials in the world; and let us ask ourselves whether that is going to do us any good in our own grim struggle against communism.

No; we ought to act on this grain for India bill and it is my deep hope that we will do so now at long last, promptly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to follow my distinguished fellow member of the Merchant Marine Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, because I believe that his experience on that committee, his very fine recollection of the problems that have come before it, will give us as good a basis for judgment as any Member of the House could. I compliment him on his views and I share them.

I would like to say at the outset that I appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. The provision upon which I am going to comment is found on page 45 at line 12 of the bill and is the provision which limits the number of voyages during any one year. In that connection I was very much concerned because I thought the language which was originally proposed almost indicated that the committee did not wish to have additional shipping concerns come under the subsidy program. I submitted language to the gentleman from Texas that might change that apparent indication. He was good enough to include in the proviso which is in the bill one of the phrases which I suggested to him, and I think it does definitely show that it is not the intention that this subsidy program should be limited to those who now have subsidies. However, I also submitted language which would permit an increase in the number of voyages every year to provide voyages for the new people who want to get into the industry. He did not agree on this point. His view was that the new people should be included under the provisions for the total number of voyages. Well, that led us to the situation in which we found ourselves this morning.

Our committee had a meeting, and before it came Mr. Gatov, a member of the Federal Maritime Board and Assistant Administrator under Admiral Cochrane. Mr. Gatov pointed these facts out to us. The shipping operators who are now under the subsidized program have contracts. Most of them, I believe, are 20-year contracts, or 10 years, I have forgotten. Most of them have 3, 4, or 8 years more to run. Under those contracts the operators each agree that they will sail a definite minimum number of voyages during each year, and if they fail to sail those voyages they have broken their contracts.

On the other hand, it is agreed that they may sail a maximum number of voyages, and any number they sail within that maximum the Maritime Administration is bound to pay for. Here is where the squeeze comes. If the operators sail the number of voyages which under their contract they are entitled to sail, they will use up more than the 1,450 voyages which it is proposed to authorize. If they do that, there will obviously be no voyages left for assignment to the other companies which wish to come in.

There are some seven applications, I believe, that are pending for 48 ships that would sail possibly another 400 voyages. Mr. Gatov said that the Administration would not create a deficiency by setting up the voyages for the new operators, and that if the bill stays as it is there will be no new lines started. I am interested in seeing some new lines started. I am more familiar with the Pacific coast situation than any other. I know that the services to China and Japan and the Philippines furnished by two companies have been very valuable in the past few years in carrying the commerce that goes across the Pacific Ocean. I think that we ought to have an expanding merchant marine, and I think there is no question but that this language will stop it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. In that particular field, is it not true that these companies have had to go out there and practically reestablish the business that was completely destroyed during the war?

Mr. ALLEN of California. That is exactly correct. The operators are, in the main, new people. There is another problem that goes with this. Our subsidy program requires that the shipping companies use American labor, which is accustomed to a higher standard of living than foreign labor. It requires that repairs be made in American yards, where the same situation applies to the standards of American shipyard labor. If we do not have our ships running, we do not have our shipyards operating to take care of them.

I was rather astounded to learn the figures from a letter recently received concerning the shipyards on San Francisco Bay. On April 19, 1951, in the three yards which have survived the war, there were 2,250 men employed. A year ago, on July 1, roughly when the Korean incident broke out, there were about 6,600. There has been a decrease of 65.91 percent during that intervening period.

To show what we need in emergency times during World War II, for example, the three yards employed something over 63,000. There has been a 96-plus percent drop-off. If we include the temporary war-industry yards, Kaiser and Marin Ship, and so forth, we now have something like 1 percent of the men working now that we needed during the war period.

I know something about the shortage of ships. Let me give you two or three examples. We had a tramp fleet about 2 years ago consisting of about 1,100 American ships, which was an extraordinary number, but which was required at that time to carry our commerce. During the period of a year it dropped off to about 100. The tramp fleet is not subsidized. It does not survive in foreign competition. At the outset of the Korean war we had about 100 operating. In the nature of things, about half of them were in port and half of them away. We found ourselves with 46 ships available, ready to operate, fully manned and equipped, and available to the military service. It was necessary for us to charter 13 foreign vessels to carry our cargo. The Navy got some Iranian, Greek, Panamanian, Canadian, and British ships to fill the immediate need until we got some of our own ships from the laid-up fleet in operation a few weeks later.

In time of war the passenger ships become troop transports. We now have in operation only three which travel at a speed greater than 22 knots, which is the speed usually attributed to modern enemy submarines. I well remember the personal experience while in the Navy in 1943 of traveling in an old Hog Islander built in 1917 during World War I, traveling at a speed of about 8 knots, unescorted, for 19 days, in waters in which enemy submarines were occasionally operating. Something over 20 of the men aboard were carried in a forward cargo hold, where they had no comforts or conveniences except a temporary stairway installed through the hatch cover, through which there was some ventilation and on which they could reach the open deck. It is not surprising that I should favor the maintenance of a reasonable number of fairly good ships during peacetime in order that they might be available to give reasonable comfort and safety to the men and materials which are carried in them during wartime.

An operating subsidy in the shipping business is not a guaranty of profits. On the contrary, an operator who makes an unreasonable profit finds the excess applied in reduction of the subsidy. Our laws properly require the use of American labor on American ships and that repairs be made in American shipyards. All but a minor part of the subsidy involved is to offset the disparity between the cost of American labor as against foreign labor with regard to the wages, subsistence, repairs and maintenance of the ships that are subsidized.

I hope that the language of the proviso, which is found on page 45 at line 12 of the bill, will be stricken from it by amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also that I may speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the course of the debate our friend and colleague the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in talking about his amendment made reference to the love life of a tuna. I know oftentimes when you get into something like that you get into something you do not know very much about. I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] got to talking about something there that, while his intentions were good, is a subject about which he cannot claim to be an expert.

I would like to review the program that our tuna industry on the West Coast has been engaged in during the past 25 or 30 years. We have built an industry out there that has grown to be the largest fishing industry in the entire United States. In the course of the last few years we have had a lot of complications and a lot of troubles in our fishing operations off the coast of South America and Central America to such a degree that a few years ago the American Government and the Government of Costa Rica and several of the South and Central American governments met and discussed some of the fishing operations and fishing problems that our fleet was involved with. It was hoped that some of the very complicated and bitter controversies that were growing out of the fishing operations in the waters down as far south as the Galapagos Islands could be cleared up and settled in a friendly way. As a result of these talks a convention was formed, and out of that there was formed what is called the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. That Commission was ratified by the other body in 1949, and then it set out its preliminary steps in organization. Exploratory work in developing the biological facts about tuna is particularly needed. In our particular fishing industry we do not use the seine operation, but we employ large boats, some as long as this room. They ply 6,000 miles south of California, off the coast of South and Central America. They churn the waters with small bait, and when the tuna arrives to take the bait they catch the tuna with hooks. They do not have much trouble with Latin-American governments so far as actually catching the tuna because they are several hundred miles off the coast. But in order to get bait to chum the tuna with, these boats have to put into the coastal waters of the South and Central American countries. In doing so they often run into complications with these governments. These governments fear our industries might take their natural resources, and, while they do not need them today, in some future time they may want this bait fish, and therefore they resent our American boats coming in. As a result they have set up a high tax on fishing rights in those waters.

Our industry men have negotiated from time to time with these governments, but it has been impossible to arrive at satisfactory long-term agreements. We need a larger scope of coverage—one that can only be encompassed by government-to-government discussions and cooperative explorative methods on the habits of the tuna and the bait fish.

I would like to point out to you that this industry represents a big factor in our economy on the West Coast. Last year, for instance, 11,000,000 cases of tuna were consumed, which represents an average of 3½ cans per man, woman, and child. It represented about $100,000,000 valuation. About $125,000,000 is invested in the industry in the way of canning equipment and boats.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKINNON. I have very limited time, but I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The reason I asked the gentleman to yield to me is because I think there is a distinction which is not being made. What the tuna industry really wants is not necessarily money. They have a very large income. They have been willing to do their own research work. But they have to have certain authority and certain backing from the United States or from some international board before they can do the research that they want to do. That carries out what I said a moment ago on the floor that we have to go out to the States and to private industry and go back to the people and say, "We do not have to pay all that. We can give you help on those things. But why should we put up Federal money when we are $257,000,000,000 in the red to pay for something that you can afford to pay or the State can afford to pay?"

I think that ought to enter into the discussion and Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman has made a very good point and a point that I was going to bring out. Our industry has developed itself independently from its own private funds. We want to keep independent. We do not want Government interference if we can get away from it. The point is that this industry cannot go to the South American governments. We have to have a Government-to-Government approach, and that is why we have asked the State Department to come in and assist us officially in getting this problem worked out. We are not asking for a free ride at all. We can pay our way, but we must have a Government-to-Government approach to get any action.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I have asked the gentleman to yield to me in order that I might emphasize the point that this problem should not be referred to facetiously as one of studying the love life of the tuna fish. There is nothing wrong with studying the love life or sex habits of the tuna fish or the love life or sex habits of halibut as has been done in cooperation with the Canadian Government for almost 30 years. This is an important international problem. It affects a large segment of our population, and affects an industry of which this country may well be proud. It should not be laughed down, as I understand was done yesterday in talking about the love life of racoons. So far as I am concerned, and I know a little about the subject, the State Department very properly negotiated the treaty and formed the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission because without it you folks on the lower west coast of California could not get the bait you must have to fish for the tuna, and you would have a $100,000,000 industry ruined. You will find the following article just written by Charles E. Jackson, general manager of the National Fisheries Institute, Inc., highly interesting:

LOVE LIFE OF TUNA, HALIBUT, AND FROGS?

Efforts are unwittingly being made for political purposes to laugh out of existence the work of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and the Halibut Commission, just as Senator Pat Harrison, by a single speech some twenty-odd years ago, killed research on bullfrogs in the United States for perhaps all time. Meanwhile, frog legs have become an expensive luxury in the United States at prices so high that this valuable food is not available for thousands of people suffering from diabetes who, like other citizens, would like a change in their diet. Had the Fish and Wildlife Service had a reasonable amount of research funds these past years, frog legs might now be available at reasonable cost to diabetic patients. As it is, the supply must come from wild stocks in the southern swamps and from imports from Cuba. Supplies cannot be maintained consistently and the price range is high. Meanwhile, Japan developed a very profitable frog leg industry which employs many people. Senator Pat Harrison's famed ridicule made the news headlines, but destroyed any hope for Federal appropriations for bullfrog research and today the State of Mississippi lacks an industry that might have provided extensive employment for her population and a change in diet for the diabetics of the Nation.

Now the work of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission is threatened by stories going around on Capitol Hill about the love life of the tuna, and a story on the love life of halibut was printed in a Washington newspaper last week.

Nothing is more dangerous to the fishing industry of America than for responsible persons in public life to ridicule our industry by satirical remarks concerning the sex life of fish and shellfish. The existence of the seafood industry depends upon sex life to the same extent as does the cattle and hog and poultry industries, yet we seldom hear of farmers' appropriations for research being curtailed because the meat, poultry, and even the honeybee industries are dependent on sex life, as indeed are all agriculture crops, not to mention the perpetuation of humanity itself.

The fishing industry resents these love life stories that are told for the purpose of killing Federal appropriations for research. Indeed, the public itself is gradually becoming aware of the fact that mankind must depend more and more on the products of the sea for maintaining the human race. Those nations recognizing this fact by amply providing research facilities for utilizing the extensive protein and mineral resources of the seas and lakes and rivers will still be around, while those nations who laugh off their responsibilities for sea-food research will be in the category of ancient Rome.

Ask your Congressman why he discriminates against the love life of fish, but encourages the love life of cattle and hogs and corn and cotton. Let him know that the fishing industry resents being laughed out of court, to defeat appropriations.

Fifteen years is a long time, but that much time and effort and patience has been expended to bring the work of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission through an international treaty, and even the exigencies of war do not necessitate complete abandonment of 15 years of work that gives such great promise for the utilization and wise conservation of the tuna resources of North and South America.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman makes a very good point.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. As a former executive of the California Division of Fish and Game, I think I know something about the problem that confronts us. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] touched on it when he spoke about it, and the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] touched on it when he spoke about the bait and the so-called lovelife of the sardine, which is used for bait. We nearly lost the sardine industry on the Pacific Coast because we were not familiar enough with the biological facts surrounding the propagation of the fish and because we overfished. We have run into great difficulties. I may say that the State of California spends a great sum of money on this each year. What we need is a greater study of the fishery resources of this country which can be increased only by knowing more about its love life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, in closing I would just like to bring home three points: The first is we do not ask for a specific subsidy; we want to be independent. Second, we need to encourage good relationships with the countries south of the border. This convention will assist in better relations with Latin America and a mutual increase in prosperity for all our peoples. Third, if we are going to study the love life of cattle, hogs, and everything else in this country, certainly there can be nothing wrong in studying the love life of the tuna which also is a very important segment of the American economy.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, about 12 years ago I became interested in the stockpile program for strategic and critical materials. I was amazed to find that we had no law establishing a stockpile. The Military Affairs Committee went about the business of writing a law known on its enactment as Public Law 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. That was the first stockpiling law in our Nation's history. In 1946 we revised that law in the Seventy-ninth Congress as Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which is the present stockpile law.

I have throughout the past 12 years had occasion to study this matter intensively, and I see on the floor here just now men who have worked with me in that field. I refer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON]—I saw him here a moment ago; he is gone now. I have seen several men here this afternoon who have a like interest with mine regarding the welfare and well-being and adequacy of our stockpile of strategic and critical materials. I will say this, that back in 1946 when we wrote Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the gentleman from North Carolina and I had definitely in mind a yardstick, an objective, to give this Nation a little better protection in the matter of strategic and critical materials for any war challenge that might come. I notice also the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] who has always been active with us.

We have watched this program carefully and very diligently throughout all the years. The objective was set in 1946 before we had what we now recognize as a known adversary; but when the Korean war came along we had not achieved over 34 percent of the planned objective of what was originally estimated as our need. When the Korean war came along those needs were also boosted tremendously, so that here even with the added acquisitions of the past year we have still only approximately 40 percent of the stockpile on hand.

I am very pleased with the stepped-up record of the responsible officials of the

Munitions Board and GSA in the matter of the acquisition of stockpiles during the past year. But I was alarmed when I saw in this bill no item for additional funds for stockpiling. I then turned to the hearings and the committee report. I find from the hearings reference to the fact that there is a billion-dollar item in the President's budget message, and also that there is a plan for the Committee on Appropriations to take that matter up later on. May I inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee if that is not the plan?

Mr. THOMAS. First, may I make an observation, then I will answer the question. This subcommittee wants to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] for his careful study and hard work on the stockpiling program. A large part of its success is certainly due to his untiring efforts.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say that at no time in the last 3 years or any other time—if I am in error I wish to be corrected but if my memory serves me correctly—has this committee ever denied one 5-cent piece for the stockpiling of critical material. As a matter of fact, in the fiscal year 1951 here is what this committee granted them in dollars and cents: First, in the 1950 bill we gave them $525,000,000, no reduction, for the stockpiling of critical material. In 1951 they came in with a regular bill requesting $605,000,000, which was granted. There was a supplemental bill for 1951, $598,637,000, then a second supplemental in 1951 for $1,834,000,000, a total for 1951 of $3,038,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman very much. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. The total we have given, the gentleman from Iowa should know, in 1951 alone was $3,038,548,370. The total we have given to date, including both cash and contract, is $4,458,548,370. The total they have on hand, which may interest the gentleman from Iowa, presently is $1,623,543,734.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is not yet expended?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is not yet expended.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. That brings out the information I wanted to have in this discussion.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is not obligated.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California for the information. I think it is highly important to get that before the Nation today in the course of this debate because the absence of any fund for stockpiling of strategic and critical materials in this appropriation bill may be misunderstood. I understand from the hearings that you are going to give the budget item for stockpiling further attention in the near future and I am behind that 100 percent.

