Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. JENISON and to include a statement.

Mr. BRAMBLETT and to include a statement by Robert L. Ryan, engineer-manager of the Ventura flood-control district.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include letters I received typical of many that have come to my office relative to House Resolution 332, regarding the Oatis case.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LOVRE (at the request of Mr. BERRY), indefinitely, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 24, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

627. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell and convey to Sam Arvanitis and George Arvanitis a parcel of land consisting of one-quarter acre, more or less, situated at the Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif."; to the Committee on Armed Services.

628. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill authorizing and directing the performance of an agreement with the Republic of Panama regarding the relocation of the terminal facilities of the Panama Railroad in the city of Panama"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

629. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4912. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4913. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities urgently and immediately needed for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4914. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4915. A bill to amend section 2151 of title 18, United States Code, relating to sabotage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 4916. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4923. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi Tunnel and its approach roads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to provide that the dramatic production Faith of Our Fathers shall be presented in each State of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. Res. 351. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Armed Services to conduct thorough studies and investigations concerning the sale to and use of narcotics by members of the Armed Forces and persons registered for induction by the Selective Service System; 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. ALBERT:

H. R. 4917. A bill for the relief of Giovannina Echelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4918. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jalal Elahi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 4920. A bill for the relief of Georgette Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Silas B. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

358. The SPEAKER presented a petition of V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., relative to transmitting a statement of the Control Yuan of China relating to the text of the draft on the Japanese peace treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 24, 1951

Rev. William F. Creighton, rector, St. John's Episcopal Church, Bethesda, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast sent the spirit of truth unto us to guide us into all truth, so rule our lives by Thy power that we may be truthful in word and act and thought.

Amidst all the half truths and falsehood by which men live keep us ever in Thy gracious protection, that no fear of ours or ambition of ours may make us false in act or speech.

Grant that our Nation may enthrone the truth which alone can make us free. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 23, 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 has passed a bill (H. R. 4262) relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4262) relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact routine business, without debate.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DISPLACED PERSONS

A confidential letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of displaced persons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

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

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

Two letters from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States for shore leave purposes only, of certain alien

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

seamen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, withdrawing the name of Charles Horatio Nelson Verchilds from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on June 1, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES COURTS OVER ACTION OF STATE UTILITY REGULATORY BODIES—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a resolution sent to me by John C. Doerfer, chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, endorsing H. R. 184, which would restrict the jurisdiction of United States district courts over action of State public utility regulatory bodies. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill, H. R. 184, Eighty-second Congress, first session, introduced by Hon. FRANCK R. HAVENNER, of California, seeking to amend section 1342 of title 28 of the United States Code, which, if enacted into law, would further restrict the jurisdiction of the United States district courts over action of State public utility regulatory bodies; and

Whereas said bill has the support and approval of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners and was introduced at said association's instance and request; and

Whereas it appears that the objective of said bill is desirable and in the interest of State regulatory authority: Be it

Resolved, That the Public Service Commission of the State of Wisconsin hereby supports said bill and urges its enactment into law; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary is hereby directed to furnish a certified copy of this resolution to the chairman and each member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, a certified copy of said resolution to each member of the Wisconsin delegation in the Congress, a certified copy of said resolution to Congressman FRANCK R. HAVENNER, and a certified copy of said resolution to the general solicitor of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF WISCONSIN,
JOHN C. DOERFER, *Chairman.*
W. F. WHITNEY.
JAMES R. DURFEE.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly introduced, passed, and adopted at a regular session of the Public Service Commission of the State of Wisconsin held on the 10th day of July 1951.

EDWARD T. KAVENY,
Secretary, Public Service Commission, State of Wisconsin.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 283. A bill for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata (Rept. No. 567);

H. R. 3442. A bill to protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases heretofore adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto (Rept. No. 568); and

H. R. 3495. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cora B. Jones (Rept. No. 569).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 495. A bill for the relief of Richard J. Walling (Rept. No. 570); and

S. 775. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso (Rept. No. 571).

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

S. 172. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen (Rept. No. 572).

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

S. 665. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor; without amendment (Rept. No. 575).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, without amendment, an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 573) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

[redacted], Nakaguchi, Shigeki, or Robert Nakaguchi.
[redacted], Buhl Christain Nielsen.
[redacted], Csech, John, or Janos Csech.
[redacted], Klimek, Henryk.
[redacted], Magaddino, Giuseppa (nee Iracani, Concetta Catanzaro).
[redacted], Manilowitz, David, or Mendel Hodak.
[redacted], Masala, Luigi, or Louis Marsorla or Luigi Mazala or Masorala or Masola.
[redacted], Pella, Dante.
[redacted], Schaefer, Hans Johannes.
[redacted], Bremmer, Edmund Oscar Heinrich, or Edmund Oscar Heinrich Sturm.
[redacted], Juliano, Mary, or Mary McKinnon McDonald Clark McCulloch, or McDonald (nee McCulloch) or Bernice Vernon or May Vernon, or Bernice Sullivan.
[redacted], Van Paassen, Cornelia Machelina (nee Sizoo), or Cornelie Machelina Van Paassen or Cornelia M. Van Paassen or Cornalie Van Paassen, and so forth.
[redacted], Van Paassen, Hugo Lodewijk Laurusse, or Hugo Lodewik Van Paassen or Hugo L. Van Paassen.
[redacted], McNally, Nellie Elena (nee Zrum).
[redacted], Volk, Christina May (nee Mackenzie).
[redacted], Sgro, Vito, or Vito Sgroi.
[redacted], Tsoulemelekis, Nicolas, or Nicholas or Tselomeiekis alias Nick Makki or Nick Mekis.
[redacted], Luder, Karl Frank.
[redacted], Aimala, Tauno Pellervo, or Tauno Pellervo.
[redacted], Hartog, Josef Jacob.
[redacted], Hartog, Ada Frederika.
[redacted], Kallinikos, Miltiadis, or James Callas.
[redacted], Diamandopoulos, Antonis Emmanuel.
[redacted], Lowinger, Mor Maurice, or Mor Lowinger or Mor (Moritz) Lovinger.
[redacted], Lowinger, Edith nee Weicz or Edit (Edith) Weisz.
[redacted], Bernier, Maudy Eleonore Frieereke.
[redacted], Bernier, Carlotta, or Deubner-Bernier.
[redacted], Djang, Stephen T., also Sung Tsing Djang.
[redacted], Haynal, Helen May Babienco.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, without amendment, an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 574) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

[redacted], Abdolah, Mohamed, or Mohamed Abdulah.
[redacted], Ahmed, Noor.
[redacted], Alaniz-Cavazos, Alfronso.
[redacted], Ambro, Helen (nee Balazsovic).
[redacted], Ambrose, Dora, alias Dora Elena Benitez Ibanez.
[redacted], Anderson, Anna Kaarina Tulikki Kaari.
[redacted], Anthony, Emma Adelaide, or Emma Adelaide Pickering.
[redacted], Antwine, Tessie Patricia (nee Mansell).
[redacted], Arellano, Domingo, Jr.
[redacted], Arellano, Innocencio.
[redacted], Arellano, Juan, alias John Arellano.
[redacted], Barber, Denise Adelaide Henriette (nee Denise Adelaide Henrietta Van Eycke).
[redacted], Barbera, Elsa Gladys (nee Reeves) formerly Wolff.
[redacted], Bell, Agnes Marjorie.
[redacted], Belovescik, Andrej, or Andy Bell or Andrew Belovescik.
[redacted], Borthwick, Mary Morton (nee Dickson).
[redacted], Bougen, Max, or Mordka David Kacenelenbojgen.
[redacted], Bravo, Maria Belen Guzman.
[redacted], Bravo, Dionisio B.
[redacted], Brayer, Roger Charles.
[redacted], Calcao, Antonio Bernadino.
[redacted], Canniff, Diane Raymonde, or Raymonde Gilberte Johnstone alias Defly DeMery.