This stockpile is the point where we start the adequacy of our defense. This is where we look to get the materials to build modern weapons, and we need more and more modern weapons and we cannot get them unless we have these particular materials. I know there is controversy in private industry about this stockpiling. I know that we were very wise when we placed in Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress that no part of the stockpile material could be taken out of the stockpile without authority from the Congress. It is because there are people who are watching that stockpile with an eye to getting some of it for their needs for civilian production that we have got to be careful. But we cannot have better insurance than this stockpile if we are going to match our strength against a world power at any time in the future. That is my real deep concern in the matter.

I commend the committee and hope they will continue their attention in this field and appreciate their giving me this information. I am looking forward to further developments. I am not going to stop with just this committee because I am going to keep everlastingly on the trail of the Munitions Board—they know it down there, I do not have to acquaint them with the fact I am constantly on their trail—also GSA—to make sure that they do not take their eyes off the real objective—that we may have an adequate national defense stockpile as the protection that we are entitled to have. Our action on these appropriation bills will help guarantee to my son and his buddies who are now fighting in Korea, that we are back of them with the sinews of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have requested these few minutes to make an inquiry with respect to only one or two items in this bill. One of them is with regard to the Government's contribution to the retirement fund of the Civil Service Commission. I notice the appropriation calls for $300,000,000 while the amount requested was $320,000,000. The request has been cut by $20,000,000. I think the membership of the House should know that we really do not save anything by reducing this particular item. The fact remains that the retirement fund lacks about $5,000,000,000 of being actuarily sound. In other words, it would take approximately $5,000,000,000 if the retirement fund were placed on a basis similar to that of life insurance companies.

The other matter I wanted to call attention to is the appropriation for the Comptroller General's Office.

It appears the committee has seen fit to reduce considerably the amount requested by the Office of Comptroller General. In all probability the members of the committee felt they had reasons for doing it, but I just want to say this is one agency of the Government that is an extremely important one, and is efficiently operated and managed. After all, it is the arm of Congress. It is the auditor. It is the watchdog for the Congress. It is headed by a very distinguished and able American, a man who is in my judgment doing an excellent job in his position. This is one agency that I would not want to see crippled in any respect.

In looking at the hearings it would appear that this committee has seen fit to cut down some of the top-flight positions for that office and has also reduced the amount of funds. I would like to have that explained, because I do not want this particular agency crippled in any respect. To reduce its efficiency and its ability to carry on will cost the Government many times in expenditures what might be saved by comparatively small reductions to this agency.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to our distinguished friend from Kansas that the committee shares his point of view exactly 100 percent. It is an agency that is an arm of the Congress. As a matter of fact, they have a tremendous budget, and we reduced them a little less than $500,000, and that reduction has come about by virtue of the fact that they transferred some of their activities to the Post Office Department where heretofore have been in the General Accounting Office. Instead of cutting down the top-flight positions, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, if he will read the report carefully, we did a little legislating, and I hope the House will forgive us, but we increased his top-flight positions by five. He wanted eleven and we gave him five.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate that. This is one agency that is headed by a group of outstanding, efficient men.

Mr. THOMAS. I know the gentleman will agree with us and he will not think we are sinning when we gave him those five.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly not. If the Comptroller General felt he should have more than five in those higher positions, he would favor doing so. He would not ask for them unless they were needed. He would be sure to select capable men qualified under civil service, and as I stated before, expenditures here will mean greater economies in other departments of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman made a fine statement, and we greatly appreciate it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I opposed this rule because I considered that the provisions in this bill, especially as they relate to housing, were manifestly unfair and unjustifiable. No one can deny that there is still a great shortage in housing; but, unfortunately, my Republican friends, especially the leaders, never seem to realize that the ex-servicemen and the people of this Nation are entitled to have a roof over

their heads. I called their attention to it years ago. Unfortunately, they have always more or less opposed housing legislation. In this bill they actually scuttled the laws that we passed in aid of housing, which I greatly regret. Of course, they did that under the pretense that they desire economy and to save money, which is only said on the floor of the House for political reasons and for no other. They have even inveigled some of the Democrats to vote with them to make possible the adoption of some of these outrageous restrictions as to public housing.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I agree with what the gentleman has said. In committee I opposed the provisions of the bill relating to housing. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of the Budget attempted to cut the 10-percent allotment to public housing which had been created by the Public Housing Act of 1949, when it was thought there would be 810,000 housing units started this year. That was the reason for the cut of public housing units from 135,000 to 75,000 by the Bureau of the Budget. I agree with the gentleman, we need more. But certainly this cut is unwarranted.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the gentleman. The other side does not object to using the materials for the construction of plants here and there, many of them unnecessary, but when it comes to housing they always seem to be opposed to it, and I have called their attention to it, that the people will resent it, and they will.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it the contention of the gentleman that only the Federal Government can build houses?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no. You know that I have advocated that private industry should build houses, but, unfortunately, up to a few years ago, they failed because we failed to adopt the legislation, due to the opposition of you gentleman on that side. Had we adopted the laws that were recommended by President Roosevelt 15 and 12 years ago, there would have been no shortage of housing today; but at that time, when we could have built houses for perhaps 50 cents of the dollar value today, you objected; your party is responsible for the great shortage that exists today, where the tenants are being mulcted by the owners of apartment buildings to such an extent that it is really, in many instances, an outrage and a crime.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sorry we did not build the houses then——

Mr. SABATH. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. PHILLIPS. By private ownership; but does not the gentleman think that regulation X is the main impeding restriction we have today?

Mr. SABATH. I would not say that because I have not studied that problem.

All I want to say in conclusion is this: A great deal has been said about the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I say this, that our committee 2 years ago started that investigation. It is due to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], its present chairman, and many of its members, that the old Board, that was altogether too liberal, from my viewpoint, and that I criticized, was eliminated. The new Board is trying to safeguard the rights and interests of our Treasury and our country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, in looking over the report on this appropriation bill, I was somewhat puzzled by one of the recommendations dealing with the estimates of the General Services Administration. In serving as a member of this body it has been my pleasure to work with the Administrator of General Services Administration on several matters and although this agency has not been in operation long I have been impressed with the abilities of the Administrator and the manner in which the activities of the General Services Administration are managed and supervised. I have also familiarized myself somewhat with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended by Public Law 754 of the Eighty-first Congress. As I recall, this legislation was one of the first enactments of the Congress implementing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It merged several semiautonomous bureaus and administrations into the General Services Administration, vesting the complete authority for the management of affairs in the Administrator. As previously indicated, this legislation was consonant with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to eliminate the specific legislative authorities running directly to bureaus or constituent units of organization which, of course, tended to hamper or restrict the authority of the head of an agency to manage his agency's affairs in accordance with his judgment.

The recommendation of the committee to which I allude is contained on page 10 of the report wherein it is stated as follows:

> The committee is of the opinion that it would be helpful to the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and to GSA if funds for the Public Buildings Service were submitted in a separate appropriation paragraph. As pointed out heretofore, this item constitutes nearly 90 percent of the entire operating expense appropriation and consists, to a large degree, of fixed charges. The new appropriation item should include all sums required for the administration and operation of activities under the Public Buildings Service from the Commissioner down, consisting of the rental of space, operation, and maintenance of buildings in and outside the District of Columbia, space acquisition and utilization, and related activities. The committee requests, therefore, that the Bureau of the Budget, with the assistance of GSA, submit this portion of the operating expense item as a separate appropriation paragraph in the 1953 budget.

To me, this appears to be completely incompatible with the intent of Congress in enacting the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and vesting the authority and complete responsibility for the management of the affairs and activities of the General Services Administration within the Administrator. Likewise, this recommendation seems to me to be in conflict with the objectives and legislative concepts as expressed by the Congress in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission and provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act recognize the necessity of eliminating duplicative management and administrative elements of related activities. They permit the responsible administrative official, in this case the Administrator of General Services Administration, to consolidate such unnecessary and overlapping independent activities. An essential ingredient of this facility is the establishment of an appropriation structure which is consonant with this over-all management concept. The relative proportions of funds to be utilized on individual programs under the single general management actually are not significant.

Without reasonable consolidation and without control in the Administrator, budgeting, financing, accounting, and reporting transactions are multiplied in almost geometric proportion. Information recently developed by the Expenditures Committee points up the almost unbelievable amount of paper work required in procurement and related financing and accounting operations at the Detroit Ordnance Arsenal. The proposed change in the appropriation structure of the General Services Administration differs only in degree and not in principle.

The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 provides in section 113 (a) that—

> The head of each executive agency shall establish and maintain systems of accounting and internal control designed to provide: (1) Full disclosure of the financial results of the agency's activities; (2) adequate financial information needed for the agency's management purposes; (3) effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets for which the agency is responsible, including appropriate internal audit; (4) reliable accounting results to serve as the basis for preparation and support of the agency's budget requests, for controlling the execution of its budget, and for providing financial information required by the Bureau of the Budget under section 213 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23); (5) suitable integration of the accounting of the agency with the accounting of the Treasury Department in connection with the central accounting and reporting responsibilities imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury by section 114 of this part.

I had thought that in accordance with the authorities conferred upon the Administrator by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and the legislative intent of the Congress with respect to budget and accounting matters, that this agency's budget has been presented in a manner which reflects reliable financial effects of each and all of its functions and activities. If this is not the case I feel sure the GSA can

and will perform properly under existing appropriations structure.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that this agency is attempting to streamline its budget and accounting operations and plans to make a further appropriation consolidation, subject to the approval of the Appropriations Committee, which will lessen their accounting burden but will at the same time enable and permit them to report to Congress the full disclosure of the financial results of each individual activity of the agency.

Of course, as the Members of this body know, the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 was, in fact, a legislative enactment and sanction of the joint accounting improvement program currently being conducted by the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department. Therefore, it follows that the recommendation as contained in the committee report is in conflict with the joint accounting improvement program.

It is therefore of deep concern to me that the Committee on Appropriations should make a recommendation which tends to revert to the adoption of some of the ills as pointed out by the Hoover Commission which will tend to restrict the flexibility of the Administrator of the General Services Administration in the management of one of the most important agencies of the Government, and would place an added and unnecessary accounting burden on the agency.

The proposed changes in the appropriation structure seem to me to tend toward the kind of condition we found at the Detroit Arsenal. I feel certain that the committee does not intend to promote such a condition. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one or two questions. I believe it was his committee's primary concern to get before it all information covering the related activities of the General Services Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. You have no particular desire to set up a separate paragraph or to transfer jurisdiction of authority to a unit head, do you?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. And you would not want to take any action which would increase the accounting difficulties or the administrative burden?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. If the committee report would carry to that extreme the requirements on General Services you would not insist upon it?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, who has certainly carried a tremendous load and who has done so much constructive work along this line, that of all the things the committee is interested in certainly one is to avoid any increase in administrative expense. You can certainly rely upon us that all we want is a clear-cut picture of all the administrative details. If they can get those details to the committee in any shape, manner, or form we will welcome it. We do not want them to go to any extra trouble. If they can do it without setting up any bookkeeping activities, so much the better from our point of view.

Mr. HARDY. I am deeply grateful to the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, so that the House may enjoy the National Polish Day ceremony.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I inquire what time the House will meet tomorrow.

Mr. THOMAS. I will ask unanimous consent later that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to convene tomorrow at 11 a. m.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PRIEST] having assumed the chair, Mr. CHELF, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) entitled "An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51–20.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to special order heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] for 2 hours.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, in the history and development of modern democratic governments, it is usually the constitution of these governments that sets the standards and the rallying points of advancing political and economic freedom.

The Polish tradition of liberty and democracy found brilliant expression in the 3d of May constitution of 1791, the most democratic constitution to have been promulgated in the Old World up to that time. And it was the only constitution received by any nation without bloodshed. This constitution, expressing the genius and the tradition of the Polish people, recognized the equality of all men, proclaimed religious liberty and established by basic law the freedom of thought and speech. This constitution, this charter of human liberty, was adopted in Poland on the very heels of the American and French revolutions. Thus Poland joined with the new American Republic in enshrining in basic law the ideals of human dignity and liberty.

The similiarity between the American Constitution and the Polish Constitution, of Polish liberty and American liberty, was not one of mere coincidence in time. Historic contribution to American independence and to victory in our war of liberation was made by many gallant sons of Poland, whose names are well known in American history, heroes who rushed to these shores as soon as they heard the thrilling call of men to arms in the battle of liberty.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 did not, of course, long endure. The tyrants of Russia, Austria, and Prussia could not tolerate this bold flowering of human spirit. They could not permit, in close proximity to their territory, the spectacle of human dignity, worth, and freedom, this cultivation of the dangerous doctrine of democracy. And so Poland was extinguished as a nation.

Not until 1918, through the intervention of that great President, Woodrow Wilson, was Poland again free. It was President Wilson who then expressed as our American doctrine the position that every people has the inherent right to determine its own national destiny.

Today again the torch of liberty is extinguished in Poland. And yet the name of Poland should bring warmth to the hearts of every lover of freedom throughout the world. Our United States owes a special debt of honor to the Polish people, they whose heroism has kept alive so long the light of freedom in Eastern Europe. It is Poland which was made the reason for opening of World War II. It is Poland which, ironically

enough, we find nevertheless today in the toils of Soviet tyranny and slavery.

There is a tragic injustice in Poland's fate, in view of her glorious record of determination and sacrifice for the cause of liberty throughout the world. But Poland's fate is not unique. In our kind of world there will scarcely be justice for Poland until there is justice for Eastern Europe, justice for all of mankind.

The mask has now been stripped from the face of Communist aggression, and underneath it we find the grim countenance of Soviet imperialism which threatens to engulf not only Europe but eventually all of the world, unless the free people of the world come to an early awakening of the grim truth.

In 1939 Poland had to stand alone and hopelessly outnumbered by the Nazi hordes in its heroic defense of its freedom. The subsequent defeat of Hitler in World War II did not bring relief to stricken Poland. The world was told that Poland would again be free and independent. But the United States had not yet awakened to its responsibilities as a world power and defender of freedom. And so it was that Stalin was able to carry out his diabolical plot against Poland while the rest of the world stood helplessly by and watched a noble, freedom-loving people bludgeoned into submission. The Russian guaranties of free elections and freedom of the press proved to be empty and cynical pledges which they had no intention of fulfilling. Under a brutal campaign of terror, slavery, purges, and tyranny, Poland, a shattered nation, became subjected to Russian generals and Kremlin bureaucrats in Polish uniforms.

The tragic story of Poland is important not only to Poles but to all of the freedom-loving people of the world. It should constantly remind us of two very important lessons. First, it should impress upon our minds the necessity of international cooperation and action through the United Nations to prevent aggression and to protect the independence of small nations. And it should also be an everlasting reminder that when the Russians speak of democracy and promise freedom, they are in reality thinking of tyranny and promising slavery.

But the United Nations, in order to continue to retain the respect of the civilized world, must have a firm determination to act with courage and speed to prevent aggression. It will then again be the hope of mankind and capture the imagination of all peoples, even those living under the iron curtain.

The determination to finally stand up and resist aggression in Korea was a great step forward. It revived a light of hope to the free people of the world. But let us not let them down again, for we may never have another chance.

Now that the future of our own America is so obviously threatened by the menace of Soviet aggression, it is imperative that all Americans be made aware of what Soviet ruthlessness and what the callousness of Red Russian policy really means.

The American people and the world must be told also and clearly what our policy is, and we must firmly stand by it. This is no time for partisanship and no time to seek partisan capital out of a critical world situation. Nero fiddled while Rome burned. And we today are engaging in an old-fashioned partisan battle while our very existence is at stake.

We have no longer any moral or legal grounds to remain bound to the compacts of Yalta and Tehran. Russia has violated them in spirit and in deed.

But there are some among us today who are willing to make political capital out of the Yalta and Tehran agreements and in the same breath advocate a defeatist policy of isolationism; a policy of refusal to help Europe defend itself against communism, a policy which not only brings bleak gloom and despair to those in Poland and other countries beyond the iron curtain in whom there still remains some hope and confidence, but what is most tragic, a policy which cannot help but bring communism closer to our own shores.

And nowhere in the recent policy speeches in the great debate can we yet find any assurance that those who rise against the Russian despot elsewhere can count on our moral and material support. We seem strangely indifferent to the fate of those on the other side of the iron curtain.

I am thoroughly convinced that the people of Poland, in whom the spirit of freedom and liberty has always burned brightly, cannot and will not submit indefinitely to the rule of their Communist oppressors. I am confident that when the opportunity presents itself, the Polish people will throw off the yoke of dictatorship and again seek the freedom and independence which is their right and their ultimate destiny.

One of our best allies in the coming struggle with Soviet Russia, a struggle which appears to be more certain with every passing day, will be those Polish patriots who have so long made their mark upon the pages of the struggle for liberty throughout the world.

Let us proclaim in ringing words that the free portion of mankind will never reconcile itself to the permanent enslavement of those now subjugated by the Communists; that we shall not consider our job done until there is a complete liberation of all the Sovietized people. Let us break down their awful sense of isolation from the democratic world.

And words alone will not be enough. They must be backed by deeds—dramatic, forthright, and unequivocal. Only then shall we come to the great conflict of our era with clean hands and clean consciences. Only then will we capture the powerful, and perhaps decisive, weapon represented by the explosive discontents, by the aspirations for freedom, in the Communist dominated part of the world.

President Truman on April 6, 1945, said:

> We shall refuse to recognize any Government imposed on any nation by the force of any foreign power.

Let us repeat and implement that pledge with a positive and forceful declaration that we shall never rest until true freedom is restored to all freedom-loving people of the world, and until the obscene shadows of Kremlin power and Kremlin ambitions are lifted by the combined might of freemen on both sides of the iron curtain.

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

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman for the scholarly, splendid address he has made, and to join with him in the expressions he has given to the House today. I also want to say that I, too, look forward to the day, as I know the people of America do, when once again there will sound from the radios of Poland the strains of Chopin's Polonaise Militaire proclaiming to the world that Poland is again free.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this day in the annals of history records the great advance of the liberty loving and democratic people of Poland. On May 3, 1791, the Parliament of Poland adopted her famous constitution. This was a milestone on the highway of progress which followed along the same course as that prescribed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; which made America the land of the free, the champion of the oppressed, and a friend of all mankind. On the basis of our constitutional achievements, the world today looks to us for guidance and support.

Over the course of centuries the people of Poland have made progress and their objective has always been to live peacefully with their neighbors, while at home their fundamental desire, premised on a wholesome family life imbued with a religious fervor, was patterned to grow into a nation dedicated to the principle of perpetuating human dignity and the freedom of the citizen. The concept among the people of Poland, which is so deeply ingrained, holds that government is the servant and not the master, and accordingly that the duly chosen representatives of the people must carry out the untrammeled will of the electorate and not impose its autocratic will upon those whom it was intended to serve.

The people of Poland at this time, subjugated as they are by a despised and unfriendly foreign ideology and power, yearn for the day when the yoke of this oppression may be broken and discarded forever and the perverted and godless foe driven beyond its border. The people of Poland walled off behind the iron curtain may be assured that the American people, spurred by the patriotism and exemplary lives of more than 7,000,000 Americans of Polish antecedents, share the hopes and the aspirations of the people of Poland. We want to assure them, Mr. Speaker, on this day commemorating the adoption of the great Polish document of freedom that we have neither forgotten nor abandoned them to the bestiality of communistic dominance and control. No barrier, be it iron curtain or Chinese wall, will ever isolate or divide the people of Poland from their friends in the United

States of America. Every loyal American prays for the day when friendly relations between the Poles and the Americans may be freely and happily resumed, when the communistic hordes will be driven out or destroyed, and the glory that is Poland once again brought into its own. The imprint of the Muscovite horde and the welt of their murderous whiplash will be eradicated and healed, please God at the earliest day.

We in America, like our brethren in Poland, hold fast to the teaching of our Holy Mother the Church, deriving our daily sustenance in our undying faith that Poland's bonds will be broken and that she will rise again along with her sister nations who have been chained and enslaved by the fiends of communism. The spirit of the true Christian like a cuirass will give protection to the faithful people of Poland in their unshaken will as expressed in their daily prayers. Each day as the sun rises they will continue to raise their eyes and their hearts toward Mary the Queen of the Polish Crown, and in her intercession there will be the final assurance of Poland's complete restoration and the resumption of Poland's rightful place in the family of friendly nations.

The periods of persecution which the people of Poland seemingly must endure from time to time tends to temper the spirit which makes them a race which can never be exterminated and which will live forever.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the institution of the constitution of Poland.

After centuries of subjugation and the travail of conquering partitions, Poland emerged from the maelstrom of World War I as an integrated and full-fledged democracy in middle Europe.

Modern Poland and the democratic constitution under which it functioned were a monument to the political genius of Woodrow Wilson.

Modeled closely upon our own scheme of representative government, the Polish Constitution brought order to a people who had cherished and nurtured the hope of liberty with grim determination against seemingly hopeless odds throughout years of desperation.

How bitter, then, must be the hearts of the liberty-loving Poles in viewing today what appears to be the wreckage of their hopes.

The constitution so laboriously brought forth for the governance of free Poland is today prostituted to the manipulations of a puppet government which serves the beck and call of its masters in the Kremlin.

Its guaranties of political, social, and religious freedom are reduced to grimly ironic platitudes in the obscene mouthings of men who neither love Poland nor respect any constitution.

The tragedy which has befallen Poland in the form of her present partition is the more awful because it seemingly was accomplished under the forms and procedures of her democratic constitution.

The world outside the iron curtain knows, however, that the overpowering army of a hostile neighbor is the cause of Poland's plight, and that her constitution is truly suspended under the tyrannical government which rules her soil as a satellite of Soviet Russia.

When our own great charter of Federal Government went into effect, Benjamin Franklin stated that—

> Our Constitution is in actual operation; everything appears to promise it will last, but in this world nothing is certain but death and taxes.

The same appearances of promise attended the inauguration of the Polish Constitution. It was drafted here on our own soil. It was devised and intended to last for perpetuity. But its inherent virtue as an instrument of government was destroyed by venal men who were unworthy of its blessings.

Therein lies the pity and the tragedy of the present woeful state of the Polish Constitution.

Governments—

Said the founder of Pennsylvania—

> like clocks, go from the motion men give them and, as governments are made and moved by men, so by men they are ruined, too. Therefore, governments rather depend upon men than men upon governments.

The successful usurpation of the Government of Poland by men of political immorality leaves her constitution unscathed. The true virtue of Poland is in the body of her people.

When those people shall rise again, as they always have, from the ruins of their nation's conquest, they shall again clothe themselves with the adornments of freedom, justice, and brotherhood under the Polish Constitution.

It is only a matter of time and let us hope it will be soon, when the brave, liberty-loving people of Poland, a deeply religious people, will again regain their freedom and independence.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished dean of the Illinois delegation [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago it was my privilege in this House to speak on the one hundred and sixteenth anniversary of the adoption of the constitution submitted by King Stanislas Augustus II to the Polish Diet; today we recall the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of this event which lives in the minds and the memory of Poles everywhere. This document embodied the dreams of a great leader—dreams of liberty and democracy for a nation and its people following the liberation of struggling Poland from Prussian and Russian despotism. It is significant to note that this constitution was adopted about 15 years after our immortal Constitution became a reality. It was hailed by the Polish Congress of that day as a master document, and it received the unanimous approval of the Diet. Polish nationalism and Polish democracy had at last been achieved in the minds of the leaders of that day. There was joy and exultation throughout the land. The lights of Warsaw blazoned throughout the night; at last they were free.

It was the hope and dream of King Stanislas and his followers that from this constitution would come the stability to discourage the aggressive plans of her powerful neighbors. It sought to establish order under law. It held that reform without order was a tragic waste. This was perhaps its greatest promise to the people of Poland.

With powerful and ruthless dictators firmly entrenched on both sides, the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people were all too soon crushed by the second and third partitions in 1793 and 1795. Then, as always, Poland was the victim of its geographical location. A land of fertile plains, with little natural defensive barriers, it soon succumbed to the rolling hordes of the German Empire and Russia. Frederick William and Catherine the Great sent their armies on a tour of devastation and subjugation once again, and Poland lost her freedom and liberty.

In 1918, during World War I, the fate of Poland and other small nations of Europe, was again uppermost in the minds of our diplomats and those of our allies. It was in 1918 that I introduced a resolution to recognize the Polish regiments who joined others in fighting the Hapsburg autocracy, as part of our allied forces, which sacrificed its all in the fight against the Kaiser and his followers in the hope that through the defeat of Imperial Germany the liberty and freedom that Poland was seeking would become a reality.

Knowing that Germany and Kaiser Wilhelm actually controlled the Austrian Army, I had urged President Wilson not to conclude a separate peace with Austria-Hungary because it would not have brought an earlier end to the war as many believed, nor would it have advanced the interest of self-determination and freedom for Poland and other oppressed peoples of Europe. I was proud indeed that I finally succeeded in convincing President Wilson that we should keep our pledge and assurance to these liberty-loving and freedom-seeking peoples by refusing to negotiate a separate peace with Austria-Hungary.

After the defeat of Germany and Austria-Hungary, I urged, together with Professor Paderewski, Professor Masaryk, and other leaders of small nations, that the United States should demand that autonomy and freedom be given these oppressed nations. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House at that time I was gratified that this was brought about and Poland reunited as a free and independent nation.

In the case of Poland, as in many other instances, history has shown that peace, democracy, and stately order cannot be confined within the borders of any one nation. The peace the people of Poland sought in that day, and the peace the peoples of the world so earnestly pray for today, can only come through a meeting of the minds of leaders in nations the world over. It can never be achieved by wars, bloodshed, slaughter, and devastation. Again, history throughout all the ages has shown that the cruel scars of the hates and enmities engendered by conflict are never healed. Even though treaties are signed providing for the peaceful solution of

problems after war's end, the sores and ugly wounds resulting from these wars suddenly become infected again, and the noble words and efforts of diplomats and statesmen around the peace table become meaningless and the treaties mere scraps of paper.

The great problem facing the world today, as always, is to change the character of dictators whose aggressive designs on weak and struggling nations inevitably result in cataclysms of horror. Difficult as this task might seem, it is not impossible. Here is to be found the basis of American foreign policy today. The United Nations is the one hope of a torn and distressed world to accomplish this end. With all of the set-backs thus far experienced, I feel very strongly that patience and determination will ultimately result in the success of the United Nations in its laudable effort to bring peace and tranquillity among nations, to bring order out of chaos in world affairs, and to end the heartless slaughter and terrible destruction the world is constantly enduring.

Only when real peace is firmly established can the people of Poland and other small nations again enjoy the true freedom, liberty, order, and justice, so clearly outlined in the historic Polish Constitution of 1791. When that day dawns, as I hope and pray it will in the very near future, the people of Poland will again witness the unanimous action of its Diet ordaining and establishing a new constitution worthy of a great people, designed along the same lofty principles of freedom, democracy, and justice for all, laid down so wisely by King Stanislas Augustus II in that eventful year 1781. I earnestly hope and confidently expect when peace becomes a reality that Poland will regain the domain wrested from her and that all her nationals will again be reunited as one in the family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on this anniversary date we recall the great work of this democratic leader as an encouragement and inspiration to the freedom-loving peoples of Poland, reminding them that the struggle for peace is unending; it must go on until its full realization is with us all. Let all who believe that people everywhere are entitled to the freedom and liberty which we enjoy, cooperate and aid in every way so that Poland's aspirations, dreams, and hopes may come true and that once again they will become one of the great nations of the world.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable date in the minds and the hearts of the people of Poland and people of Polish ancestry everywhere in the world. This is the one hundredth and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution—the charter of liberty for the people of Poland.

That great nation has been the victim of much bitter suffering and humiliation since Constitution Day in 1791. Throughout her history she has endured the disaster of military conquest at the hands of more powerful neighbors several times. She is today under the domination of the Soviet Union, and her people today are tasting the bitter dregs of Communist rule.

In company with other countries behind the darkness of the iron curtain, the people of Poland have learned the sorrowful lessons from harsh personal experience that where communism prevails there is no freedom of the body, of the mind, or of the spirit. Her people were among the first to learn that communism is a godless struggle for world dictatorship founded on atheistic materialism.

But even now, as always before when she has been ground under the heel of foreign aggression, Poland may take some measure of comfort in the inspiration of this day on which her constitutional liberties were defined and given effect 160 years ago. The memories of that great event linger on as a basis for the hope and the prayers of Poles for the dignity of freedom and independence.

A nation which produced men with the courage and the will of a Pulaski, a Sobieski, and a Kosciusko is a nation which will never succumb to the lash of the dictatorship of communism or any other atheistic dogma.

It is a nation which is determined to regain its freedom no matter how long freedom must wait.

Not alone Americans of Polish descent but Americans who admire and respect the yearning of mankind everywhere for dignity and freedom share on this day a feeling of fraternity and kinship with the people of Poland whose fight for freedom may have been slowed down by a ruthless police state, but we take comfort in the knowledge that their fight will go on until it is won.

May God speed that great day.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland—May 3, 1791—presents to us the best opportunity for an appraisal of the true meaning of the present tragic plight of Poland.

The following two undisputable facts characterize the present situation:

First. Poland always was and today still remains an essentially western country, a Christian land whose culture, civilization, and attitude were as western in its orientation as those of France, Italy, Spain, and other western European countries.

Second. At the present time, while Poland is subjugated under Communist regime whose Soviet masters are in Moscow, Poland's centuries-old ties with the western culture and with the Christian world have been cut off, against the Nation's will, against its history and tradition, and against its best interest.

Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791, was the best expression of Poland's western way of thinking, Poland's strong intellectual and ideological ties with the cultured west, as opposed to the then, and still now, barbarian east.

It seems needless to prove that what happened in Warsaw, Poland, on that historic day of May 3, 1791, was but a logical result of the Poles' thinking and feeling along the lines of the then undergoing revolutionary changes in France, and, indeed, in these United States.

The powerful wind that was blowing from the west could not fail to reach Poland. The overthrow of the obsolete and tyrannical French monarchy, the ensuing currents of liberation of the human flesh and soul from dictatorial bondage, the actions undertaken by the revolutionary leaders of this country, have as they indeed must have, influenced the thinking and the conduct of the leaders of Poland.

Although Poland's monarchical system and the elective kings that it installed on Poland's throne, were in many ways much more liberal and certainly less dictatorial than most of the monarchical systems at the time prevailing in Europe—it was, nevertheless, true that a majority of Poland's population, especially the peasant class and the inhabitants of that country's towns and cities, were deprived of any influence on the affairs of state, at that time, before adoption of the liberal constitution of 1791. It is also true, however, that no other country in Europe had, at that time, a more democratic system of government based on a limited constituency.

The adoption of the constitution of May 3, 1791, brought Poland into the ranks of the new democracies of the world. Being threatened then—as she was throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—and up to date, unfortunately, by separate or combined efforts of Russia and Germany, regardless of the coloring of the regimes that the two predatory countries might have at their respective helms at any time, Poland has seen fit to enlarge the constituency upon which the Government was based, to give complete equality to all classes of its population, and to make a decisive step on exactly the same way to self-government, that this Nation had chosen under George Washington, assisted by the great son of Poland, Thaddeus Kosciusko.

The numerous provisions of the May 3 constitution include certain basic elements which have retained a lasting value for the Polish nation, as well as a number of valuable, just, and sound decisions.

The greatness of the May 3, 1791, constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system, and that is also the reason why this day marks both the crowning act of regeneration of the spirit of the Polish nation in the second half of the eighteenth century and, also, a testament of the progressive and evolutionary methods with which the Poles entered political life after the temporary downfall of their own state.

In the very forefront of lasting contributions of this constitution we must place the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which sovereignty was also made the primary postulate of

the first constitution of the restored Poland, passed on March 17, 1921. In the 1791 constitution this principle was formulated in the words:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation. Three distinct powers shall compose the Government of the Polish nation, according to the present constitution, viz:

1. Legislative power in the states assembled.

2. Executive power in the King and council of inspection.

3. Judicial power in jurisdiction existing, or to be established.

To any Western European, who had been reared in the French ideas, or even more in the age-old parliamentarianism of Britain, or in the principles which have been natural to the United States from their very beginning, this principle is almost a truism, and something natural in itself. But in Eastern and Central Europe it cuts off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared throughout the centuries in the principle of state, and not national sovereignty.