[redacted], Carr, Keith Constantine, or Keith Carr or Kenneth Rainford.
[redacted] Cerda-Garcia, Manuel.
[redacted] Chin, Toh Ling, alias Mrs. Leon Chin nee Tan Toh Leng.
[redacted], Chong, Mark, or Mock Chang or Choy See Bow or Mark Yee Sing.
[redacted], Ciliax, Doris Marion.
[redacted], Conatser, Victor Cattan.
[redacted], Coppola, Luigi Guiseppi.
[redacted], Correia, Joao (John) Martinho.
[redacted], Cosio-Rementeria, Juan.
[redacted], Crawe, William.
[redacted], Daher, Mouna (nee Nader).
[redacted], Davidian, Nazar Yeznik.
[redacted], DeBuelna, Maria De Jesus Rios.
[redacted], De Esquibel, Lidia Alamillo.
[redacted], De Greve, Beatrix Maria Herckenrath.
[redacted] De Minnick, Maria Catalina Andrade, or Maria Minnick (nee Maria Catalina Andrade).
[redacted], Eggiman, Guillaume Jean, or William John Eggiman.
[redacted], Egorov, Anton, or Egoroff.
[redacted], Ellis, Hugh Milton.
[redacted], Ettrup, Jens Sigvart.
[redacted], Falanga, Vincenzo.
[redacted], Fan, Hsing Yun, or Edwin Hsing Un Fan.
[redacted], Fay, Cozie Verna, or Cozie Verna Horne Ostle Pettit.
[redacted], Fay, Grace Lorraine (nee Grace Lorraine Mizen).
[redacted], Frazzio, Venturina, or Venturina De Loreto or Renz De Loreto nee Di Loreto.
[redacted], Ferguson, Alvin James.
[redacted], Fernandez, Aurelio Rodriguez.
[redacted] Finger, Hannorah Winnifred (nee Hurley).
[redacted], Flemming, Lily, alias Lily Slater alias Lily Hill alias Lily Wells alias Lily Beety.
[redacted], Foltz, Marie (nee Maria Stanislawa Kaszowski) formerly Cruxton.
[redacted] Ftikas, Gus, or Constantinos alias Gus Tickas.
[redacted], Fukushima, Hideo, alias Eddie Fukushima.
[redacted], Gabrich, Ignatz, or Fred Gabrich or Kenneth Couey or Covey or Kenneth Gabrich.
[redacted], Galaz, Angelo Custidios, or Angelo Curtodios Galaz.
[redacted], Galindo, Maximiliano, or Maximiliano Galindo-Salazar.
[redacted], Galindo, Rafael.
[redacted], Gardner, Eulalia Ofelina (nee Eulalia Ofelina Gumbs (Gomez) or Elaria Lavergne).
[redacted] Gavallas, Emanuel, or Manolis Gavallas.
[redacted], Gentile, Tito.
[redacted], Glatt, Ita, or Ita Tanzer Dorlich.
[redacted], Goldber, Becky (nee Alperowitz or Alpert).
[redacted], Gomez-Munos, Antonio, or Antonio Gomez.
[redacted], Goodman, Ruth Lillian, alias Ray Goodman.
[redacted], Gorny, Edward, or Edward Garry.
[redacted], Grace, John Ronald.
[redacted], Gronaas, George Oluf.
[redacted], Gronning, Nils Johan.
[redacted], Gruber, Ingrid.
[redacted], Guerrero, Antonio Belmonte, or Antonio Belmonte.
[redacted], Gustafson, Karl Arthur.
[redacted], Guzman, Pascasio.
[redacted], Hall, Daisy Evadna.
[redacted], Hall, William Roderick.
[redacted] Hall, Lorna Daisy.
[redacted], Hall, Robert Arthur.
[redacted] Halpern, Chaskel.
[redacted], Hans, Joseph.
[redacted], Harpell, Frederick John.
[redacted], Harrington, Robert Albert.
[redacted], Harris, Clarence George.
[redacted], Hill, William Gordon.

[redacted], Hillmann, Madeline Margaret, or Madeline Margaret Deslauriers or Madeline Margaret Campbell.
[redacted], Hing, Wong.
[redacted], Hochstetler, Dora Lavina, formerly Beauchamp (nee Hennan).
[redacted] Hodges, Alice Mary.
[redacted], Hognestad, Eivind.
[redacted], Hwa, Jesse Chia-Hsi.
[redacted], Hyer, Clara Margarita Pichardo Mendndez.
[redacted], Ikuta, Yasutaro.
[redacted], Jackson, Evelyn Florence Cozens.
[redacted], Jody, Boris Abel (Berelis Josidijo).
[redacted], John, Chiang King, or John Chiang.
[redacted], Johnson, Runar, or Runar Holmberg.
[redacted], Johnson, Shirley Louise.
[redacted], Jones, Laurette Leduc (nee Marie Rose Laurette Leduc) formerly Laurette Albert or Theresa Albert.
[redacted], Kato, Ikano (nee Ikeno Oishi).
[redacted] Kato, Kiyoka, or Kazuo Sewaki.
[redacted] Klass, Abraham, or Al Klass.
[redacted], Krajian, Leon Sarkis.
[redacted], Kuant, Moy.
[redacted] Kuschak, Andrew.
[redacted], Lamb, Eudora, or Dora Lamb (nee Spicer) formerly Harrower.
[redacted], Le Blanc, Ann (nee Horan).
[redacted], Le Blanc, Theotime Joseph, or Timothy or Tim Le Blanc.
[redacted], Lettsome, Wilmoth Carigon.
[redacted] Lettsome, Mera Celestina.
[redacted], Lind, Jacob, or Jack Lind.
[redacted] Logoski, Stefan (or Lagocki), or Steve Logoski Kozek.
[redacted], Luena, Emilio Bieja.
[redacted] Luena, Julia Bulan.
[redacted], Malcolm, Vincent A.
[redacted], Mantsios, Elias Gregory, or Elias Mantsios (Mantziou) or Elias G. Mantsios.
[redacted], Marcrum, Anna Engel Dorothea (nee Behrens).
[redacted], Martin, Angel Elias Frias, or Angel Elias Frias.
[redacted] Martinez-Gonzalez, Jesus, or Jesus G. Martinez.
[redacted], Massengile, Irene Mary (nee Washington).
[redacted], McCandlish, Sally (nee Levine), or Sally McCandlich or Sally Levy or Shana Levin or Levinaite.
[redacted], Melki, Michael.
[redacted], Mello, Maria Cremilde (nee Paiva).
[redacted], Mercan, John, or Joseph Wolff.
[redacted], Mercan, Teresa, or Wolff (nee Mandi).
[redacted], Merritt, Antonia Maris Alamilla.
[redacted], Mihailides, Pashalis.
[redacted] Millington, Irene Christina.
[redacted] Mirakian, Setrak, or Setrak Medzigian alias Sam Mirak.
[redacted], Mitchell, James Alexander.
[redacted], Moldovan, Rose (nee Steiner) alias Rose Weiss.
[redacted], Moore, Flora Ann, or Flora Ann Gumbs.
[redacted], Morales, Rosa Ydalia Morales (nee Rosa Ydalia Urena).
[redacted], Morales-Gonzalez, Alejandro.
[redacted], Morawetz, Kurt Otto.
[redacted], Morawetz, Rita Chana.
[redacted], Morello, Maria Losardo, alias Giovanna Lipari Scianca.
[redacted], Morgan, Gladstone Jonathan, or Clanson Jonathan Morgan.
[redacted], Mucino-Basurto, Carlos, alias Anthony Calociche.
[redacted], Muloski, Olga, alias Olga Casey nee Zawada.
[redacted], Munkittrick, Ingrid, or Ingrid Gassner.
[redacted], Nakamura, Yoshimitsu.
[redacted], Nakanishi, Sadao, alias Shuichi Nakanishi.

[redacted], Nedelkoff, George, or George Nedelkow.
[redacted], Nencel, David.
[redacted], Nielsen, Herdis Johanne (nee Frandsen).
[redacted], Nimori, Kaoru, or Richard Kaoru Nimori.
[redacted], Noi, Chew Yan nn Yan Noi Sung.
[redacted], Ocampo, Emeterio Mendoza.
[redacted] Olsen, Henrik Hjalmar.
[redacted], Ono, Mokichi, or Frank Ono or Ichizaemon Suwa.
[redacted], Ortiz-Hurtado, Juan.
[redacted], Owen, Judith Elizabeth.
[redacted], Papageorgiou, Nikolas.
[redacted], Perez, Francisco, Doncel Castro, or Frank Castro.
[redacted], Peters, Heinrich Hans Gustav Amandus.
[redacted], Picking, Douglas Barnette.
[redacted], Picquett, Daisy Veronica, alias Daisy Veronica Picquett (nee Riley).
[redacted], Popianas, Stella Maria.
[redacted], Poy, Chiu Chong, or Poy Chew.
[redacted], Phiu, Victoria, or Chiu Ying Ngor.
[redacted], Prager, Fritz.
[redacted], Pulos, Maria C. (nee Maria D. Constantinides).
[redacted], Quijano, Alonso.
[redacted], Quintas, Antonio, or Antonio Quintas Rodriguez.
[redacted] Randell, Dora (nee Dura or Dora Miller).
[redacted] Regus, Vasile (William Rabbitt or Rabit) (William Rubek).
[redacted], Ritchey, Joseph Eugene.
[redacted], Rivera, Lorenzo.
[redacted], Rodi, Frank, or Antonio Sgambati.
[redacted], Rodriguez-Hizon, Virgilio Lourdes.
[redacted], Russak, Joseph Chaim.
[redacted], Rychel, Jan, alias John Joseph Richel.
[redacted], Schiller, Elsa (nee Elsa Vogt), or Elsa Johanna Schiller or Elise K. Schiller.
[redacted], Schwarz, Hans, alias Hans Eisler.
[redacted], Sciullo, Franco.
[redacted], Seiler, Daniel.
[redacted], Shee, Lew, or Lew Lan Hing or Heung or Mrs. Eng Hoy.
[redacted], Siber, Steve.
[redacted], Simandjuntak, Gerson, or Simandjunta or Saleh Bin Karim or Karim Bin Salley.
[redacted], Sipari, Vilho.
[redacted], Smarzik, George, or George Sivak.
[redacted], Spano, Gaetano, or Clyde Spano.
[redacted], Spencer, Giovanna, or Sheasby nee Srintz.
[redacted], Stein, Ray (Rachael) (nee Rajacsky).
[redacted], Stougaard, Carl Gorm Petersen, alias Gorm Stongaard.
[redacted], Szumilas, Stanley, alias George Sokol.
[redacted], Tait, Claude Anthony, or Claude Anthony Wang or Claude Anthony Wang Tait or Claude Anthony Francis Tait or Claude Antoine Wang or Claude Wang.
[redacted], Takemura, Nobuto, or Nobuya Takemoto.
[redacted], Tarca, Dante.
[redacted], Thomsen, Bente Oda Fritze.
[redacted], Tiner, Mevzat.
[redacted], Tournay, Lucille Mariette.
[redacted] Toy, Mark Dock.
[redacted], Tsai, Ruby Wu, also known as Yu Kee Wu.
[redacted], Tsai, Shih Hao.
[redacted], Tschetschot, George.
[redacted], Tsukimoto, Tadashi.
[redacted] Hurley, John.
[redacted], Vaggalis, Calliope (nee Taboulari).