The philosophy of government discernable throughout this Polish Constitution would lead one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Throughout the May 3 constitution runs a philosophy of humanitarianism and tolerance, such as—

We publish and proclaim a perfect and entire liberty to all people, either who may be newly coming to settle, or those who, having emigrated, would return to their native country; and we declare most solemnly, that any person coming into Poland, from whatever part of the world or returning from abroad, as soon as he sets his foot on the territory of the republic, becomes free and at liberty to exercise his industry, wherever and in whatever manner he pleases, to settle either in towns or villages, to form, and rent lands and houses, on tenures and contracts, for as long a term as may be agreed on; with liberty to remain, or to remove, after having fulfilled the obligations he may have voluntarily entered into.

We find in this Polish Constitution, adopted almost contemporaneously with our own Federal Constitution, rule by majority, secret ballot at public elections, and the language relating to religion that—

The same holy religion commands us to love our neighbors, we, therefore, owe to all people of whatever persuasion, peace in matters of faith, and the protection of government; consequently, we assure, to all persuasions and religions, freedom and liberty, according to the laws of the country, and in all dominions of the republic.

Thus, it was on May 3, in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life.

That is why Poles everywhere since that year on May 3, on the anniversary of the adoption of this liberal constitution, celebrate their national holiday. In observing this day, we are joining Poles all over the world—in establishing spiritual contact with the only country where no celebrations of this national Polish holiday are allowed—namely, in liberated Poland.

Russia and Germany—or Prussia as it was then called—prevented Poland from gaining strength under the new constitution and with the assistance of the then existing Austrian monarchy proceeded to perpetrate the worst crime of the nineteenth century, the occupation and dismemberment of Poland.

The same crime was perpetrated by the same partners—minus Austria, of course—in 1939. And once more, the same crime was perpetrated by the only remaining member of the international criminal gang—Russia, under Stalin this time as in 1939—after the last war in 1945.

It seems improper to sound facetious in discussing problems of such gravity, magnitude and purport, as the problem of Poland. But, one cannot help but feel a little encouraged when one realizes that there is only one member of the international predatory group left—Soviet Russia.

Our President, speaking on behalf of the United States, has stated that—

Our country would not recognize any government imposed on any nation by the forces of any foreign power.

This looking toward a resurrection of a free Poland will find heart in the pledge of the American people.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the Polish National Constitution.

Every loyal son of Poland, whether in the motherland or living beyond its borders, celebrates this anniversary with patriotic pride. Every loyal friend of the brave and freedom-loving Polish people joints in commemorating this day with the hope that the time is not too far distant when Poland will again become a free and independent nation.

Poland, back through the years, has always fought for liberty and freedom whenever its domain has been encroached upon by powerful aggressor nations. In the recent war Poland was the first nation to take a stand, not only against the Panzer divisions of the Nazis but also against the vicious onslaught of the Soviet tyrant. Poland did not submit meekly agains terrific odds as did other nations at the beginning of World War II. As we look back upon the beginning of Hitler's aggression, we remember how Hitler conquered country after country and the world looked with hope that his onslaught would be hampered and delayed. The world will never forget the valiant and brave defense of Warsaw in September of 1939 by the heroic stand of the Polish Army. The heroic Polish people from the beginning of the war battled the invader not only within their own borders but also on every other battle front in Europe until the enemy surrendered. Poland's loss, per capita, was the greatest in human life and with prisoners in murderous concentration camps of any nation in that conflict.

Poland carried through and fought on and was deserving of the highest reward for the victory, but today Poland is not free. She is governed by a communistic regime forced upon her by Soviet Russia. The Polish people are not Communists. They believe in free enterprise and freedom of religion. They are a Christian people. The Polish people have defended Christianity for centuries and will continue to do so until the last vestige of atheistic communism is driven from their country.

Poland has a right to demand the restoration of her eastern boundaries as they were in 1939 and her western boundaries permanently fixed on the Oder-Niesse line. This is territory from which she has been robbed and it must be returned.

The Russian betrayal, as it allowed the Nazi overlords to slaughter the Polish people, will be recorded as history's most barbarous duplicity and treachery.

The discovery of the graves of over 5,000 Polish officers near Katyn on April 12, 1943, reveals a new low in international banditry, the like of which has never been surpassed in world history. Over a year and a half ago I called upon the State Department, International Red Cross, and also in a speech on the floor of Congress, demanded that a special investigation be instituted in order to secure concrete and direct evidence to officially determine the responsibility for the massacre at Katyn. In response to this, both of these departments assured me that every effort would be made to directly place the responsibility for this violation of international law regarding captive soldiers.

I am recalling these facts because it is our duty to keep alive in the minds of free nations everywhere the type of criminal intellect which predominates the brain of the present rulers of the communistic Soviet regime. It is evident now that the democratic and free nations of the world must marshal all their forces to stamp out the spread of dictatorial aggression and not repeat the mistakes that were made after World War I when the isolationists got control of our Government and repudiated Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. Had America, the greatest Nation of the world, accepted its responsibilities 30 years ago, aggression by dictators could have been stopped and World War II would have been avoided.

We must now rally behind the United Nations, and it is my earnest hope and belief that the steps that we have taken in Korea to stop aggression, will be the beginning of the age-old effort to successfully outlaw war. No international organization similar to the strength and power of the United Nations has ever been tried in world history before. Let us hope that we have found a solution.

We must follow through. If we do, Stalin will either be crushed from without or overthrown by his own subjects from within. The gallant Polish nation, which has fought so many defensive wars in times past, will again achieve the in-

dependence, the liberty and the peace to which she is entitled. Until Russia proves by her actions that she is willing to cooperate instead of dominate, the United Nations must be ready and on guard for any surprise attack.

The time has now come when every nation in the world which intends to survive, must know that it cannot make agreements with other nations and discard them. High on the priority list of wrongs to be undone, is to require that Russia withdraw all of her military and civilian forces from Poland and permit that heroic nation to breathe freely again. The same yardstick applies to other nations under the whiplash of tyranny. The democratic nations wanted peace too much when the war was raging with Japan. That was before the atom bomb appeared on the scene. Unfortunate concessions were made to Russia for her help in the Japanese war theater.

The mistakes made at Yalta 6 years ago today in yielding to the Russians must be corrected and rectified. At that time, our military leaders underestimated our strength. We did not know then that the atom bomb was soon to knock Japan into surrender. Yalta and Tehran and the results of the mistakes incident to those conclaves, will be a threat to world peace until the day comes when the Soviet aggressor retreats behind its own border. Russia has broken its promises—agreements made at Yalta and Tehran should be thrown in the wastebasket.

Where slavery by a dictator exists as it does in Poland, or any other nation who wishes to be free, it stands as a threat to freedom everywhere. The communistic dictatorship will be eventually overthrown in Russia and it is our earnest hope that this will come about from a revolution within. Whether from within or from outside force, Soviet dictatorship of democratic countries cannot continue. Our sacrifices to protect freedom throughout the world are costly, but necessary.

A free and independent Poland will rise again so that Polish Constitution day, May 3, can continue to be a reality.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world today, all Poles and all persons of Polish extraction together with all freedom-loving people pause to commemorate the Polish Fourth of July. One hundred and sixty years ago today, the Polish Constitution was adopted, a very definite step toward the recognition of the basic right of all people to a free and democratic way of life.

The history of the Polish people is a glorious one—it is a record of valor unsurpassed, of courage without fear, of honor without blemish. And so it is fitting today that we recall Poland's magnificent heritage, ever present through the years, that we recall that spirit of Poland which never yielded its devotion to an ideal.

It has been said that the true measure of a people's greatness is in its fidelity to its native ideals. If this be true, then the Polish people are without peer, for the record they have achieved in resisting the forces of oppression and tyranny in the face of almost insurmountable odds stands as a splendid example to people of all races and all creeds.

Through the centuries, Poland has had her great leaders—her Pulaski, her Sobieski and her Kosciusko—men of extraordinary courage, character, and capabilities. Yet all the great men of Poland, no matter how varied their spheres of influence or how different their fields of endeavor, have inherited several things in common which gave them their reason for being—their love of God and their religion, their love of country, and their burning desire for its eventual liberation.

The heroic stand of Poland in 1939 in the face of aggression by superior force was an example of courage unparalleled in history. When Poland offered the first resistance to the overwhelming strength of Hitler and the Nazi war machine, she inspired the freedom-loving nations of the world and brought home to them the first realization of the Axis threat to civilization. Had Poland compromised instead of resisting aggression, the whole course of history might have been changed.

Poland's contribution to the success of the allied nations during World War II and the fight of her people to preserve Western civilization as they had on several previous occasions make it incumbent upon us to keep faith with the Polish people now at a time when her long-cherished freedom is once again in chains.

We must continue our efforts to restore Poland to her prewar glory. We are morally obligated to render all possible assistance to Poland in her underground struggle to break the chains of Russian communism by which she is now surrounded and which threaten to engulf all of Europe.

If we of the United Nations go forward in the spirit of the brave people of Poland, who are resisting by every possible means the domination of Communist Russia and her satellites, it is my conviction that we can build a world where intolerance and aggression are only bitter memories of the past and where the ideals of liberty and justice are adhered to by all nations of the world.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of a great historical event that took place in Poland by the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, less than 3 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States.

The lifetime of every nation is marked by certain momentous events. From generation to generation significant anniversaries are observed for the great influence wrought upon the course of history and human relations. The Bastille, the Magna Carta, the Fourth of July have a counterpart in every country.

To the Poles there is one date which for over a century and a half retains the highest, the most honored place, and is cherished by the entire Polish element throughout the world with unparalleled fervor. It is the 3d of May, when they commemorate the adoption of the constitution by the Commonwealth of Poland in 1791, which took place amid general national rejoicing and patriotic enthusiasm. May I quote at this time a part of that constitution:

> Every person, upon coming to this republic from whatsoever parts of the world or one returning to this, the country of his origin, as soon as his foot touches the Polish soil, he is entirely free to indulge in whatsoever enterprise he wishes to enter, in the manner and place of his own choice; that person is free to enter into contact for purchase of property, for work, for rent in whatever manner and for whatever time he himself agrees upon; he is at liberty to settle in the city or in the village; he is free to live in Poland or to return to whatever country he himself chooses after his commitments in Poland which he voluntarily embraced, are duly performed and completed.

This constitution of May 3 abolished restrictions upon the freedom of the individual and gave the Polish nation a democratic form of government. However, due to the aggressiveness of its neighbors, the Polish nation was allowed by a short time in which to enjoy the blessings of its democratic rule. The three powerful neighbors of Poland—Russia, Germany and Austria—were dissatisfied with the reforms introduced in Poland by this constitution. They connived among themselves, and partitioning Poland, put an end to the freedom and democracy of the Polish nation. It was not until much later, that, thanks to the efforts of one of our presidents, Woodrow Wilson, it regained its freedom and independence.

With almost 1,000 years of national existence, Poland ranks among the oldest European nations. Varied was her fortune through the centuries. There was a time when she constituted one of the major powers of Europe, when princes and monarchs sought her favor and aid; but at no time has she sought her neighbors' possessions, or sinned by invading and terrorizing their lands. If she grew territorially, it was not through conquest, but as a result of concord with the adjoining countries who freely desired a permanent union with her. For through alliance with Poland they found the realization of the freedom and personal liberties which no other country offered.

The Poles have a deep, natural love of freedom; it is something so vital in their soul that they fight and die for it wherever it is attacked, or where it is to be gained or ransomed at the cost of wounds and blood. Upon the pages of American history their names are honorably recorded for their contribution to the independence of this country. Kosciuskó and Pulaski serve not only as a classic evidence, but shall forever remain revered national heroes of Poland and the United States.

Confronted with tremendously adverse and crucial conditions of the present day, the Polish Nation looks expectantly to the magnanimity and democracy of the United States for assistance in dispelling the yoke of aggression enforced upon her by outside influences, so that she may restore independence and take her place among the free nations of the world.

It is, therefore, just and reasonable to assure the people of Poland on the day of their national holiday that the United States shall not fail to extend them friendly support nor relax in vigilance over the execution of justice. Our great and prosperous republic bears proudly the banner of humane policies. It has drawn universal respect as a decided enemy of injustice and enslavement. It will not, it cannot, add disappointment to the present fate of Poland.

It is impossible today to recall the Constitution of May 3 without comparing the events of the eighteenth century with what has taken place in Poland.

After years of unfortunate appeasement of Germany, during the dark days of September 1939, it was the Polish Nation which first took up arms against the evil forces of violence and aggression. The events of war developed in such a way that many of us subconsciously forget the part that Poland played in World War II. We forget the ideals and the principles, which Poland rose to defend, and which are being fought for today by almost the entire world. We forget that the chief slogan at the outbreak of war was the struggle for individual freedom, the defense of the weaker against the stronger, the struggle for justice above evil.

In the opening days of World War II, President Roosevelt called Poland an inspiration to all nations, because Poland alone dared defy the Germans in their ruthless challenge of those freedoms and democratic liberties championed by Poland.

It was but a short-lived appellation. Poland, that inspiration to all nations, was ignominiously sold down the Soviet river and today it is languishing in the throes of Russian forced slavery.

Today Poland's sons, scattered through the various parts of the globe, dare not place their foot upon Polish soil for fear of unjust reprisals, uncertain of their property and life in the land of their origin because Poland's political life is dominated by secret police and puppet agents of Soviet Russia who control its political life.

The third of May has ceased to be an official Polish national holiday in Poland by decree of the present regime in Poland. But the third of May remains a Polish national holiday in the hearts of all true Poland, and in all centers in the United States where Poles or Americans of Polish extraction live. In numerous Polish national homes, the Polish flag hangs proudly on this day, side by side with the American Stars and Stripes. Thousands of people listen attentively to the voices of the past. They hope that there will again be a Poland which in the spirit of the constitution of May 3 will be independent once more and free from foreign invaders.

On this day, the third of May, the hearts and minds of the American people are as one with the Polish nation, linked by indissoluble bonds of friendship with the United States. For the principles of the 3d of May constitution are in line with the ideals on which the American Nation bases its existence and the realization which America desires for all the people of the world.

So on this day, the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the constitution of the 3d of May of Poland, let us give our Polish friends our most sincere assurance of our moral support; to cheer them; to encourage them in their continued fight for freedom in the full sense of the word. Long live Poland.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the birth of an idea—the idea of modern government based on democratic principles.

In the eighteenth century Poland, extending from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea, was still a large country, the third in size among European states. But she was growing weaker internally, owing to the exhausting war fought in the seventeenth century and the lack of a strong executive. In 1764 Catherine II of Russia imposed on the electors her own candidate, Stanislaus Poniatowski, who was the last king of Poland. He was entirely under the influence of Russia, who did all she could to maintain chaos in the country. An attempt at resistance was made and a military league, the Confederation of Bar, to drive out the Russian troops from Poland, was formed under the leadership of Casimir Pulaski, who later became one of the heroes of the American Revolution. The Confederation broke, and in 1772 the first partition of Poland took place. Prussia annexed Pomorze, that is the Baltic coast, Russia, the eastern provinces, and Austria, the southeastern parts.

Deeply shaken by this disaster, the Polish people started stupendous internal reforms. The first Ministry of Public Education in the world was created in Poland in 1773, the treasury and army were reorganized, and a new constitution was voted on May 3, 1791. That day has since been the Polish national holiday. The constitution of May 3 established the foundations of modern government on democratic principles. At that time only England, France, and Poland had a liberal constitution in Europe, all the other countries being ruled by despotic regimes. The autocrats of Russia and Prussia called the democratic Polish constitution anarchy and annexed further provinces of Poland in 1793. Thereupon General Kosciusko issued a proclamation calling the Polish nation to arms. After a few initial victories Kosciusko was defeated and Poland lost her freedom in 1795.

The partition of Poland—

Says Lord Eversly, the English historian—

although remote and indirect, was the essential cause of the World War. The partition overthrew the European equilibrium and introduced the victory of violence and the principle: Might is right.