[redacted], Vaiarelli, Vincenzo Maria, or Vincent Vaiarelli.
[redacted], Valerdi, Celestino, Belestino Valerdi.
[redacted], Valsas, Steve, Alias Stayros Valsamidis.
[redacted], Vavasis, Sam, or Arzirious Spiros Vavasis.
[redacted], Velcich, Domenick.
[redacted], Ventura, Ramon Daniel Garcia.
[redacted], Visini, Maria.
[redacted], Vrana, Stefan Josef.
[redacted], Wakimoto, Matsue Kimura, or Matsue Kimura.
[redacted], Wiitainoja, Katri Elisa (nee Lilja), alias Mrs. Katherine Brickson.
[redacted], Wilson, Edna May (nee Cohen), formerly Holt.
[redacted], Wilton, Christina Farquharson (nee Gill or Kimmel).
[redacted], Wimmer, Lillian Rose, formerly Lillian Rose Duane, Lillian Rose Faulkner.
[redacted], Wloszczewski, Stefan.
[redacted], Wolff, Johanna Bernardina Hendrika.
[redacted], Wu, Wan-Ching (nee Wan Ching Chiang).
[redacted], Yirmibes, Orhan Osman, or Orhan Osman Yirmibesh.
[redacted], York, Lourdes Lontoc Francisco.
[redacted], Hsueh, Chao Wang.
[redacted], Yu, Greta Yee-Tak.
[redacted], Zehetner, Joseph.
[redacted], Zito, Rocco.
[redacted], Kayar, Sedat Arif.
[redacted], Madeira, Luis Julio.

CITATION OF MARTIN ACCARDO FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Martin Accardo for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 562) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 180) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Martin Accardo to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the southern district of Florida, to the end that the said Martin Accardo may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JULIUS FINK FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Julius Fink for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 563) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 181) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Julius Fink to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Julius Fink may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ABRAHAM MINKER FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Abraham Minker for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 564) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 182) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Abraham Minker to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Abraham Minker may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ISADORE MINKER FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Isadore Minker for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 565) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 183) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Isadore Minker to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Isadore Minker may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ALEX FUDEMAN FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I report favorably an original resolution citing Alex Fudeman for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 566) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 184) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Alex Fudeman to answer a series of questions before the said special committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Alex Fudeman may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of George A. Efron and his wife, Anna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1886. A bill for the relief of Hisae Kuramoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1887. A bill for the relief of Mordechay Dinewitz; and

S. 1888. A bill for the relief of Roberto Campa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1889. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1890. A bill authorizing the establishment and maintenance of additional national cemeteries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. GEORGE):

S. 1891. A bill for the relief of Lubo Paskalovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1892. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Daniel Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1893. A bill to amend and extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; and

S. 1894. A bill to assist the national defense by authorizing the provision of housing at reactivated military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1895. A bill to make funds allotted to Senators for clerk hire available for use for payment of toll charges on telegrams; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1896. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. FERGUSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. NIXON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3973, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3973, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 3973, supra, which was

ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDERSON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, at the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. —. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765) as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to all sums heretofore authorized to be appropriated for such purpose, the sum of $4,000,000 to be available only for access roads for the prospecting and mining of uranium deposits and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum authorized by this section shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That the roads authorized to be constructed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate."

Mr. ANDERSON also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

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. IVES:

Address entitled "No War—No Peace," delivered by him before a luncheon plenary session at the Colgate University Conference on American Foreign Policy, on July 22, 1951, at Hamilton, N. Y.

By Mr. GREEN:

Address delivered by Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, United States Navy (retired), treasurer, Silver Users' Association, before the Mirror Manufacturers' Association, San Francisco, Calif., July 12, 1951.

By Mr. LANGER:

Address on the subject of the duty of eligible citizens to vote in national and off-year elections, by Harry L. Brumond, chairman of the Citizens' National Affairs Committee, delivered at the meeting of the executive committee, held at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y., on July 23, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "Containment Is Far From Enough," written by Barbara Ward and published in the New York Times magazine.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Letter dated July 16, 1951, addressed to him by Hiram Bingham, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board.

Article entitled "Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union," written by Victor Lasky and published in the June 1951 issue of the National Jewish Monthly.

By Mr. ECTON:

Editorials from various newspapers commenting on Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin.

By Mr. PASTORE:

Editorial entitled "Italian Treaty Revision," published in the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of July 23, 1951.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Article entitled "Open Mind on McCARTHY," written by Bill Cunningham and published in the Boston Herald of July 17, 1951.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "BRICKER's Warning," published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of July 21, 1951.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, last month the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held 2 weeks of daily hearings on the operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and proposed amendments thereto. One of the assigned duties of our committee is to evaluate the workings of that law.

Some 60 witnesses appeared before the committee and submitted suggestions for strengthening the organization and operation of the Congress. More than half of the witnesses who appeared were Members of Congress and of the congressional staff.

A summary of the recommendations they submitted, classified in accordance with the schedule of topics upon which the hearings were based, has been prepared for the consideration of the committee.

In the belief that this summary will be of interest to the entire membership of both Houses, as well as to all those who are concerned in strengthening our Nation's Legislature, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
July 17, 1951.

Staff memorandum No. 82-1-46.

Subject: Amendments to Legislative Reorganization Act—Summary of recommendations received.

In order to assist the committee in formulating its own recommendations on the organization and operation of Congress, I submit below a skeleton summary of the principal recommendations received by the committee during our June hearings from Members of Congress and other who appeared or sent in written statements.[1] Their recommendations are classified in accordance with the schedule of topics upon which the hearings were based. The names listed after each suggestion are those who made them.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND OPERATION

1. Create a standing Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs (S. Res. 148) (FERGUSON, MURRAY).

2. Create standing Committees on Civil Rights in both Houses (Henderson).

3. Establish a Joint Select Committee on the Organization of Congress (S. Con. Res. 3, H. Con. Res. 60) (HUMPHREY, HOLIFIELD, A. L. MILLER).

4. Provide machinery for coordination and evaluation of legislative policy on fiscal affairs (Ruml).

5. Perfect the parallelism of the committee structure of the two Houses (Walker).

6. Reduce size of minor Senate committees and increase size of major committees (CASE, McCARTHY, TAFT).

7. Increase five Senate standing committees from 13 to 15 members each, and the Appropriations Committee from 21 to 23 members (TAFT).

8. Increase size of Committee on Foreign Relations (Wilcox).

9. Make the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations exclusive in their membership (McCLELLAN).

10. Give each first-term Senator one major committee assignment before any first-term Senate receives two major committee seats (BENTON).

11. Clarify definitions of committee jurisdiction (MURRAY).

12. Realine the congressional committee structure (Parks).

13. Central scheduling of committee meetings, to avoid conflicts (BENTON).

14. Allow subcommittees to hold executive sessions without obtaining approval of full committee (sec. 133f) (MEADER).

15. Include in each committee report a simple, concise statement of the bill's objectives (LeMay).

16. Provide funds to enable members and staffs of Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees to travel abroad on committee business, without necessity of seeking funds each time such travel is contemplated (Marcy).

17. Adopt a general code of fair play for the conduct of committee hearings and investigations (Kefauver, Ferguson (voluntary), Humphrey, Holifield, Meader (voluntary), A. L. Miller, Multer, Heller, Loeb (ADA), Levy (ACLU), Mrs. Stone (LWV), New York City Bar Association, committee on bill of rights).