Throughout the nineteenth century the Polish Nation never lost hope of regaining independence. During the Napoleonic era, General Dabrowski formed Polish legions to fight on the side of France in Italy. It was then that the song Poland Is Not Yet Lost was composed, later to become the national anthem of reborn Poland. Napoleon intended to reestablish the Polish State and created its nucleus, the Dutchy of Warsaw. After Napoleon's fall the Congress of Vienna in 1815 assigned the major part of Poland to Russia. But the Tsar exercised such tyranny that the Polish Nation rose in 1830 to free itself from Russian bondage. The insurrection was suppressed after a year's war and the last shadow of freedom was taken away from Poland.

In 1863 the Poles rose again. A secret revolutionary government was formed in Warsaw with Romuald Traugutt at its head. But the insurrection was eventually suppressed with great difficulty; tens of thousands of Poles were executed, Traugutt and others were seized and deported to Siberia. Henceforth Poland was treated with the utmost ruthlessness, no efforts being spared to Russify the Polish Nation.

POLAND, TOO, HAD ITS KOREA

One could list the events in Poland from 1863 through the present time, including World War I and World War II.

Suffice it to say that, like the people of Korea, the people of Poland have been split by artificial means which were not successful. The thirty-eighth parallel in Korea is a travesty on the dignity of a courageous people. Let us hope that on this day, we have seen the last of parallels, Curzon lines, and so forth and that one day, even Ireland may be undivided. Covenants may separate people, but the heartbeat in every man, woman, and child makes mockery of covenants not founded on the right of a people to be governed by their consent.

Poland is not yet lost, and in our lifetime, I pray that she will again know freedom, in the true spirit of Woodrow Wilson, her benefactor.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, millions of Poles all over the world celebrate today the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the May 3 constitution of 1791. This historic document was adopted by the freedom-loving people of Poland on May 3, 1791, less than 3 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. The first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a European nation, it resembles our own Constitution in many respects. It recognized the fundamental principle of democracy that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." It guaranteed freedom of religion. It adopted the principle of division of authority among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The Polish people are proud of their constitution. It is an immortal testa-

ment to the political genius of a people who during the past 150 years have enjoyed only two decades of national freedom.

The Polish Constitution is to the Polish people their charter of liberty and is comparable to the Magna Carta for the English and the Declaration of Independence for our own beloved America. It is fitting and proper that the Congress of the United States should set aside a portion of its deliberations on this, the great national feast day of the people of Poland, and pay tribute to the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. The people of America have ever been grateful for the services rendered during the dark days of the Revolution by the brave Polish patriot, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the father of American cavalry, who gave his life for the cause of freedom while leading his troops into action during the Battle of Savannah. Count Pulaski was a tried and trusted friend of our own immortal George Washington, as was Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, who likewise served under Washington.

Today the casualty lists from Korea are full of Polish names of our brave soldiers of Polish descent whose magnificent record of patriotism and sacrifice does honor to our country, as well as to the memory of their gallant ancestors, like Pulaski, Kosciusko, Karge, Krzyanowski, and others, who fought and died for America's noble ideals.

Many thousands of my constituents are of Polish descent. I have known and admired them for many years. I have shared their sorrow when Poland was partitioned by Hitler and Stalin, and I sympathize with them with all my heart, knowing how their families and friends now suffer under the Red yoke.

What I desire to say was well expressed many years ago by George Brandes, who said:

> Old Field Marshal Moltke one day said that, in a book he had read about Poland, he had been most pleased by this sentence: "We do not love Poland as we love Germany or France or England, but as we love freedom"; a very curious remark from the lips of one whom one would not suspect of loving freedom overmuch.
>
> We love Poland as we love freedom. For what is it to love Poland but to love freedom, to have a deep sympathy with misfortune, and to admire courage and enthusiasm? Poland is a symbol—a symbol of all that the best of the human race have loved, and for which they have fought. In Poland the contrasts of human life are found in bold relief; here the cosmos is concentrated as in an essence.
>
> Everywhere in Europe where there has been any fighting, the Poles have taken part in it, on all battlefields, on all the barricades. They have sometimes been mistaken in their views of the enterprises to which they lend their arms; but they believed that they were fighting for the good of humanity; they regarded themselves as the bodyguard of freedom, and still look on everyone that fights for freedom as a brother.
>
> Poland, in the historical development of relations, has become synonymous with our hope or our illusion as to the advance of our age in culture. Its future coincides with the future of civilization.

In paying tribute to those sons and daughters of Poland who died for freedom and Christianity, and those who now continue in the noble tradition of the cross held high by the White Eagle over Poland's martyred soil, I am going to change Dante's inscription over the entrance to the Inferno which reads: "Lasciate ogni speranza voi ch'entrate"—Abandon all hope you who enter here.

To the Poles in Poland and all over the world I say: "Have hope you who now suffer and fight. Have hope that Poland will be freed to be a Christian, free, independent and happy land in a new peaceful world. If there is no hope for you, then there is no hope for the world."

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the May 3 Polish Constitution Day. To all Poles this day has the celebrated meaning of our American Fourth of July.

Because Poland's history goes back more than 1,000 years—a history filled with glory and sacrifice, one asks why have the Poles added such great significance to May 3, 1791? The reasons are many. The signing of the constitution on this day meant the end of the nobility, which at the time was the ruling class of Poland. It meant that the oppressed masses of people were emancipated. This document meant that Poland was to have a constitution modeled after our own Constitution, which was adopted only 2 years earlier, and provided for three separate and equal branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. It meant that the Polish Diet—equivalent to our Congress—was to consist of two chambers: First, the Chamber of Deputies; and, second, the Chamber of Senators, with the King at its head as presiding authority. To the Poles it meant the guaranty of religious toleration; rule by the majority of citizens; secret ballots at public elections; personal security. Poland was no longer to be a government of a few, but a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

This was the substance of the constitution which was approved on May 3, 1791, by the Polish Diet and Stanislaus August Poniatowski, Poland's last King. It was accepted by all Poles as a symbol of democracy and liberty. This document became a guide for Poland's future.

Progressive thinkers throughout Europe hailed it as a significant step in establishing a modern political system. But the recognition of equality of all men, the proclamation of religious liberty promised in the constitution, were more than Russia, Prussia, and Austria could tolerate, so these three neighboring countries attacked Poland with full force on all sides.

Poland fell in 1795 and was partitioned, but the May 3 constitution kept the spark of spirit and hope alive in the Polish people. The constitution brought moral victory for millions of Poles who became infused with a new patriotism and love of liberty. For 127 years, the Polish people thought, planned, and plotted for their national independence. Their struggle for independence never ceased. The Poles tried to free themselves many times through insurrections which failed. Even though all of their uprisings were unsuccessful, and many Poles lost their lives, the cause of freedom was never lost. The May 3 constitution served as a beacon of political freedom and democratic government.

From the role of living in bondage, the people of Poland were restored as a republic in 1918. The dreams of Polish patriots for 127 years were realized. The new government was set up, with a few technical changes, along the lines of the constitution of May 3, 1791. Once again Poland flourished as an independent nation. Her people enjoyed the privilege of democratic living. However, the happy, glowing picture of a free and independent Poland was blotted out by World War II. First, Germany invaded Poland and enslaved its people. Then the Russians took over and made a mockery of freedom and all the principles set forth in the May 3 constitution.

During this second world conflict, the Poles, inspired by the ideals of freedom and love of liberty, fought bravely on all battle fronts—in Africa, England, France, Italy. They fought at Narvik, on the Maginot Line, and at Monte Cassino. Millions of Poles gave their lives so that other people in the world might be free. They fought not only in defense of their own freedom, but also in the defense of the threatened freedom of the whole world. The western democracies assured the Polish nation repeatedly that its great sacrifices will not be in vain, and it will regain independence and freedom. The Polish nation believed in these assurances.

Unfortunately, the victorious end of World War II did not bring the richly deserved and longed-for freedom and independence to the Polish nation. Surely, freedom and independence were earned by the Poles for fulfilling a duty beyond glory. The sacrifices borne by Poland, as our ally, were not surpassed by any nation, yet she was denied her rightful place among the peoples of the world.

For this, the western democracies must bear the responsibility—since the promises given to Poland have not been kept. Regretfully, I must confess that the present administration has been a party to the betrayal of Poland at Yalta and Tehran. It agreed to turn Poland over to the Soviet sphere of interest, to Soviet bondage and complete abandonment by the western democracies.

The Polish nation under the Communist regime knows full well the tyranny of a dictator. I shall enumerate some of the changes which have taken place since the Politburo took over in Poland: the introduction of the Soviet slave-labor system for the workers; the beginning of the collectivization of agriculture; the placing at the head of the regime, and the army, well known and experienced international Communist agents; the speeding up of the Communist indoctrination of the youth; the open fight against the church; the complete economic dependence on the state.

Such is the reward of a once proud nation which was the first to take up

arms in the cause of freedom and independence. Surely, we cannot abandon the hopes and aspirations of a freedom-loving nation. The present sad plight of the Polish people can be traced back to the mistakes made by this administration when, at Yalta and Tehran, the Western Powers left Poland to the fate of Russian domination. Russia, with impunity, violated all her obligations toward Poland, and now ruling over Poland indivisibly, prepares Poles as cannon fodder for the armed clash with western democracies in its endeavors to force communism throughout the entire world. In the name of justice, is it not time for us to rectify the wrongs of Yalta and Tehran by invalidating these pacts of appeasement?

We must be ever mindful, especially on this anniversary, of the promises of our allies concerning the Polish nation, which are, to guarantee a free, strong, and independent Poland. In formulating our policies to eradicate communism, we cannot forget this unfortunate nation which is jailed behind the iron curtain.

The Polish people are not without hope. They are Poles, cheerful, hopeful, idealistic as their forefathers have been, imbued with patriotism and a deep love of freedom. They are mindful of the spirit of their constitution of May 3. Today, the torch of freedom is burning in the hearts of every Pole and with our help and God's blessings they will not rest until the day of emancipation is at hand. Deliverance of Poland from the communistic yoke will once again give the Polish people an opportunity to live in a land of freedom and independence as was the intention of the signers of Poland's historic constitution which was adopted 160 years ago today.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and proud to follow in these exercises my distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] who has just spoken to us so eloquently. I came to Congress with Mr. SADLAK and I know how close to his heart have been the matters of which he has spoken today and how diligently he has pursued them.

Each year we celebrate our Fourth of July with parades, firecrackers, and political speeches at picnics. Because we are a free people, united under one flag, we show our exuberant rejoicing in any fashion we please. But today the Polish people can only sit by their hearths and silently recall the days when they too were free and independent and united, not menaced by the constant threat of a knock on the door at midnight.

Just as the signing of the Declaration of Independence signifies to us the beginning of our determination as a united people to be free from tyranny and foreign rule, so the Polish Constitution Day, May 3, has the same deep meaning for all people of Polish origin, whether at home or abroad.

In 1791, 160 years ago, the Polish king Stanislaus Augustus II presented to the Diet this precious document, setting forth widespread reforms and granting greater individual liberty for all his people. It was adopted by acclamation, and that night lights burned in all the houses as the capital city celebrated the beginning of its newly won freedoms. Unlike surrounding countries, the Poles achieved these rights by peaceful means, without the necessity of revolting against despotic rulers. The Polish people may well be proud of the fact that their liberty was an inherited tradition, the natural evolution of centuries of self-respect and regard for the rights of others.

Poland's enjoyment of its constitution was tragically short-lived since after 2 years the armies of foreign conquerors engulfed it. At one fell swoop, Poland lost its independence, constitution, civil order, and justice which had been carefully cultivated and preserved during four centuries of progress.

But the will to resist was not lost, and through the intervening years of war and slavery, with only brief intervals of peace and independence, the hope of eventual liberation and self-determination has sustained the Polish nation in their fierce resistance to enslavement or resignation to that dire plight.

The history of Poland holds for all freedom-loving peoples a profound moral lesson. Poland's is the tragedy of a rich, fertile country, surrounded by voracious, powerful neighbors, from whom they are protected by no natural barriers.

In this country, we occasionally tend to think that our freedom and our present national strength are exclusively the result of our own unique virtues. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our infant democracy came to maturity in a country with almost unlimited natural resources and wealth, surrounded and protected from hostile countries by thousands of miles of ocean over which no trespasser could attack. So we do well to remember that the desire for liberty is not enough. Independence without the means to defend it is a hollow possession on this earth today.

With each passing day, the obstacles of space and weather are being overcome by human resourcefulness, and with this progress, our natural defenses lose their effectiveness. We can only hope, as we review the inspiring history of Poland under the most bleak and terrible ordeals, that should we ever be reduced to similar circumstances, we would strive with equal heroism and determination for our Nation's eventual freedom and independence as this small nation has done.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States often think of Eastern Europe as a part of the world having little in common with the West; an area where the population is accustomed to despotism and neither knows nor cares for anything else.

This view may or may not be true for some countries in the East. It is certainly not true for Poland. Whereas Russia looks back on a thousand years of despotic regimes, one after another, and the German-Austrian Empire evolved a very elaborate system of absolutism, Poland, between these two powerful neighbors, was one of the first countries in Europe to have a parliament and a bill of rights. True, we do not find in Poland a long-established democratic tradition in the modern western sense. But this is not due to a lack of democratic tendencies among the people as expressed in their institutions. On the contrary, in the sixteenth century, Poland already had a National Diet which controlled the King's power and regarded the unanimity principle as the cornerstone of civil liberties. Every delegate had the "liberum veto" which enabled him to stop the whole legal procedure in much the same way as in the Continental Congress of the 13 American colonies. There was not too little democratic spirit in Poland, rather too much of it. Polish individualism often endangered the interests of the whole country. It led, unfortunately, to the division of the country by its powerful neighbors. At the time when in North America as well as in Western Europe democratic tendencies were being legally consolidated and organized, Poland slipped from the main stream of political development.

For 150 years, Poland ceased to exist as an independent nation. Russia, Germany, and Austria tried vainly to de-Polandize the provinces where it had stood. After the first partition, in spite of the threatening neighbors, the Polish Diet worked for 4 years, without a break, on the project of a constitution which was ratified on May 3, 1791. This was the foundation on which the hope of freedom and further democratic development continued to rest during the dark decades of national oblivion.

It proved to be a hope that even the ruthless methods of suppression of the Germans and Russians failed to extinguish. Polish patriots fled to Western Europe and to the United States. They fought for American, Greek, Italian independence, hoping that by serving the general cause of human freedom, they would eventually help their own country to resume its place among the free nations.

Polish civilization and way of life, though Slavic, has always had its strong and inalienable ties with the West. The Polish people for example, still cling to their Roman Catholic faith despite all efforts to destroy it.

Today in Poland, a new, wholesale effort at Russianization is being made—all the more ruthless, since Poland is now cut off from the Western World. But the people who, between two partitions of their country were able to work for 4 years on a constitution that established the basis for further democratic evolution in Poland, will not yield to terrorism. The Poles have often been disillusioned in their hopes. Nevertheless, they still look to the west, and especially to the United States for inspiration. Here, they see achieved their ideal of independence. If we do not break faith with that nation whose sons have contributed so much to our own country, their hope for a rebirth of freedom will one day be realized.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the Polish leaders, inspired by our war for

independence and the rights and privileges granted to our people under our constitution, promoted a new constitution for the Polish people, under which they obtained the rights they are now being denied. Their constitution was one of the most liberal and democratic documents of its day.

Today, as we again commemorate the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, we are forced to admit that little progress has been made toward helping Poland and the other enslaved nations, to throw off the yoke of their oppressors.

The Polish people have been among the most ardent and courageous fighters for the rights granted to them under the constitution. Their history is replete with stories of their heroic sacrifices for their freedom and independence. And even today, the consecration, endurance, ingenuity and bravery of the Poles in the underground service, is almost unbelievable.

Enemies may conquer their country, but they can not conquer their spirit. These unconquerable people have made themselves the symbol of indomitable national will. If ever a nation, by sacrifice and courage, earned the right to resurrection, it is Poland.

By our economic and financial assistance to the free European countries, we are helping them to rebuild their economies and to strengthen their opposition to communism. By our efforts, with other democratic nations of the world, to prevent the spread of communism in Korea, we are helping tremendously to build up the morale of the enslaved nations, and the nations in danger of enslavement by the Communists.

May the day soon come when the freedom envisioned by the writers of the Polish constitution and for which the people of that nation have so valiantly fought and died, may be an established fact.

It is my fervent hope that through the efforts of the United Nations, it will soon be possible to find a way to restore to Poland and the other nations now behind the iron curtain, their freedom and independence, so that they may again take their places among the democratic nations of the world and enjoy the rights and privileges to which all men are entitled.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I arise before this great body as an American that loves his country and for what stands. My main reason for arising here on this 3d of May is to draw a parallel of what may happen in this country of ours if we are not careful. A review of Poland's history during the time we were fighting for our liberty may, I sincerely hope, will help to bring out the kind of a war we were fighting the last few years and are fighting today. It is not a war of armies but a war of demoralization.

During the crucial last quarter of the eighteenth century, when this great Nation of ours was being born, when the very foundations were being laid for its future might and glory, almost half around the globe a Christian nation was being murdered by its greedy neighbors.

In the course of three consecutive partitions of 1772, 1793, and 1795 the Royal Republic of Poland was first overrun and then completely dismembered and deprived of its independence for 123 years.

Americans question why do we think and talk of these far-off events today? Why do we in the United States of America commemorate the Polish Third of May 1791 Constitution? While in the course of history many nations had lived, flourished and then were crushed by their stronger neighbors, it seems to me that today more than ever we have not only to pause for a short while but we should ponder and seriously reflect on all the circumstances and many cases preceding these fateful events. As strange and even incredible as it may seem, some of the very factors which had largely contributed to Poland's fall, more than one and a half centuries ago, continue to exist and to cast their shadows not merely on the life of single nations but of the whole world including our own United States of America.

There were many reasons why, after over 800 years of existence as one of the pillars of liberty, law, and western civilization in Eastern Europe, Poland was wiped off the map of the old continent. Her intents were like ours—to live in peace. Several generations of historians wrote volumes of scholarly books on the subject searching for and finding many causes of the collapse of the Polish State, despite its great reforms realized in the 3d of May constitution.

Today, however, it is particularly proper and fitting to draw the attention of the public of our country to one of these causes often mentioned, though not always sufficiently emphasized by many historians and political thinkers.

The life of the Polish Nation, ever since the beginning of the fifteenth century, and particularly since its union with the grand duchy of Lithuania in the latter part of the sixteenth century, the whole existence of the Polish Commonwealth was based on political and religious freedom, on national and racial tolerance. For over three centuries its elected kings were not autocratic monarchs but rather chief executives, whose personal rule was restricted, controlled, and checked by statutes of law; royal privileges signed by the king elected by the will of the electors—the gentry—organized in provincial dietines and the central diet called sejm or parliament. This gave considerable measure of personal liberty to a much greater portion of the country's population at that time than in the majority of contemporary European nations.

But the very same traditions of power based on law, of free open debate, of equalitarian democracy and liberty were the source of Poland's weakness, they having been continuously exploited and abused by its expansionist neighbors, particularly by the Czarist then imperial Russia and the militaristic Prussia, as the always willing follower and accomplice of Moscow and St. Petersburg in spoliation of freedom-loving peoples of Eastern Europe.

Before Poland was partitioned in the end of the eighteenth century the Tsarist autocratic Russia true to its deep-rooted centuries-long tradition of subversion, spying, and conquest from within was buying with favors and gold influential personalities, particularly among Polish aristocracy and a few bankrupt, ambitious, or irascible individuals among the gentry, to put their personal freedoms to work for the benefit of Russian despots and against the very existence of Poland as an independent state.

One is stricken today with amazement upon finding how little actual military power was used by Russia in the conquest of the eighteenth century Poland and how much effort, skill, and energy was applied by Russia's rulers and their able subordinates to weaken, sap, and destroy its victim from within, before the final blow was delivered from without.

The whole length of the eighteenth century not just one but all Russian despots, particularly Peter the Great, Peter the Third, and Catherine the Second, through their ambassadors in Warsaw, their agents and spies, often recruited among the best families of the nation, progressively and systematically strangled its independence, putting on the royal throne in Warsaw their followers the hated Saxon princes or controlling the whole reign of the last King of Poland, Stanislaus August Poniatowski.

Having expanded in Asia beyond any limits of justifiable needs they turned toward hated and disdained Europe and first of all against Poland as the nearest to Russia's outpost of western civilization. When after his gallant participation in our Revolutionary War Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko organized in 1794, a truly popular uprising against Russian domination of Poland, his troops captured the files of the Czarist Embassy in Warsaw. It was then disclosed that for years some 110 leading personalities in the country had been on the Russian payroll, not counting swarms of lesser officials who drew from the Embassy regular monthly salaries.

Over 160 years have passed since those fateful years but the Russian methods on the international scene have remained true to their basic form. Only the insatiable appetite of Moscow's rulers has since grown immensely. At present they are out not to subjugate a weaker neighbor country, they openly declare that they would not settle for less than the whole world, and the whole human race. Then it was Poland, Lithuania, and Baltic shore, now it is the whole of Asia and Europe, and as their final objective this country of ours. At that time they were buying Saxon kings, aristocrats and other influential personalities; today using the slogans of international communism as a timelier disguse they attack the most crucial segments of our very existence and of our security, that is in our foreign affairs and our atomic secrets.

It is shuddering to think what tremendous results have the Kremlin masters achieved in these two fields since the end of World War II: what immeasurable and invaluable services did they get from the Canadian spies, Hisses, Remingtons, and their influential protectors, from

Fuchses, Golds, Greenglasses, and Coplons of whom we know and from hordes of others we shall never even hear about.

The signally Russian tradition of spying, subversion and boring from within, of sapping the enemy's security has achieved during these few last years the results which must make certain heads in the Kremlin turn with glee and satisfaction. With the Communists and fellow-travelers the world over securely harnessed to the vehicle of the contemporary Russian imperialists, today have accomplished now in the matter of months what had taken scores of years and generations of spies or agents, their predecessors, the Russian Czars in the 18th century.

These, gentlemen, are the few reflections which came to my mind when thinking on the present-day significance of the events that took place at the time when the brave people of Poland were sold out. The Russian communistic mind today is the same as it was then, except that now it is more experienced. We shall always be at war as long as there exists a communistic government. I also want to assure the people of the world that as long as Poles live on this earth their hopes of freedom shall never die.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is Polish Constitution Day. Year after year during my incumbency I have stood in the well of the House to take part in this very appropriate observance. I can recall when Polish Constitution Day was a happier day.

I have been briefed repeatedly on the plight of the Poles by my good friend from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK]. I was briefed on their sufferings during the midst of the war by their great leader, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, when we broke bread under the dome of this very Capitol. I saw Polish soldiers fighting side by side with American soldiers for liberty, overseas, during World War II. I am proud to say that I have thousands and thousands of people of Polish extraction living in my congressional district, builders of America.

What can we do to inspire the liberty-loving people of Poland besides giving lip service on this very important anniversary? For one thing, we can demand the formal repudiation of the infamous Yalta agreement, which sold them down the river.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, May 3 represents a day in history when in 1791, shortly after the first partition of Poland, the Polish Diet issued a constitution which was one of the most advanced documents of its time. Today, around the world, people are commemorating this historical event, except in the home country of Poland, now controlled by Communist Russia.

There is an old Polish saying: "Wherever beats a Polish heart, wherever flows Polish blood, there is Poland."

This old saying tells us much about Poland's history of a fierce and proud people whose country was often invaded and even obliterated from the map, but whose will to live as a free and independent nation could never be crushed. The Polish desire to live a way of life marked by freedom of speech, religion, and of Government has never died.

With the first partition of Poland the Polish patriots went into exile and, though many of them knew they would never again see their homeland, they did not tire of working for a united Poland. They told Poland's story abroad and sought help among other freedom-loving nations to liberate Poland.

In 1939, when Poland was the first country to literally die for her principles of religious and personal freedom, her patriots fled again and joined the Allies. They fought in Western Europe, in Africa, and thousands of them died for their beliefs at Monte Cassino in Italy. Then there is the sad story of the 10,000 Polish officers who fled to the Russians only to be brutally and wantonly massacred by these butchers at Katyn Forest, just outside of Smolensk.

During World War II no allied country suffered the horrors of war as much as Poland. She lost one-fifth of her population, and Warsaw became the most completely destroyed city in Europe. No allied country could boast of a more active or more effective underground. But Poland had much to fight and die for. Polish civilization, though Slavic, always pointed to the west and her finest sons, poets, and patriots sought and looked for help from the western allies. Poland's acceptance of Christianity in the western, Roman Catholic form, opposed all attempts to convert them to Russian orthodoxy.

Then here, in my estimation, enters the great tragedy of Poland. She looked to England and to America for salvation. And what did she receive? The betrayal at Yalta, where the bungled foreign policy of our present administration first manifested itself when, with Alger Hiss as one of our advisers, we divided the countries of our allies, Poland and China, without even consulting them. President Truman, at the Potsdam Conference, instead of repudiating this infamous sell-out, went along with the Russians as he said in his report to the Nation:

> The question of Poland was a most difficult one. Certain compromises about Poland had already been agreed upon at the Crimea (Yalta) Conference. They obviously were binding upon us at Berlin (Potsdam).

What compromises they were—no more government of their choosing; no more freedom of speech; no religious beliefs, except to follow the materialistic beliefs of atheistic Russian communism.

What a sorry spectacle. Poland, a country which offered herself on the altar of freedom, is further punished and deserted by an unrealistic foreign policy which has succeeded in bringing defeat out of victory and bringing us world war III.

So shameful was our foreign policy that it had to be kept a secret for a long time from the American public. Even our Ambassador to Poland, 1944–47, Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, said that he "was not advised by his own Government of the commitments which had been made and were being made with respect to Poland."

Some day we in America will right the wrongs done to Poland and she will rise again, glorious and free, and we, too, will be able to hold our heads high, knowing that justice has prevailed for Poland.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, history shows us that some of the greatest achievements of humanity were produced in times of crisis and stress. When challenged by fate, time and time again mankind has awakened from slumber, stood up, and answered the challenge. At times these achievements did not, for the time being, repel the impending wave of tragedy. At all times, however, they remained in the minds of man, and on the pages of mankind's history, much longer than any temporary misfortune, their presence enriching our heritage and their remembrance offering an inspiring example to be followed through years to come.

It was during a time of stress, when the kingdom of Poland was plagued by need for national unity, for governmental and civil reforms, and beset by greedy neighbors, that its citizens produced one of the remarkable documents of our civilization, the constitution of May 3, 1791. Although this constitution did not bring into the world any startling innovations, since the principles on which it was based were already being put into effect in the New World and on the strife-torn French soil, the peaceful manner in which it was brought into existence, and the manner in which it had survived to this day, were indeed remarkable, and set an example for the world to follow.

One of the very unusual occurrences in the history of mankind, and a factor which we should today bear in mind, is the fact that, through the years which followed the adoption of their famous constitution, the people of Poland remained true to the principles which it embodied. Although their country was partitioned by their greedy neighbors, and although they were subjected, in the course of the century that followed, to constant attempts at forceful russification, they abided by their heritage.

This is an important factor, for it gives us the assurance that the people of Poland, who are today again subjected to oppression, will not surrender their minds and hearts to the Communist teachings but, rather, by continuing their attachment to the principles of their constitution, will play an important part in the global struggle with the forces of communism.

Mr. Speaker, from the time of her national conception, Poland was a part of the Western World. Christianity, which had its roots in Rome, reigned in her lands. Respect for the dignity of man, parliamentary form of government, freedom of religion, and other human liberties, constituted an integral part of her historical heritage from the earliest times.

For that reason, Poland today represents a weak link in the chain of Com-

munist domination. Through this link we will be able, when the day for it arrives, to penetrate Soviet defenses and start a process which will bring about the deterioration of the Communist empire, depriving it of its strength.

Before that day comes, however, we have a primary job on our hands—a job of stopping the Communist forces from spreading their domination over any additional peoples and any additional areas of the world. We have been doing this job. We have thwarted Soviet designs on Greece; we have strengthened Turkey and Iran; we have saved Italy and France from being destroyed from within by the Communists; we have—and will continue to—aid the Nationalist forces of China; and today we are helping to repel Communist aggression in Korea.

This is the first step in our struggle with the Communist forces; to succeed in this endeavor, the free nations of the world have to work together. Our country has provided the leadership and the means for achieving that goal. By giving food to those who need it, and by giving arms to those who want to defend themselves, we have molded the free nations of the world into a unit which is determined to stop Soviet aggression wherever it may strike.

After we succeed in this primary effort and surround the Soviet empire with a wall of steel, we shall turn to those nations which are today under Communist domination and aid those which want to free themselves of the yoke which has been imposed upon them. The success of this second step will depend, in a large part, on the peoples of the nations concerned—nations which want to be free.

But what must these people—the people of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, and of other enslaved nations—do in the meantime? They must keep the principles of freedom and democracy alive in their hearts; they must prevent the indoctrination of their children in the theory and practice of dialectical materialism of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin; they must wait, and prepare themselves for the day on which they will be able to regain their freedom.

Will they wait so long? I do not think so. One cannot measure, however, the suffering of mankind in days, months, or years. It must be measured in terms of the goal for which we are striving. If a free world—a world in which all nations shall determine their destiny in accordance with the just desires of their people; in which freedom of religion, freedom of opinion, and freedom from oppression shall reign; in which peace and liberty, not enslavement, shall be the rule—is worth waiting for, then the suffering and sacrifies which we must undergo today become endurable.

The free nations of the world are determined to achieve that goal. To achieve it, they shall need the help of the people of Poland, and the people of other nations which want to be free. The people of Poland, I am certain, will give us that help. They know what suffering is; they know what enslavement is; but they also know how to survive, and, above all, they shall remain true to their heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I need to go back into history to show that the indomitable spirit of the Polish people will not be killed by their Communist oppressors. The world knows how strong that spirit is. The world remembers how bravely the Poles fought during the last war, not only on their home soil, but in France, in England, and in other areas of the world where democracy fought totalitarianism on the field of battle. The Polish names on the graves on Monte Cassino, on the beaches of Normandy, and wherever freemen fought, tell their own tale.

The sacrifices and the courage of the Polish people in the last war have no parallel in history. Their endurance is almost beyond description. Through the centuries, the people of Poland have endured oppression, enslavement, and the tragedies which wars bring, with the hope that they would some day live in peace and freedom among the nations of the world. History would forever condemn us, if we were to fail to aid them in attaining that goal.

It is for us, the people of America, to rededicate ourselves today to the task of aiding the people of those nations which were our true friends and allies in two world wars, in this dark hour of their need. We must rectify our apparent error in placing faith in the power which later violated our trust and proved to be an international thief. The negotiations which we undertook with that power during and immediately after World War II never attained the status of treaties, since they were never confirmed by our Senate. Since they have been violated by a party to the agreement—Soviet Russia—we should not give these negotiations any further recognition.

Mr. Speaker, in the remembrance of the Polish constitution of May 3, 1791, and in the examples of the invincible courage and will of the Polish people, we should draw inspiration today—just as the people of Poland draw inspiration and courage from them. And we should let the world know our conviction—the conviction that, with God's help, Poland and the rest of the world shall be free.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in rendering tribute to the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the Polish constitution. The 3d of May has been a national holiday in the hearts of the Polish people since the year 1791, when that country gave to the world the most democratic constitution to be found in all Europe. The yoke of foreign aggression to which that country has been subjected at various periods in her history has failed to crush her free spirit. The tragic years of Poland's present bondage will be an inspiration for future generations of Poles to carry on with that indomitable spirit that has brought that country through so many trying situations in the past.

Poland has always fought tyranny and international immorality. She has always supported every expression of international morality, and in that spirit she alined herself with the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms.