18. Authorize House Judiciary Committee to draft a code of procedure for conduct of hearings and examination of witnesses before House committees (H. Res. 221) (CELLER).

19. Change name of Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to Committee on Government Operations (McCLELLAN).

20. Provide for reference of legislation for relief of certifying officers to Committee on Expenditures (staff, Senate Expenditures Committee).

STAFFING OF CONGRESS

1. Expand the staffing of Congress (BENTON).

2. Expand professional staffs of standing committees (sec. 202) (MEADER, WALKER).

3. Provide each standing committee (other than Appropriations) with a permanent staff of at least 6 professional and 12 clerical employees (MURRAY).

4. Raise ceiling on size of professional staffs of busiest committees (Wilcox).

5. Expand professional staffs of Committees on Appropriations (DOUGLAS, FERGUSON, HUMPHREY).

6. Let Foreign Affairs Committees have one or two roving agents who could, on committee direction, make spot surveys abroad of matters related to United States foreign policy or to pending legislation (Marcy).

7. Develop an eligible register of competent committee staff experts (MEADER).

8. Forbid use of committee staff positions for patronage purposes (MEADER).

9. Place all employees of Congress under a merit system based on competitive examination with permanent tenure during good behavior (Walker).

10. Establish professional standards for appointments to Senate Library staff (HUMPHREY).

[1] See appendix A for complete list of witnesses.

11. Provide that ranking minority member of each standing committee shall have privilege of appointing, with approval of minority committeemen, one professional staff member, the assistant clerk, and one stenographer. Or, alternatively, that professional staff shall be equally divided between majority and minority (BRIDGES).

12. Permit majority and minority committeemen to select their own staff employees (MURRAY).

13. Assign two-thirds of enlarged committee staffs to majority, and one-third to minority (MURRAY).

14. Make professional staffs of standing committees available to minority members (BRIDGES, Burdette).

15. Let the Joint Budget Committee have a counsel appointed by the majority, and associate counsel appointed by the minority (BRIDGES).

16. Increase staff of Senate minority policy committee (SMITH).

17. Relax the conflict-of-interest statute to permit committees to employ persons on a temporary basis (MEADER).

18. Clearance of official committee stenographers by the FBI (FURCOLO).

19. Amend House rule to provide for admission of professional committee staffs to House floor when their committee bills are under consideration (Foreign Affairs Committee staff).

20. Proportion allowances for staff of Senators' offices to the population of the State they represent (Walker).

21. Fix clerk hire allowance of Representatives at $12,500 a year (MULTER).

22. Permit Representatives to employ administrative assistants (MULTER).

23. Classify positions in legislative service and compensate each grade uniformly (A. L. MILLER).

24. Establish a salary scale for congressional employees on a par with salaries paid for comparable work in executive branch (MURRAY).

25. Make the base salary of congressional employees their actual salary (S. 633) (FLANDERS).

26. Raise ceiling on salary payable temporary committee personnel (MEADER).

27. Condition compensation of borrowed personnel upon price approval of administration committees (MEADER).

28. Adjust retirement benefits for legislative employees, by amending title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act (BRIDGES, DEANE, SMITH).

29. Add the fields of national defense, recreation, public health, immigration, forestry, fisheries, insurance, crime, and atomic energy to those in which senior specialists may be appointed in the Legislative Reference Service (sec. 203b) (Griffith).

30. Change "price economics" to "marketing" (sec. 203b) (Griffith).

31. Amend rules of both Houses so as to allow standing committees to reimburse Legislative Reference Service for services rendered (Griffith).

32. Authorize the Legislative Reference Service to: (a) index printed hearings; (b) prepare analyses of lobby data); (c) digest pending amendments of major bills (Griffith).

33. Restore funds for the publications staff of the Legislative Reference Service (Stone, Smith).

34. Permit House and Senate legislative counsels to make staff appointments without the necessity of clearing with the Speaker of the House or the President pro tempore of the Senate (staff, Senate Expenditures Committee).

WORKLOAD ON CONGRESS

1. Ban the introduction of all private bills and delegate all private legislation to appropriate administrative agencies (Benton, Humphrey, Multer, Stone, Heller).

2. Create a new joint standing Committee on Private Legislation of all types, with an adequate staff (CELLER).

3. Grant home rule to the District of Columbia (Benton, Humphrey, Kefauver, Heller, Loeb, Levy, Stone, Van Arkel).

4. Create a congressional commission to study the devolution of governmental functions (BENNETT).

5. Reduce workload on Congress by (a) avoidance of special investigating committees, (b) fewer committee assignments per Member, (c) systematic personnel arrangements, (d) addition of more staff where needed (Stone).

OVERSIGHT OF ADMINISTRATION

1. Increase oversight of administration by congressional committees (sec. 136) (MURRAY).

2. Conduct a televised report-and-question period fortnightly in both Houses (KEFAUVER, Walker).

3. Require committees to review administrative legislation and recommend to Congress disapproval of regulations contrary to legislative intent (Walker).

4. Use the Subcommittee on Senate Investigations as a central investigating body for the Senate (Nobleman).

5. Establish a Joint Legislative Council (Holcombe).

STRENGTHENING FISCAL CONTROLS

1. Create a Joint Committee on the Budget, with an expert staff (S. 913) (McClellan, Bridges, Taft, Atkins).

2. Let the Joint Budget Committee furnish estimates of probable cost of proposed authorizations (BRIDGES, SCHOEPPEL).

3. Let the Joint Budget Committee make a study of existing authorizations to see if any could be repealed (PRIDGES).

4. Consolidate all the general appropriation bills (S. Con. Res. 27) (Bridges, Butler of Nebraska, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Atkins).

5. Require a record vote on all appropriation bills (H. Res. 119) (ROGERS): and on all committee amendments offered thereto (Atkins, A. L. MILLER).

6. Include cost estimates in committee reports (S. Con. Res. 2) (Ferguson, Atkins, Schoeppel).

7. Authorize President to veto individual items in general appropriation bills (H. J. Res. 24; H. R. 492) (Keating, Multer, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Atkins).

8. Establish a permanent congressional Commission on Government Efficiency and Economy (H. R. 1402) (REES).

9. Increase expert staffs of Appropriations Committees (DOUGLAS, FERGUSON, HUMPHREY).

10. Make greater use of the facilities of the General Accounting Office (FERGUSON).

11. Require amendments offered to appropriation bills to specify where the money shall come from (FURCOLO).

12. Reduce the number of appropriations; break each appropriation down into subheads; and empower Budget Bureau to sanction transfers between subheads (Wilmerding).

13. Appoint a single accountable officer in each department to prepare and defend the appropriation accounts (Wilmerding).

14. Let the appropriation accounts be audited for Congress by an audit department completely independent of the Executive (Wilmerding).

15. Establish a Public Accounts Committee to receive and review the Auditor General's report (Wilmerding).

16. Start the fiscal year October 1 instead of July 1 (MCCLELLAN).

REGISTRATION OF LOBBYISTS

1. Clarify scope of application of lobby law (FRAZIER).

2. Delete the words "principal" and "principally" in section 307 of title III (Zeller).

3. Require lobbyists before executive agencies to register and report (LANE, Zeller).

4. Require groups engaged in "indirect lobbying" to register and report (LANE, Zeller).

5. Authorize withdrawal of registrations of persons who have stopped lobbying (LANE, FRAZIER).

6. Extend exemption granted under section 308 of the lobby law to include radio, television, and facsimile (LANE, Zeller).

7. Exempt organizations receiving and spending less than $1,000 a year, directly or indirectly, from lobby law (LANE, Zeller).

8. Amend section 305 to require reporting of contributions of $100 or more (LANE).

9. Require lobbyists to give names and addresses of contributors of $500 or more (Zeller).

10. Require lobbyists to report campaign contributions (BENTON).

11. Amend the lobby law to require an allocation of payments into lobbying and nonlobbying categories (LANE).

12. Require a statement of total expenditures of organizations engaged in influencing legislation, broken down into broad categories, with legislative expenditures itemized (Zeller).

13. Require quarterly listing of name and address of each recipient of an expenditure of $50 or more (sec. 304, a4) (Zeller).

14. Prohibit payment of contingent fees to lobbyists (Lane, Zeller, Buchanan Committee).

15. Require lobbying organizations to file statement of their bona fide total membership (Zeller).

16. Require lobbying organizations to state how their legislative policy was determined and to indicate the responsibility of their agents (Zeller).

17. Deny the privilege of the floor to ex-Members who are engaged in lobbying (Lane, Loeb).

18. Create a Joint Committee on the Legislative Process to supervise administration of the lobby law and the Corrupt Practices Act (Lane, Zeller, Buchanan Committee).