What did that Atlantic Charter say? Let me quote three points to which those who signed that charter committed their respective nationals:

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.
2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.
3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

These, in plain language, are the first three points in that charter. The United States was a signator to that pact. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics endorsed these objectives and became a signator on January 1, 1942. The freedom-loving people of Poland accepted this charter as a guaranty that the spiritual rebirth and the principles of freedom to which they had dedicated their lives on May 3, 1791, would be restored to them when the ravages of World War II had reached its end, and the last drop of blood had been spilled. They had earned the right to such expectations. For had they not continued to brave Hitler's power after their country had been desolated? Had they not fought gallantly on when their people were in chains? Had they not made the same sacrifices on the altar of human decency and liberty as the soldiers of other lands including our own fair sons? And finally had they not every right to place their faith and their trust in the intellectual honesty of America, a country which had never broken a vow with another nation in either peace or war?

But what happened? Around the secret peace table at Yalta the noble principles in the Atlantic Charter were forgotten. The freedom-loving people of Poland were locked behind the iron curtain, where they remain today. Never was a greater travesty perpetrated upon the aspiration of any people. The events of those fateful hours at Yalta in the year 1945 constitute the blackest pages in the history of our Republic. For those misdeeds we today bow our heads in shame as we celebrate Poland's national holiday. We pray that in some manner we may atone for the wrongs committed on a people who placed their trust in our honor, who suffered incredible agonies in the belief that some day they would be free.

Today the Polish people stand conquered but not subdued. Their spirit is not crushed. That intense and unquenchable patriotism which they have never failed to manifest in their most tragic hours will live on to the day when they will again throw off the yoke of the oppressor and take their rightful place among the freedom-loving peoples of the world. Poland, I salute you on this one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of your epoch-making constitution—the political and spiritual rebirth of a noble people.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1951, we are privileged to mark and commemorate Polish Constitution Day. One hundred and sixty years ago, shortly after this great Nation gave birth to our present Constitution, Poland adopted a great document granting far-reaching freedom to her people.

Here in this country we are cognizant of the tragedy, unparalleled in universal history, that the Polish Nation is going through. On this day we express our heartfelt sympathy and, at the same time, convey our sincere sentiments as a brotherly nation.

If you can but imagine an enslaved America without the right to celebrate Independence Day on July 4, then you have some idea how the people of Poland feel today. Poland would jubilantly celebrate today if it were possible for her to do so, but Poland cannot rejoice today. Soviet oppression will see to that; but even Communist enslavement and Russia's iron heel cannot prevent the Polish people from a silent and hopeful observance of this great day.

Today there is another Poland—a free Poland which exists, lives, and grows outside of her natural boundaries. Yes, outside of the iron curtain this free Poland is just as strong, physically, morally, and spiritually, as the one which is known for courage, knighthood, and untiring efforts in their pursuit for freedom, liberty, and independence. We cannot overlook the enormous contribution of the great Polish nations in their fight to protect western civilization from being overrun by evil forces all through the history of mankind.

In passing, it is also just and fair to point out the contributions of many sons of Poland to this great Nation of ours, the United States of America. Yes; there was Pulaski, whose monuments and statues adorn many of our parks and public squares in this country. Pulaski made the supreme sacrifice for this country at Savannah, Ga. His contribution was truly symbolic of the Polish desire to fight freedom's battle anywhere on God's earth. There was Kosciusko who, for a time, was adjutant to George Washington. His recommendations to build fortifications at West Point and, further, that a military academy be established there will always be a monument to his memory. The very names of Pulaski and Kosciusko are "watchwords of liberty"; their contributions are indelibly written into the glorious record of American independence.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the valiant people of Poland look to this great Nation of ours for encouragement and support in the hope that through the efforts of the United States of America, a future observance of Polish Constitution Day will be one which the peoples of Poland can join in with all of the citizens of this great Nation who wish her well today.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] such time as he may require.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in these trying days when liberty is being challenged all over the world, and when liberty and freedom are dying all over the world, it is only proper that we pause in our day's reflections and pay tribute to a people and a nation who have done so much to spread and encourage freedom world-wide. We all know in searching our history that when the Constitution of the United States was first launched not only to the people of America but was publicized throughout the world, there were those monarchs in Europe, Asia, and all over the world who laughed and scoffed at the Constitution of the United States. They said it would never work, that it was the work of madmen, that it was just something temporary, that it was something that would soon pass by. However, in this commemoration of Polish Constitution Day, the reason why we should pause in our reflections to pay tribute is that the first people and the first nation in all history that had confidence enough in the Constitution of the United States of America to emulate it was the country of Poland and the people of Poland. Something less than 3 years after the Constitution of the United States of America was adopted, here in a far away land, in a far away continent, a people and a country, the people of Poland and the Nation of Poland, were the first people and the first nation of the world to emulate the Constitution of the United States of America.

The Constitution Day of Poland that we commemorate today is commemorated because they were the first people and the first nation to pattern and model their constitution of freedom and liberty after that of the United States of America. That act, through the ages and since then, has been typical of the love and the ferver and the feeling of Poland for freedom and liberty.

We might come down to more modern times, for instance to the time of World War II. The patriotism and the love for freedom that the people of Poland showed is one that has no match in the annals of history of all mankind. Let us go back, for instance, to September of 1939, when all the world was shaking in its boots, afraid of that madman of Europe, when England got to the point when they sent their great statesman, Neville Chamberlain, over to Munich to meet Adolf Hitler.

Hitler said: "I am going to take this part of Czechoslovakia, I am going to take this part of another country, what are you going to do about it, Mr. Chamberlain?"

Mr. Chamberlain, shaking in his boots, said: "Mr. Hitler, I have my umbrella with me to protect you from the rain. You go ahead and take everything you want, just leave England alone. Let us alone."

Just as Chamberlain was shaking in his boots when he was meeting with Adolf Hitler and all of the rest of the world was trembling at the great force Hitler had assembled in Europe, there was one country and one people who said: "As for you, we care not what you do, but as for us we rather die for our freedom than to live under Nazi slavery."

And alone, with false promises from England, with false promises from France, the little country of Poland, which was not a warring nation, stood up and fought; the first people in all the world with courage enough to stand up and say "No" to Adolf Hitler; the first people to stand up and tell Hitler: "You may take other parts of Europe but as for us, you are not going to take us without a fight."

They fought. For 19 days they stood up with bare bodies against the mightiest military machine the world has ever seen. At that time, you will remember, Adolf Hitler and Joe Stalin were pals. They made a pact. And on the 19th day of September, on the nineteenth day of the war, Hitler and Stalin made an agreement by which Joe Stalin started to march from the east, and Poland, a little country of some 32,000,000 people, was now wedged in between the two madmen of Europe, Joe Stalin on one side and Adolf Hitler on the other side. Still the 32,000,000 Poles did not give up. They fought for exactly 17 days longer. For 36 days Poland alone stood the onslaught of two of the mightiest military leaders and two of the worst and most brutal killers that the world has ever known.

Oh, yes, there are those cynics who say: "What does 36 days of resistance mean?" When you consider the fact that when Hitler started to march westward instead of eastward, he marched through Norway, through Belgium, through Denmark, through Luxemburg, through part of France and was ready to take England in 12 days, it gives you an idea of the bravery and the glory of the 32,000,000 Poles who stood alone. The aid that was promised never arrived. The 2,000 planes that England promised them never saw Polish soil because England did not have that many planes to give when they made the promise.

Did Poland give up? Not at all. In intrigues and escapades that will make some of the most romantic pages of our history if the truth were known these Poles that were now divided by the Russians and by the Germans skipped from one country to another and 6 months after Poland fell 12,000 Polish fliers were flying in the British Royal Air Force and they shot down 1 out of every 5 Nazi planes that were bombing London at that time. The only expeditionary force that the Allies sent to Norway after it was overrun by the Germans overnight was an expedition of impoverished Polish troops that were asked not to take a certain part of Norway. They not only achieved their mission but sent word to London that they needed more supplies and more men, saying that they would drive the Germans out of Norway. But, the only answer was, "Come back to England and save the British people." You will remember that was in the days of Dunkerque. Then they had them marching in the Normandy invasion; they had them marching in Italy and every place. The first defeat that Hitler suffered in Africa he suffered at the hands of a Polish regiment; a regiment of Polish people that skipped from the land of Poland from one country to another until they were regimented into a fighting force. Yes, the first defeat that the Germans suffered in Africa was suffered at the hands of a Polish contingent. And, that is not

all. Take the battle of Monte Cassino, where the Allies were driven back on four different occasions at a heavy loss of American lives. Finally, Gen. Mark Clark assigned troops to General Anders, and together they took Monte Cassino hill. They took it at a great cost of blood.

I remember very well the statement when General Anders went to General Clark in Italy. He said, "General, Poland wants to do its part in this fight for freedom. What can we do for you?" General Clark looked at General Anders, and he said, "General, you have not got any men. How can you fight the enemy?" General Anders looked at General Clark, and he said, "Oh, General, that is where you are wrong. I already have 25,000 Polish boys. You are different from me. You have your reinforcements behind you, General Clark, but I have got my reinforcements ahead of me, and every mile that we march through Italy my army is going to increase." And one by one the Polish boys joined the cause of the Allies. And the general of the Polish Army, General Anders, who started out with a contingent of 25,000 troops in Italy before the war was over had a contingent of 250,000 fighting Polish boys.

Poland has paid a price in this war that no nation has ever paid in the history of all mankind, 8,000,000 dead. Before the war Poland was a land of 32,000,000 people. After the war there were about 24,000,000 left. No people on earth ever paid so high a price for their liberty as did the people of Poland. And what was their reward? Three men going to Yalta, with more vodka in their bellies than brains in their heads, decided that these brave and gallant people shall receive their just reward. And their reward was betrayal by the United States; betrayal by England.

The master mind of that betrayal today sits in the Federal penitentiary. His name is Alger Hiss. He masterminded the betrayal of Poland. So today we find 24,000,000 Polish people living under Communist dictatorship because of the proficient work of a Communist agent working in a high place in the Government of the United States of America. His name is Alger Hiss. The monument that he has erected on behalf of his work is 24,000,000 people in Poland sold under the yoke of Communist slavery. The work of Alger Hiss is one that must be wiped off the history books of the United States of America. As long as the present policy in regard to Poland exists, every liberty-loving American must hang his head in shame until the wrong we have perpetrated against the people of Poland is corrected. We have no right to look for support from liberty-loving people all over the world until we do that. That is why today we find 90 percent of the people of the Slavic race under Communist yokes. They are under the Communist yoke because they look at the betrayal of Poland as an example of the word and honor of allies like Great Britain and the United States. So, in commemorating Polish Constitution Day, let us dedicate our lives and our efforts to redeeming the great wrong that was perpetrated against a gallant and a great people. If we accomplish that and work in that direction, the world will love us, and freedom and honor once again will play the major part in the dealings of the United States of America with other people. Until that time comes I have grave concern for the future of this country and grave concern for the future of liberty and freedom everywhere.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, once again, on this anniversary of the founding of the free Polish Government, I am privileged to address the House, in behalf of a nation and a people, who have greatly and immeasurably contributed to the development of free institutions in this world.

History is replete with the unexcelled sacrifices and evidence of devotion to the cause of liberty of the Polish people. I do not think there is any nation in the world, which has sacrificed more bitterly, more courageously, more unflinchingly that the Polish people.

In connection with my remarks, I desire to refer to a spendid letter recently received from an able advocate of the Polish cause, Mr. K. Stefan Pomierski, of Glen Cove, N. Y. I quote:

> Let us pledge ourselves to the faith that says that the Yalta agreement shall be nullified forthwith, that the Polish-Government-in-exile and at present in London, shall receive immediate diplomatic recognition and that Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, hero of of World War II, be appointed to the general staff of the armies of the Allies. If we do that we shall regain the full confidence of all freedom-loving peoples of the Americas, of Europe, and of Asia.

I believe sincerely that the foregoing brief sentences accurately reflect, not only the sentiments of Polish-Americans, but also the deep feeling of an overwhelming number of Americans of every class, creed, color, and station.

This historic day fills me at once with feelings of anguish and glory—the anguish of one whose heart goes out to the millions of poor souls in Poland, strong in the Christian faith, strong in their allegiance to democracy, who were betrayed in such a merciless, heartless manner at Yalta—glory because of the inspiration which lovers of democracy throughout the world have received from a people whose courage, fortitude, and unflinching spirit in the face of adversity, persecution and even death emphasize and exemplify the noblest qualities of the human soul.

Of course we must stand with the brave, gallant Polish Nation and its unsurpassed people. We must stand with them as they pass through the valley of the shadow of death into the new light of reborn freedom, which already appears on the horizon. We must stand with them in their struggles for independence and liberty, for tolerance, dignity, and justice, for the recapture of their free government and their rights as free men and women.

As I have said so many times, Poland is the test case of our intentions toward human freedom. If we do not come to the assistance of this suffering nation now, if we ruthlessly and mercilessly consign the Polish people to the unspeakable horror of oppression and tyranny, we will be failing to measure up in this generation to the great heritage of American freedom itself.

Let us solemnly resolve on this sacred occasion that not only our hearts, but our assurances of unfailing devotion, practical support, and assistance for their cause go out today from this great tribunal of democracy to the great and noble people of Poland. May the day of their liberation soon be at hand.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today, the 3d of May, marks the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. It is fitting that this great body pay tribute to the Polish people on this, their national holiday, even though the principles laid down in that constitution have gone temporarily into eclipse under the domination of a foreign power. I say temporarily, because the Polish Nation has been under oppression before in its history and has always emerged strong and resolute. The people of Poland are courageous people. That many of us know from our association with the Americans of Polish descent who have contributed so much to the building of this country.

We owe much to them, just as the whole Western World owes much to the Polish Nation which took the brunt of the brutal Nazi attack on that valiant country 12 years ago.

We owe much to the courage and determination of the Polish leaders who contributed to our own struggle for independence—Kosciusko, Sobieski, and Pulaski. Their contribution at the testing time for the infant American cause was incalculable. We owe much to Poland and to the people of Polish blood in our midst.

Today, 160 years after her first Constitution Day, Poland is again waiting for the chance to regain her independence. But commensurate with the bravery and spirit of her people, she is not waiting supinely. The underground which worked so effectively against the Nazi invaders is again carrying on. The flame of independent thought is being kept alive. Let us pay tribute to that unyielding spirit of independence and of unquenchable hope which keeps this flame alive, as we join with the thousands of free Poles all over the Western World who are observing this day.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished Members who spoke here today on their wonderful remarks in behalf of the people of Poland. That tragic sell-out of Poland by the United States and allies should be a lesson to us today that whenever we

surrender principle we have to buy it back in blood as we are now doing in Korea.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point, and have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 50 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion and considerable confusion existing in the minds of many Members of Congress concerning the need for the 16,000 beds which the President eliminated in his budget estimates for the fiscal year 1950.

In his recommendations for the curtailment of approximately 16,000 beds, President Truman asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to recommend specific adjustments in the program. As a result of this request, the Administrator named 24 hospital projects to be canceled outright, and a reduction in the planned capacity of 14 additional hospitals.

It should be borne in mind that the President made this cancellation in the spring of 1949, when the veteran population had not reached its peak, and when there was no thought of a Korean conflict. Today's conditions alter the picture materially. In making his cancellation, the President said in his message:

> I have reviewed the veterans' hospital and domiciliary construction program and find that to continue with the construction of the full number of 90 authorized hospitals will result in a serious overbuilding, in terms of beds needed to meet foreseeable requirements. A reduction in the program will still make it possible to provide for all service-connected patients in every geographical area and will provide an even more liberal allowance of beds for non-service-connected patients than at present.

That statement could not be made today. Unforeseeable circumstances have caused an overcrowding of Veterans' Administration hospitals to a point where good service to the disabled veteran is difficult and in some instances impossible to render. Especially is this so in the case of the neuropsychiatric and tuberculosis facilities, as I will point out later.

As of February 28, 1951, the latest figures which are available from the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, 147 hospitals were in operation, 18 of which were for tubercular patients, 34 for neuropsychiatrics, and 95 were general medical and surgical hospitals. These facilities had a bed capacity of 108,035 patients and were occupied to the extent of 102,319 patients. This is approximately 95 percent of capacity. I am informed that civilian hospitals consider 80-percent capacity to be a safe margin for efficient operation and good service. In the case of our Veterans' Administration hospitals the percentage should be slightly higher, but not over 85 percent. Any increase over this 85 percent, I am told, is reflected in the well-being and treatment of the patients.

To consider the situation fairly, the types of hospitals should be weighed separately. At the present time, 50 percent of all veteran patients are in NP hospitals, 15 percent are in TB hospitals, and the remainder, 34 percent, are in the general medical and surgical hospitals.

The most serious congestion—and it is dangerous overcrowding—occurs in the NP hospitals, which bears, as you will note, over one-half of the entire patient load. There are several cogent reasons for this condition. There are operational difficulties in NP hospitals that are not present in other facilities. First, the patient turn-over is exceedingly slow, as you can realize; the nature of the disability makes long, tedious treatment necessary. Secondly, it is very difficult to staff these hospitals, both from the doctor and the nurse viewpoint. Professional men and women are loath to enter this phase of the profession and few of them stay with it permanently. This makes for a shortage of skilled professionals to service the patients.

Perhaps because I am more familiar with the conditions that exist in my home locality, I would like to cite the situation in the two NP hospitals that service the entire New England area. At Bedford, Mass., which is in my congressional district, is located an NP hospital which has a bed capacity of 1,803 patients. The hospital was planned and built for 1,636 beds, but the demand for hospitalization has become so urgent that space for an additional 167 patients has been made by using recreational and other available rooms for bed space. As of February 28, 1951, Bedford Hospital had a percentage of 100.6 patients in the facility. The manager of the hospital, Dr. Winthrop Adams, is one of the oldest in point of service and best known of the Veterans' Administration professional men. He is greatly respected for his ability and knowledge of his work. He is operating with a staff which is sadly undermanned both as to doctors and nurses. The taking away of recreational space and other rooms in order to make additional bed-space handicaps and prolongs the recovery of patients. In mental hospitals much better progress is made when the patient is contented and happy in his surroundings, and a reduction in recreational facilities is sharply reflected in the patients' progress toward recovery.

In the case of the NP hospital at Northampton, Mass., again we find that it has a patient load running to 98.8 percent of capacity. This hospital was designed and built for 933 beds. At the present time 1,092 beds are occupied. The overload, here again is cared for by the addition of 172 beds in recreation rooms and other space originally not designed for hospital-bed uses.

Recently I received a protest from a committee appointed by the Franklin-Hampshire District No. 2, the American Legion, about the lack of facilities at Northampton Hospital. It was explained to me that the hospital load had been 100 percent full for the past 2 years. The larger number of these patients are veterans of World War I and World War II who have been hospitalized for several years. Incidentally, this hospital serves not only two-thirds of Massachusetts, but all of the States of Vermont, Connecticut, the western part of Rhode Island, Albany and Troy, N. Y. At the present time 50 percent of the bed patients are from the State of Connecticut, and the other 50 percent from various parts of New England. Also, right now there are 23 service-connected cases that are in the State hospital, their care being paid for by the Veterans' Administration. Four of these cases are not only mental but have tuberculosis. There are 168 non-service-connected cases on the waiting list at the present time. Sixty of these patients have been on the waiting list for 6 months. In the Northampton State Hospital, which is only approximately 4 miles from the Veterans' Hospital, there are 62 veteran patients now receiving treatment. Much resentment is being voiced by the families of these veterans, who feel their boys should be cared for in Veterans' Administration facilities.

As I said before, I point to the conditions in these two NP hospitals only because I am more conversant with the detailed facts in my own locality. However, a similar, and in some localities a worse, condition prevails. Just note the percentage of beds occupied in the neuropsychiatric hospitals of the Veterans' Administration listed below. The figures are as of February 28, 1951:

	Operating beds	Percent full
American Lake, Wash	904	89.0
Augusta, Ga	1,300	96.8
Bedford, Mass	1,803	100.6
Canandaigua, N. Y	1,700	96.7
Chillicothe, Ohio	2,116	100.3
Coatesville, Pa	1,953	92.9
Danville, Ill	1,717	99.8
Downey, Ill	2,290	94.4
Fort Custer, Mich	2,067	97.3
Fort Lyon, Colo	853	96.6
Fort Meade, S. Dak	720	94.0
Gulfport, Miss	1,098	97.2
Knoxville, Iowa	1,631	98.0
Lebanon, Pa. (new addition)	652	92.8
Lexington, Ky	1,216	96.1
Lyons, N. J	2,013	98.1
Marion, Ind	1,696	99.5
Montrose, N. Y. (new hospital)	1,349	81.1
Murfreesboro, Tenn	1,307	94.5
Northampton, Mass	1,105	98.8
North Little Rock, Ark	2,095	95.8
Northport, N. Y	2,502	95.0
Palo Alto, Calif	1,443	96.4
Perry Point, Md	1,910	96.8
Roanoke, Va	2,000	94.6
Roseburg, Oreg	670	92.5
St. Cloud, Minn	1,382	97.6
Sheridan, Wyo	754	93.2
Togus, Maine	869	94.2
Tomah, Wis	1,685	94.9
Topeka, Kans	1,375	81.6

	Operating beds	Percent full
Tuscaloosa, Ala	817	94.0
Tuskegee, Ala	2,190	94.2
Waco, Tex	2,040	96.2
Total neuropsychiatric beds	50,793	95.5

It should be noted here, in considering the above table, that of the above total of 50,793 operating NP beds, 2,015 of these are emergency beds which, as I explained above, are beds placed in any space which can be made available and which was not designed primarily for operating beds. The percentage of capacity occupied—95.5 percent—is a dramatic figure when one considers the nature of the disability treated and the effect such overcrowding will have upon patients suffering from mental disabilities.

Conditions in tuberculosis hospitals of the Veterans' Administration are little, if any, better. Here are figures on these hospitals:

	Operating beds	Percent full
Atlanta, Ga	225	95.1
Excelsior Springs, Mo	251	87.3
Fort Bayard, N. Mex	222	87.4
Kerrville, Tex	438	87.4
Livermore, Calif	495	94.5
Memphis, Tenn	300	92.0
Oteen, N. C	1,500	89.8
Outwood, Ky	316	96.2
Rutland Heights, Mass	615	95.8
San Fernando, Calif	441	95.9
Springfield, Mo	477	88.7
Sunmount, N. Y	383	94.8
Tucson, Ariz	405	95.3
Walla Walla, Wash	421	86.9
Waukesha, Wis	256	85.5
Whipple, Ariz	380	79.9
Total TB beds	7,973	91.4

Here again, it should be recalled, that for safe, efficient operation a Veterans' Administration hospital should have no more than 85 percent of its beds occupied.

In the case of the general medical and surgical hospitals, the conditions are better, but not sufficiently so as to make the situation normal. There are a total of 49,269 operating beds, of which 86.5 percent are occupied.

That is the picture of the bed occupancy in our Veterans' Administration hospitals, according to the latest figures obtainable. What the situation will be when the disabled veterans from the Korean conflict flood into the Veterans' Administration facilities is one that gives much pause for thought. The time is not far off when the service hospitals will be turning these disabled veterans over to the Veterans' Administration for treatment and hospitalization. Already casualties in the Korean conflict have risen above the 50,000 mark so far as wounded are concerned. Thousands of these have been brought back to the United States and are being treated in the Army and Navy hospitals. These hospitals no longer will accept large blocks of disabled veterans from the overcrowded Veterans' Administration facilities. An example at hand is that of Walter Reed General Hospital here in Washington, which now has a regulation permitting not more than 10 Veterans' Administration patients at any one time. A similar condition prevails at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, which at one time cared for several hundred Veterans' Administration patients.

The overcrowding, necessarily, has forced a large number of Veterans' Administration patients into civil and State hospitals. Hospitalization and treatment of these veterans is paid for by the Veterans' Administration. However, as everyone knows, our civil and State hospitals are inadequate for civilian needs and repeated requests have been received for relief from the care of these disabled veterans. It is particularly hard upon the disabled veterans, who would much rather receive treatment in a Veterans' Administration facility, and, as I noted in the case of the Northampton Veterans' Administration Hospital, the families of the veterans feel that their boys should be cared for by the Veterans' Administration.

At the end of February 1951 there were 4,209 disabled veterans being hospitalized in State and civil hospitals. There was a total of 3,502 veterans being cared for in other Federal hospitals. This adds up to 7,711 disabled veterans in outside hospitals. Of the number in State and civil hospitals, 1,630 were TB patients, 1,778 were NP cases, while 80 were general medical and surgical cases. This places a real burden upon the non-Veterans' Administration hospitals and in the cases of the NP and TB patients it is fair to point out that these are long-treatment patients, some of whom will require years of hospitalization.

There has been some criticism and inquiry over the classification of veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Because of the manner in which hospital records are kept by the Veterans' Administration, the present hospital load is divided at about 60 percent for non-service-connected veterans and 40 percent for service-connected veterans. However, there is one factor in this question of non-service-connected status that should be borne in mind. The average person looks at the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration showing that approximately 60 percent of the patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals are in the non-service-connected category and expresses astonishment. The fact is that there are many thousands of veterans in hospitals who are listed as non-service-connected but who also had a service-connected disability. They were admitted as non-service-connected cases because the major diagnosis was that of non-service-connected disability. Add to these cases the hundreds of others who are now rated as non-service-connected but will be designated as service-connected after complete adjudication of their claims, and the picture changes materially.

I believe it would be fitting at this point to insert a table showing veterans awaiting admission to hospitals as of February 28, 1951. It is an impressive list, and if conditions continue as they exist today, many of these disabled veterans will never receive the hospitalization they need so badly.

Veterans awaiting admission to hospital

	Total	Tubercular	Neuropsychiatric	General medical and surgical
AS OF 15TH OF MONTH				
1950—February	24,441	2,441	10,367	11,633
March	26,325	2,398	10,747	13,180
April	27,369	2,415	11,272	13,682
May	26,314	2,386	11,252	12,676
June	25,312	2,337	11,462	11,513
July	24,781	2,215	11,787	10,779
August	23,751	2,287	12,242	9,222
September	21,950	2,262	12,378	7,310
October	20,557	2,222	12,095	6,240
November	19,929	2,095	12,013	5,821
December	19,185	2,226	11,860	5,099
1951—January	19,306	2,069	11,753	5,484
February	20,821	2,346	11,852	6,623

There is a situation, however, that affects Veterans' Administration hospitals and their operation more seriously than any other factor. That is the alarming loss of professional and ancillary personnel through the draft and the recall of Reserves to the Armed Forces. From July 27, 1950, to the end of March 1951, the following professional employees of the Veterans' Administration have been lost to the Armed Forces:

	Number employed	Lost to Armed Forces
Staff physicians	3,986	136
Resident physicians	2,255	282
Nurses	13,640	434
Total	20,804	908

In the category of ancillary personnel—attendants, clerks, technicians, and so forth—1,571 employees have been lost to the Armed Forces. Replacements for all of these employees, and especially the professional, are difficult to get. As a result of competition from industry the Veterans' Administration is losing ward attendants at a rather alarming rate, particularly in NP and TB hospitals that are in areas where defense industries have begun to start up.

As you may recall, when the universal military training bill was before the House of Representatives an amendment was offered and adopted, that would exempt professional people of the Veterans' Administration from the draft and from recall to service. However, I am informed that when the bill came to conference this amendment was dropped, and any help from this quarter seems unlikely. About the only hope that I can see, at the present time, is the enactment of my bill, H. R. 2996, which would make these personnel a branch of the military forces of the United States. A similar plan was followed during World War II, and it worked successfully. I hope that it can be done again.

I have talked with a number of persons who are eminently qualified to know of the situation regarding the availability of doctors, nurses, and so forth, who would be necessary to man additional hospitals for the Veterans' Administration. Invariably the answer has been that there would be little difficulty in

finding the quantity and quality of professional men and women if the hospitals are not located in isolated localities.

In closing, I want to stress the great need for more hospitals for the Veterans' Administration, particularly in view of the tremendous potential bed load caused by the Korean conflict. Much of the need exists in TB and NP type facilities, where patient turn-over is slow and where the greater percentage of the cases are service-connected cases. We must not let these veterans down. It is an obligation we must face squarely and promptly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Charles A. Merrill appearing in the Boston Globe, April 29.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

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

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he intends to make today and include certain letters.

Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a brief editorial appearing in the April issue of Fortune magazine.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

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

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two letters and one newspaper article on the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam project on the Colorado River in Utah.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a clipping from the Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News, relative to CARE.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. THOMAS) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. YATES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $389.50.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material in the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ALLEN of California (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a recent address by Warren R. Austin, United States Representative to the United Nations.

Mr. WHITAKER (at the request of Mr. CHELF) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] in Committee of the Whole today and include an article by Charles E. Jackson, general manager of the National Fisheres Institute.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 4, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

425. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease for the month of March 1951, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

427. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

428. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the twenty-seventh quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period January 1 through March 31, 1951, pursuant to Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

429. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Dewulf Maquet"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

430. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

431. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a request for authority to make grants for the development and improvement of certain class IV and larger airports as shown in the attached appended list, which projects are included in the current revision of the national airport plan and, which should be undertaken during the fiscal year 1952, pursuant to section 8 of the Federal Airport Act, Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2684. A bill to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida; with amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2889. A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lien selection, and similar rights; without amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOSONE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3795. A bill to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 420). 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 Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 3954. A bill to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3955. A bill to permit the retention of oil, gas, and other mineral rights in lands condemned by the United States for waterway improvement purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3956. A bill to provide that the period of active service required of any person inducted into the Armed Forces shall be reduced by any period of active service which such person may have performed before such induction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3957. A bill to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3958. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to increase to 120 days the amount of leave which members of the Armed Forces may accumulate; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3959. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3960. A bill to amend section 371 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3961. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to appoint a committee to designate the most appropriate day for National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 221. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies in the conduct of hearings before committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Res. 222. Resolution to provide for an investigation in open hearings of all circumstances relating to the action of the President in relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of his commands in the Far East; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3962. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Becker Gutierrez; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Kurt Karl Otto Walther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Wladysla Bogusz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of George S. Paschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of Marcella Maria Vankeirsbilck, nee Vanootegem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of Franco Berardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of John (Hans-Christian) von Kotze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 3971. A bill for the relief of Esther Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 3972. A bill for the relief of Ziao Fong Hsia; 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:

266. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 21, expressing regret that General Douglas MacArthur was removed as supreme commander of the Far East, and a further reaffirmation of the resolution adopted at the last national convention of the American Legion calling for the removal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson and also expressing regret that President Truman refused to meet with and have an audience with the national commander of the American Legion, Erle Cocke, following Cocke's world tour which included a visit with troops in Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

267. Also, resolution of the Rock County Dental Auxiliary, Rock County, Wis., reaffirming faith in the American, voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

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

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

Most merciful God, the fountain of all wisdom and goodness: We thank Thee for the gift of sleep when the tangled web of weary striving and confused thought emerges clarified and straightened by the touch of a new day. In the midst of daily toil and ever-pressing tasks, we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts, grateful for the noontide pause at this wayside well of peace and prayer.

Bring all our desires and powers, we beseech Thee, into conformity to Thy will. Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day, with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land but all the continents and the islands of the sea. May our individual lives be as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. We ask it in the name of that One who is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 3, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PROPOSED REVISION OF A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 37)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed revision of a supplemental appropriation, involving an increase of $13,000,000, for the Atomic Energy Commission, fiscal year 1951, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES APPRAISERS' STORES, BALTIMORE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., on April 23, 1951, relative to improving conditions at the United States Appraisers Stores in Baltimore.

This is a matter of the utmost importance to the well-being of the great port of Baltimore, particularly at this time when traffic is moving through the port in near-record volume.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 841. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 310); and

S. 1039. A bill to amend the provision of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the composition of boards for the recommendation of rear admirals of the Navy for continuation on the active list, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 311).

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. HUNT), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1244. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Territory of Alaska from certain restrictions upon the making of Federal contributions, and to amend the provisions thereof relating to the taking of oaths by certain civil defense personnel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 312).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, Friday, May 4, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, or passed, as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Stavros S. Niarchos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which was considered and passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to