19. File lobby statements in triplicate with Department of Justice, Clerk of House, and supervisory committee (Zeller).

20. Require registrations and reports under lobby law to be filed either with Clerk of House or Secretary of Senate, not with both (FRAZIER).

21. Simplify the information published quarterly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the lobby law, and use one form for filing (FRAZIER).

22. Do not require notarized oath on registration forms under lobby law (FRAZIER).

COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT OF MEMBERS

1. Increase congressional salaries (Heller, Ruml, Multer, Stone).

2. Increase compensation of Members of Congress to $15,000 a year (S. 1290) (WILLIAMS).

3. Increase congressional salaries to a minimum of $25,000 a year (BENTON).

4. Establish a Commission on Congressional Salaries (S. 1117) (DIRKSEN, BRIDGES).

5. Refer the question of adequate salaries for Congressmen and fair retirement allowances to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board (Ruml).

6. Let the President name a commission to study congressional salaries and pensions (Loeb).

7. Repeal tax exemptions allowed Members of Congress and high executive officers (S. 1290 (WILLIAMS, PICKETT).

8. Permit Members of Congress to deduct official expenses in computing their income taxes (PICKETT, MCCLELLAN).

9. Grant expense allowances to Members of Congress (MULTER).

10. Grant more adequate allowances for travel (Walker).

11. Grant allowances to enable Senators to travel abroad (Wilcox).

12. Increase retirement allowances for Members (BENTON, HELLER).

13. Amend section 602 to base retirement allowances on length of service in Congress rather than on age, with 12 years' service a minimum condition (BRIDGES).

14. Provide an alternative option of retirement under title VI at age 55, with appropriate reduction in annuity (Bridges).

15. Permit former Members of Congress to participate in the Federal retirement system (O'Connor, Nye, and Bulow).

COMPOSITION AND TENURE OF CONGRESS

1. Amend Constitution to provide that term of office of Representatives shall be 4 years, with half the House selected each biennium (Lea).

2. Four-year term for Representatives (CASE, MULTER).

3. Limit first term of Senators to 2 years (FURCOLO).

4. Consider methods of fixing a future age limit on service in Congress (BRIDGES).

5. Equalize the size of constituencies in the House of Representatives (Walker).

CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS AND IMMUNITY

1. Repeal congressional immunity section of the Constitution (art. I, sec. 6) (HUNT).

2. Amend title 28 of United States Code to allow damage suits by persons defamed by Members of Congress (H. R. 2130) (Denton, Hunt, Walker).

3. Provide that no Senator or Representative shall be immune from civil liability for any defamatory statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (H. R. 3440) (CELLER).

4. Make it unlawful for any Member of Congress to receive or accept any part of the salary of his employees (H. R. 451) (BURDICK).

5. Amend the Corrupt Practices Act to cover receipts and expenditures in primary campaigns, and to check smear methods of campaigning (MORSE).

6. Require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to disclose the amount and sources of their income (S. 561) (MORSE, Loeb).

7. Forbid persons registered under the lobby law to distribute literature under congressional franks (DEANE).

8. Limit distribution of franked matter to a Member's district or State (DEANE).

9. Limit distribution of franked matter in proportion to the population of a congressional district or State (DEANE).

10. Assign a monthly quota for free distribution of frankcd matter (A. L. MILLER).

11. Find a formula for maintaining confidential character of congressional documents (sec. 202d) (MEADER).

12 Regulate nepotism (A. L. MILLER).

PARTY GOVERNMENT IN CONGRESS

1. Consolidate the several leadership groups in each House into one truly effective and responsible leadership committee for each party (Humphrey, Gross (APSA), Holcombe, Loeb, Stone).

2. Make the party leadership committees in each House responsible for (a) regular meetings of party membership, (b) submitting policy proposals to party membership, (c) selection of committee chairmen, (d) assignment of members to committees, (e) planning the legislative schedule (Gross (APSA), Loeb, Stone, Humphrey).

3. Establish party policy committees in the House of Representatives (Ruml, Smith).

4. Place more responsibility upon the party caucus and party steering committees (Walker).

5. As regards seniority: (a) Abandon or modify seniority rule in committee appointments (Burdette, Walker); (b) let party caucuses elect chairmen of standing committees (Holcombe); (c) provide for the democratic selection of chairmen and members of committees (Sifton (CIO)); and (d) appoint standing committee chairmen on some other basis than seniority (Henderson, Stone).

6. Translate party platform pledges into legislation action (MULTER).

7. Give priority in legislative scheduling to implementation of party platform promises (Henderson).

PUBLIC RELATIONS OF CONGRESS

1. Have the Library of Congress make a study of the public relations of Congress, under auspices of Joint Committee on the Library (BENTON).

2. Televise public hearings of congressional committees (KEFAUVER).

3. Make committee hearings available to American people through radio and television (Wilcox).

4. Broadcast and televise important House sessions, via commercial broadcasting companies, subject to a code of ethics (H. Res. 62) (JAVITS).

5. Experiment with broadcasting and televising important debates (HELLER, HUMPHREY, MILLER).

6. Adopt a planned program of televising selected committee hearings, with a code of fair practice (S. Res. 106) (WILEY).

7. Broadcast and televise all sessions of both Houses and selected committee hearings via Nation-wide networks owned and operated by Congress (Sifton).

8. Provide facilities for making motion-picture films for use in television stations in home States (BENTON).

9. Arrange the sessions of Congress so as to have more frequent recesses (Walker).

10. Arrange for a regular congressional recess during the first of each Congress, from July 1 to September 15 (MCCARTHY, Minnesota).

11. Provide for adjournment of Congress during April, August, and September in odd-numbered years (H. R. 6180, 81st Cong., 1st sess) (CELLER).

12. Make the Daily Digest section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD separately available for public sale (Riddick).

13. Phrase the titles of bills and resolutions so as to summarize their objectives and contents (Riddick).

14. Include at end of each printed edition of a bill a digest of its objectives and contents (Riddick).

15. Print periodically a full history of legislation pending before both Houses (Riddick).

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

1. Arrange for a general revision of the standing rules of the Senate (MORSE, HUMPHREY).

2. Adopt a rule of relevancy in Senate debate (HENDRICKSON, LEHMAN, MORSE, DOUGLAS, HUMPHREY, HELLER).

3. Adopt an improved cloture rule in the Senate (Walker).

4. Provide for majority cloture on all matters before the Senate (S. Res. 41) (Morse, Humphrey, Gross (APSA), Heller, Loeb, Stone, Burdette).

5. Amend the Senate cloture rule (S. Res. 105) (Lehman and 10 other Senators, Loeb (ADA), Henderson).

6. Amend rule XIX of the Senate standing rules (re disorder in debate) so as to permit the Chair or the Senate to rule upon its violation (LEHMAN).

7. Hold committee meetings and Senate sessions on alternate days (Ferguson, McClellan, Morse, Sifton).

8. Vote by electricity in the House (Davis (Wisc.), Bennett (Fla.), Denton, Kefauver, Heller, Walker).

9. Vote by electricity in both Houses (Humphrey, Miller, Sifton, Stone).

10. Limit power of House Rules Committee over legislation which may be considered from the calendar (Walker).

11. Restore the "21-day rule" in the House of Representatives (Holifield, Heller, Loeb).

12. Liberalize the present House rule concerning the discharge of committees from further consideration of bills (Walker).

13. Reduce required number of signatures on House discharge petitions from 218 to 150 (H. Res. 59) (SABATH, HOLIFIELD).

14. Require House Appropriations Committee to hold open hearings (Stone).

15. Hold joint hearings on identical or similar bills (McClellan, Sparkman, Furcolo, Holifield, Multer, Riddick, Sifton, Walker).

16. Hold joint hearings on departmental appropriation bills (SALTONSTALL).

17. Abolish riders on appropriation and other bills (Walker).

18. Abolish or limit the practice of pairing (Walker).

19. Add the following sentence to the rule limiting the power of conferees (sec. 135):

"It is hereby expressly provided that this paragraph shall be deemed to include reports on measures where one House has struck out all after the enacting or resolving clause and inserted a substitute."

ADMINISTRATION OF CONGRESS

1. Establish an Office of Congressional Services to coordinate the housekeeping facilities of Congress and modernize methods of personnel administration (Heller, Burdette, Kammerer).

2. Modernize methods of office management (Kammerer).

3. Appoint a business manager to rationalize housekeeping services of Congress (Kammerer).

4. Abandon antiquated patronage system on Capitol Hill (Kammerer).

5. Improve facilities of Senate Office Building for radio and television (Wilcox).

6. Provide more adequate office space for Senate committees (Wilcox; and, for Senators, ERIDGES).

7. Improve labor-saving devices, mimeograph facilities, and restaurant services in the Capitol and Senate Office Building (BRIDGES).

8. Survey the facilities and needs of the Service and Duplicating Department of the Senate (Smith).

9. Increase telephone and stationery allowances for Senators (BRIDGES).

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY,
Consultant.

APPENDIX A

HEARINGS ON THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF CONGRESS BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

LIST OF WITNESSES[1]

Senators: WILLIAM BENTON, STYLES BRIDGES, FRANCIS CASE, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, HOMER FERGUSON, RALPH E. FLANDERS, ESTES KEFAUVER, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, WAYNE MORSE, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, JOHN J. SPARKMAN, ROBERT A. TAFT, JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Representatives: CHARLES E. BENNETT, USHER L. BURDICK, EMANUEL CELLER, CHARLES B. DEANE, WINFIELD K. DENTON, FOSTER FURCOLO, CHET HOLIFIELD, JACOB K. JAVITS, KENNETH B. KEATING, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, GEORGE MEADER, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, TOM PICKETT, EDWARD H. REES, DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

Former Members of Congress: William J. Bulow, South Dakota; Gerald P. Nye, North Dakota; Clarence F. Lea, California; John J. O'Connor, New York.

Others: Carter W. Atkins, executive director, Connecticut Public Expenditure Council; Franklin L. Burdette, professor and head,

[1] References made to names not appearing on the above list are covered in written or oral statements submitted to the committee.

department of government and politics, University of Maryand; Donald C. Cook, chief counsel, Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee (presented statement of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON); William L. Ellis, Chief of Investigations, General Accounting Office (accompanied by Robert F. Cartwright, Assistant Chief; Francis T. Matchett, Assistant chief; Taylor G. Addison, Assistant Chief; Investigations, GAO; Edward J. Roach Jr., Administrative Officer); Emery L. Frazier, Chief Clerk of the United States Senate; Ernest S. Griffith, Director Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; Bertram Gross, chairman, committee on political parties, American Political Science Association; Elmer W. Henderson, director, American Council of Human Rights; Robert Heller, chairman, National Committee for Strengthening Congress; Dr. Arthur N. Holcombe, professor of government, Harvard University; Dr. Edgar Lane, instructor of politics, Princeton University; Francis M. LeMay, coordinator of information, House of Representatives; James Loeb, Jr., national executive secretary, Americans for Democratic Action; Allan H. Perley, legislative counsel, House of Representatives; Dr. Floyd M. Riddick, Senate editor, Daily Digest; Beardsley Ruml, chairman, business committee, National Planning Association; Paul Sifton, UAW-CIO national legislative representative; John H. Sims, legislative counsel, United States Senate; George H. E. Smith, staff director, Senate Republican policy committee; Mrs. Kathryn H. Stone, League of Women Voters of the United States; Gerhard Van Arkel, counsel, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia; Dr. Harvey Walker, professor of political science, Ohio State University; Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., Princeton, N. J.; Dr. Belle Zeller, professor of political science, Brooklyn College, New York.

ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the passing of the United States Chief of Naval Operations and my good friend, Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, fills me, as I know it does every one of us, with a deep sadness. His death comes as a great shock to every American, and his loss is one beyond measure.

Forrest Sherman was born in Merrimack, N. H., but at an early age he moved with his family to Melrose, Mass., where he attended the public schools, and graduated at the head of his class from Melrose High School. He attended Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1913 and 1914, and was appointed to the Naval Academy from there. Born and bred in the tradition of the sea, Admiral Sherman throughout his 37-year naval career exemplified the very best that that tradition has represented ever since men have gone down to the sea in ships bearing the American flag.

Admiral Sherman's most recent assignment was a demanding one, requiring of him his every ability and energy—as Chief of Naval Operations, as a diplomat, and as a representative of the purpose and policy of the United States in an unsettled and worried world. I had the privilege of talking with him at length just before he left on this last assignment, and I felt again the glow of confidence and quiet courage which he always radiated. It is most fitting, even though it is terribly tragic, that Admiral Sherman should have died in line of duty, in a heroic effort to help bolster the defenses of this land he loved so well and of the free world in whose interests he had always fought superbly.

Mere words on the part of any one of us are of little avail in this time of crisis unless we are willing at the same time, and as never before, to buckle down to the tasks and endeavors to which Forrest Sherman committed himself above and beyond the call of duty. The security of this Nation on the sea, in the air, and on the land must be our first and greatest objective, as it was his, for on that security the freedom of our own Nation and many other nations depends. In the name and in the example of the late Admiral Sherman, let us resolve now to do our duty as it lies compellingly before us toward the achievement of this goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a somewhat more complete description of Admiral Sherman's life, as printed in the Boston Herald of Monday, July 23. I wish to call attention to just one portion of the article, namely, the part which refers to the fact that at the age of 12 Forrest Sherman was sailing with his grandfather on Buzzard's Bay when his grandfather died of a sudden heart attack, and Forrest Sherman then brought the boat ashore and called for help. His grandfather was also a man who loved the sea.

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

ADMIRAL SHERMAN DIES ON EUROPE MISSION—UNITED STATES NAVAL CHIEF HAD HEART ATTACK

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

ROME, July 22.—Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, United States Chief of Naval Operations, died suddenly of a heart attack in the Excelsior Hotel in Naples at 12:30 p. m. today. He was 54.

WIFE FLIES HOME

The body was shortly afterward taken aboard the U. S. S. *Mount Olympus*, which is anchored in Naples harbor and acts as temporary headquarters of Admiral Robert B. Carney, commanding the southern sector of North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces. It will remain there pending arrival of instructions from Washington.

Admiral Forrest Percival Sherman, who ran the United States Navy for 2 years until his death yesterday, was a Melrose boy who caught the fever of the sea from his grandfather, a salty old New Bedford whaling skipper.

One of six brothers who wore big brass during World War II, he aimed high, and early at the age of 8 when, so the story goes, he informed his parents he was going to be an admiral.

COMMANDED "WASP"

He exceeded his own ambitions, going on to win the Navy Cross for his heroic command of the ill-fated carrier *Wasp* in the Pacific, drawing the praise of Pacific Naval Chief Chester W. Nimitz as "the man who is responsible for winning the war in the Pacific," and finally vaulting into the Navy's top post, Chief of Naval Operations, in 1949.

Admiral Sherman was born October 30, 1896, at Merrimack, N. H., a descendant of John and Priscilla Alden and son of Frank J. Sherman, for many years chairman of the board of assessors in Melrose, who died about 6 years ago.

When he was a small lad the family moved to Melrose, and when he was 6 Forrest began summering with his grandfather, Capt. John Allen, of New Bedford.

He listened to the yarns of Captain Allen and his old whaling friends. The boy shipped as crew on the old man's 21-foot catboat on runs around Buzzard's Bay and became well steeped in the craft of the mariner and the lore of his calling.

When Forrest was 12 he brought the boat into dock unaided one day, tied her up, and called for help. His grandfather had died on board of a heart attack.

ATTENDED M. I. T.

Young Sherman foreswore baseball as a waste of time, concentrated on mathematics, wireless, and boats, and stood at the head of his class at Melrose High when he was graduated in 1913.

He attended Massachusetts Institute of Technology for a year, then took competitive examinations for Annapolis, getting the appointment from Congressman Frederick S. Deitrick. It was touch and go for a while, he recalled many years later, because Deitrick was a Democrat and his father a Republican.

In 1917 he graduated from the Naval Academy, second in a class of 203, and was commissioned an ensign in June. Sherman was immediately assigned to naval forces in the Mediterranean during World War I.

He had decided by 1922 that aviation was the coming thing in the Navy, and thereafter held a variety of assignments, playing a considerable part in the defense planning prior to World War II.

It was during this period that he achieved the reputation as a trouble-shooter compromise expert which was to catapult him to fame after the war.

LAST TO QUIT SHIP

In September 1942, Captain Sherman was in command of the aircraft carrier *Wasp* when she was torpedoed by a Japanese submarine off the Solomons.

The *Wasp's* ammunition and gasoline were exploding and burning and the bridge was blistering with the heat. Sherman, in a brilliant maneuver, reversed the direction of the ship to contain the flames in the bow section, at the same time allowing space and time for 130 men trapped there to escape aft.

The *Wasp* finally sank, but about 90 percent of the crew were saved. Sherman was the last man to leave.

He then served as Chief of Staff to Admiral John Henry Towers, Commander of the Pacific Fleet Air Force, later as Deputy Chief of Staff to Fleet Admiral Nimitz, took part in the initial surrender conference with the Japanese at Manila and watched the formal surrender aboard the Missouri.

His war decorations included the Navy Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Purple Heart, Legion of Merit, Honorary Companion of the Order of the Bath (British), Grand Cross of the Order of the Phoenix (Greek), and Commander of the Military Order (Italian).

AIDED IN UNIFICATION

In 1945 he was named Deputy Chief of Naval Operations and during the next 2 years he was the negotiator for the Navy when representatives of the Navy, Army, and Army Air Forces sought to produce a compromise bill for unification that would meet some of the Navy objections.

Admiral Sherman commanded the Sixth Task Fleet in the Mediterranean in 1948, a tough diplomatic as well as naval job involving the implementation of American foreign policy.

Sherman's reputation as a "flying admiral," coupled with his conviction learned from the success of coordinated operations in the Pacific during the war that a unified command in Washington was desirable and necessary, carried him to the limelight in 1949.

Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, the then Chief of Naval Operations, had been removed by President Truman for his outspoken criticism of top defense policies in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee.

Sherman, a vice admiral, was propelled over the heads of nine other admirals—including four full admirals—to succeed the ousted Denfeld. He restored morale to the Navy and the unification row cooled down.

BRILLIANT OFFICER

Commenting at his Westboro home yesterday on his successor's death, Admiral Denfeld said:

"He was one of the most brilliant officers we have had in the Navy in many years. He has done a marvelous job as Chief of Naval Operations. I am very sorry. I was very fond of him."

Sherman married Dolores Bronson of Pensacola, Fla., in 1923, and is survived by her and their only child, Ann.

He also leaves five brothers and a sister.

Lt. Col. Edward A. Sherman, the only one of the six brothers still living in Melrose, is executive secretary of the Massachusetts Commission for the Hoover Report.

Lt. Comdr. Kenneth Sherman, USNR, is superintendent of schools in Andover.

Col. Paul D. Sherman is commandant of the Marine Corps Barracks at the Boston Navy Yard.

Col. Frank J. Sherman is a Cleveland resident and soap company executive.

Lt. Comdr. Ernest L. Sherman, a former history teacher at Kimball Union Academy in Meriden, N. H., has been stationed in the Mediterranean with a home in London.

Miss Mary Sherman, the only girl in the family, is employed by a Boston brokerage firm.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I share the grief the Senator from Massachusetts has expressed in regard to the untimely death of Admiral Sherman. He was a brilliant and able naval officer. He was contributing mightily to our defense plans; and he died in Europe, while furthering our plans for the strengthening of the United States and its allies.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of Friday, July 20, 1951, the Chair lays before the Senate, House bill 3973, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the agriculture appropriation bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the amendments proposed by the committee be first considered.

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

The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Title I—Regular Activities—Research and Marketing Act of 1946," on page 2, line 4, after "(7 U. S. C. 1621–1629)", to strike out "$4,700,000" and insert "$4,850,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader if it is the intention to complete action on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill today?

Mr. McFARLAND. We cannot complete action on it today for the reason that it was agreed that two or three amendments would go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. It is not indicated in the unanimous-consent agreement as to what amendments are to go over until tomorrow. The only reason I rose to inquire is because of a colloquy which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD between the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the subcommittee. We should proceed with the work of the Senate. On the other hand, I do not want to be in the position of not protecting some Senators who are absent from the Senate on official business inspecting flood conditions in the Middle West.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to assure the Senator from Nebraska that it is the intention to go ahead with the bill. However, I know that the distinguished Senator from Georgia will ask that the amendments which he agreed should go over may go over. The oral agreement which was entered into concerning them is just as binding upon him as if a unanimous-consent agreement had been entered into.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us which amendments are to go over?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, at the present time the only amendments the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked to have go over until tomorrow are those dealing with the appropriations for the Production and Marketing Administration for the purpose of making soil-conservation payments to farmers.

Mr. McFARLAND. Those are the only ones which it was agreed should go over at the time the colloquy took place.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are the only amendments which have been submitted to me. Both the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Illinois were anxious that those amendments not be acted upon today.

Mr. McFARLAND. Those are the only amendments which were discussed on the floor, are they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois indicated that there are one or two other amendments he intended to propose to the bill, but I have no information as to the effect of the amendments nor the sections of the bill to which they relate.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the distinguished Senator from Georgia to understand that so far as I am concerned personally, I am ready to proceed with the bill. I sat in the subcommittee with the Senator from Georgia. In the interest of orderly procedure, I think we should proceed with the bill. As I recall, the Senator from Michigan mentioned in the colloquy which has been referred to, or else he mentioned to me privately, that he would offer three amendments. Two relate to the soil-conservation appropriation which has already been mentioned by the Senator from Georgia. Another one is on page 12, line 22, relating to the Bureau of Plant Industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

If it is agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, may we not pass over those three amendments?

Mr. RUSSELL. What are the other two items?

Mr. WHERRY. One is on page 31, line 15, and the other is on page 33, line 1. They deal with the same subject matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are the two amendments I had agreed with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan should go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. The third is on page 12, line 22.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had no knowledge that any Senator desired to have that amendment go over, but if the Senator from Nebraska desires it to go over, I shall not object.

Mr. WHERRY. I am only asking that it go over for the benefit of the Senator from Michigan. In the absence of a unanimous-consent agreement, I really do not have any right to do so. However, the Senator from Michigan talked to me about the possibility of offering an amendment to that committee amendment. For the benefit of the Senator from Michigan, I should like to ask that the amendment on page 12, line 22, be passed over. The Senator from Georgia knows about the other two.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to let that item go over until tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that as the amendments are reached, if any Senator desires that an amendment go over he make such a request.

Mr. WHERRY. Aside from the three amendments referred to, the junior Senator from Nebraska does not ask that any other amendments be passed over. With respect to the three amendments, I wish the Senator from Georgia to know that I make the request that they be passed over at the request of the Senator from Michigan.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Frear	Kilgore
Anderson	Fulbright	Knowland
Bennett	Gillette	Langer
Benton	Green	Lehman
Brewster	Hayden	Lodge
Bricker	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Bridges	Hennings	Malone
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Martin
Byrd	Hill	McCarran
Capehart	Hoey	McCarthy
Chavez	Holland	McClellan
Clements	Hunt	McFarland
Connally	Ives	McKellar
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Moody
Eastland	Kefauver	Morse
Ecton	Kem	Mundt
Ellender	Kerr	Murray

Neely	Smathers	Underwood
Nixon	Smith, Maine	Watkins
O'Conor	Smith, N. J.	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Smith, N. C.	Wiley
Pastore	Sparkman	Williams
Robertson	Stennis	Young
Russell	Taft	
Saltonstall	Thye	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the measure which is before the Senate is the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. Last year I undertook to point out that the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture were substantially below the prewar appropriations. Without desiring to draw any invidious comparisons, I gave figures which indicated that the appropriations for all other departments of the Government had shown a substantial increase since prewar days. I offered the figures for the RECORD, and I shall do so again this year in dealing with the bill.

I have asked to have prepared some charts or graphs which would indicate the substantial reductions, not only in the over-all appropriations for the Department of Agriculture but in the total number of employees working in the Department, as compared with other representative agencies of the Government.

Mr. President, there can be little question that the agricultural appropriation bill, during a period like the present, is a defense measure. Greatly increased responsibilities rest upon the Department of Agriculture to step up the production of food and fiber essential for the use of our Armed Forces, our civilian population, and those associated with us in the defense of the free world from the threat of Communist aggression.

In World War II an agency known as the War Food Administration was created for the purpose of stimulating increased production of agricultural products, as well as of enforcing all the many acts growing out of the war conditions, which were applicable to agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture for the year 1940 had total appropriations amounting to $1,414,000,000. The budget estimates for the fiscal year 1952 are $990,000,000. The bill as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations is approximately $35,000,000 below the budget estimates.

I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the graphs, which show the downward trend in the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. I invite comparison with the appropriations for other departments, which appear on the charts, all of which show a substantial increase since the year 1940. In all fairness to the Department of Commerce, I believe it should be stated that a great part of the most recent increase in the Department of Commerce appropriations is due to the fact that the Bureau of Public Roads and the Maritime Commission were placed in the Department of Commerce about 2 years ago.

When we come to consider the number of employees, the disparity between the prewar conditions and the conditions today is all the more marked in the Department of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, the number of full-time employees in the Department of Agriculture is smaller by more than 13,000 in this year's budget.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I could not hear what the Senator said. How many fewer employees?

Mr. RUSSELL. More than 13,000 fewer full-time employees and some 8,000 fewer part-time employees than were on the rolls of the Department of Agriculture in the year 1940.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. The graph shows the increase in the number of employees in other representative Government agencies. Without exception, all of the other departments have more employees on their rolls to perform the work of the departments than has the Department of Agriculture, when comparing this year's budget with the year 1940.

I bring this fact to the attention of the Senate because I feel that the great reduction which has taken place in the Department of Agriculture, as distinguished from the other agencies of Government, places the Department of Agriculture in a somewhat special category when it comes to consideration of amendments reducing the appropriations which are recommended to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I shall not at this stage of the discussion make any detailed statement with respect to farm income. It is a striking fact, however, that farm income has shown a drastic reduction since 1947, in comparison with other incomes. The per capita income of the farmers of America has gone down from year to year, in 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950, whereas the income of every other segment of America's population shows a substantial increase since 1947.

It is apparent that if crop conditions remain good, and prices do not continue to decline, which is the marked course of prices of stable and basic agricultural commodities, in the year 1951 agricultural income will slightly recoup some of the losses, and eliminate in part the very great disparity which exists between the income of the farm population and that of other segments of our population.

In the course of the hearings, the Department of Agriculture made reference to some charts which were prepared for submission to the defense agencies to assist the Department in securing the necessary priorities for steel for farm machinery, copper wire for rural electrification, fertilizers, and so forth, which were necessary to achieve the increased goals that have been fixed for agricultural production. I was so impressed with the charts that I requested the Department of Agriculture to bring them down to date, in order that I could let all the Members of the Senate have the advantage of the information. I believe they show a rather graphic picture of the great achievements of American agriculture in increasing production during the past 10 years.

Mr. President, we must always bear in mind that our farm population has been decreasing during the same period of time. Fifty years ago each farmer in the United States was required to produce food and clothing for himself and for seven other American citizens. Today, because of the shift of our population to urban areas, the average farmer must produce food and fiber for 15 American citizens. The ability of the farmers to do this constitutes a great achievement, without which it would have been impossible for us to have waged World War II to a victorious conclusion. It would likewise have been impossible for us to bring about the great increase in the standard of diet of the American people, which is reflected by the charts.

The chart which I now exhibit shows the 1951 goal for agriculture under the all-out production drive. The index relates to the production in the period from 1935 to 1939, inclusive, because they were the 4 years which passed immediately before the outbreak of World War II. Of course, we were not drawn into the war until a year later.

In 1940 agricultural production was 110 percent of the base-period production. I ask Senators to notice the greatly increasing scale of production during the war years to 1946, the year after the war, when it reached 137 percent of the production during the base period.

Mr. President, this chart is, I think, a monument to the labor sacrifices, and efforts of the American farmers. They were compelled to contend with shortages of machinery, with shortages of fertilizer, and with serious shortages of farm labor; but they overcame all those difficulties and brought the production up to 137 percent of the quantities produced during the base period.

The goal for 1951 is 144 percent of the base-period production. That is based on the need for food for our Armed Forces. I have here another chart which shows how much more it takes to feed a soldier than it does to feed a civilian. That chart takes into account our greatly increasing population.

Our population has increased by 20,000,000 since the time prior to World War II, and is now increasing at the rate of 6,000 new American citizens each and every day. The birth rate, as compared with the death rate, gives us a net increase of population in the United States of 6,000 persons a day.

We also, of course, wish to have sufficient food to take care of our overseas commitments to our allies who stand with us in the cause of freedom, and we also have the purpose of replacing the depleted reserves of agricultural production.

There is one chart here which demonstrates that instead of having a great surplus and carry-over of agricultural commodities, we have a steadily decreasing reserve.

Mr. President, the next chart merely shows the reasons why it is necessary to encourage all-out production of farm commodities, in order to meet the continuous and expanding need. Let us remember that even partial military mobilization calls for a great increase in food needs.

A moment ago when I pointed out that our population has increased by 20,000,000, I might have pointed out that that increase is 15 percent.

Mr. President, it is remarkable to contemplate that our civilian-food consumption per capita is 13 percent above the 1935–39 average. In other words, because of the greatly increased national income, the people of the United States are now consuming 13 percent more food, on a per capita basis, than they consumed in the period from 1935 to 1939, inclusive.

The next page of this presentation shows some reasons why military mobilization so drastically increased the need for the production of food and fiber. In the first place military kitchens must be backed up with from 7 to 9 months' supplies of reserve stores or supplies of food, whereas the civilian community requires only from 7 to 9 days of reserves of food. In the second place, men in uniform eat far more than civilians eat. For example, a man in uniform eats more than twice as much meat as the average civilian eats. I feel sure that no one would begrudge the very best food in the largest quantities it is possible to obtain for those who are wearing their country's uniform in a time of great national peril. At the present time, for 3,500,000 men, which constitute only 2 and one-third percent of our population, the military requires that there be set aside, on the average, more than 9 percent of the national pack of canned fruits and vegetables.

Of course, Mr. President, it is quite obvious that if it should become necessary to increase the number of men in the Armed Forces, much more food will be required, or else we shall have to take the food from our dwindling reserves.

The next chart shows the increase in civilian food consumption. The chart is entitled "Civilian Food Demand." From a base of 108, as compared with the average for the period 1935–39, the consumption of food has increased to the point where it is anticipated that in 1952 the figure will be 137 percent. Of course, with the increase in the income of the civilian population, food consumption will continue to increase, and the line on the chart indicating the consumption of food will continue to ascend.

The next chart relates to exports of agricultural commodities. Perhaps I knew it, but I was surprised to see how much our agricultural-commodity exports have increased since the war, as compared with the exports during the war years. Such exports reached their peak in about 1948, and have been gradually decreasing since that time. However, because of the shipment of wheat to India and the need for considerable foodstuffs to prevent starvation among the civilian population of Korea, a slight increase is anticipated in 1951.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask whether the exports of agricultural products are being shipped on a basis which is profitable to the farmers of our country; or are those exports being made with government aid?

Mr. RUSSELL. The greater proportion of them are going with Government aid. Does the Senator mean to ask whether ECA and other funds are being used to defray a part of the costs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I meant to inquire whether agricultural commodities are going abroad on a basis which means that they are profitable exports for the farmers of our country, or whether the exports are being made with Government aid—in other words, with the use of the taxpayers' funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of the exports, other than ECA shipments, involve a loss to the taxpayers. For example, approximately 2 or 3 years ago the Senate ratified an international wheat agreement, a treaty with other wheat-producing nations, providing for the disposal of the wheat crops of the earth. Under American prices, we have committed ourselves to a permanent annual outgo of approximately $76,000,000 worth of wheat a year to carry out the terms of that agreement; and of course that is a cost on the American taxpayers, over and above the expenditures which are necessary to be made in order to carry out the ECA program.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yesterday I read in the newspapers, or perhaps it was in Time magazine, that in May we shipped 25,000,000 pounds of dried eggs to England, and that a short time ago we shipped 16,800,000 pounds of dried eggs to England. I assume that those eggs were purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation, because egg prices have decreased, and those eggs are now being sold at a loss to the Government. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. That has been true in the past, but my impression from the testimony which was submitted to the subcommittee, is that about the only commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has in supply consists of dried eggs. The Commodity Credit Corporation has disposed of practically all of its other surpluses.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that, when the chart says "Agricultural exports help friendly nations," it means of course, that they help them because they feed them, but it results in costs to our Government by reason of certain losses, and it results in certain profits to our farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is any question that the greater part of this activity is handled with tax money, if that is what the Senator has in mind; and that has been true ever since World War II. Most of the overseas shipments of foods have been those which were shipped under ECA, or under our wheat program, to India, or our shipments to Korea, to feed the civilian population there.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. What is the meaning of the volume index "50"?

Mr. RUSSELL. The volume index was the average for the four prewar years, 1935–39, inclusive.

Mr. BENTON. Does it represent dollars, or tonnage? What are the units? It is 50 units of what? I see that we trebled our exports.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is on a volume basis.

Mr. BENTON. It could be deceptive, if it related to dollars, and that was the reason for my question. With rising prices, it is conceivable that if prices had trebled, we could be exporting the same amount of food, but the curve would rise three times as fast.

The Senator figures that the tonnage chart would not show so great an increase, does he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator that there has been a very drastic reduction in the price of basic agricultural commodities within the past 3 months. Cotton has declined from around 44 cents a pound to 33 cents. I do not see the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] on the floor at the moment, but I call attention to the fact that wheat has suffered a reduction of approximately 20 or 30 cents a bushel.

Mr. BENTON. Perhaps that is the explanation of the decline shown at the end of the chart.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because at one place we refer to 1950. This chart shows the 1951 anticipation. The other chart shows the decline which took place in 1950. As a matter of fact, the downward trend which is evidenced is one of the arguments which have been used to show the efficiency of the ECA program,

to indicate that it has helped put other countries, such as France, into such shape that they could produce more of their own requirements.

Mr. BENTON. I desire to congratulate the Senator upon these exceedingly graphic charts, which are the most illuminating I have ever seen on this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. They were so interesting to me that, even though they were prepared for presentation to defense agencies in order to secure additional steel and copper wire for the farmers, I asked that I might have them so as to make them available to the Senate.

We have heard a great deal about the food surplus in this country. There have been times when the Commodity Credit Corporation was roundly condemned and when the entire farm-loan program was condemned because the Department was acquiring surpluses of food. The surpluses which were on hand at the outbreak of World War II not only saved this Nation, or at least enabled us to bring the war to a close 3 or 4 years earlier than would have been possible otherwise, but they netted a considerable profit to the Department of Agriculture, or the Commodity Credit Corporation, because of the increased prices of the staple commodities accumulated.

The next chart relates to the total food stocks of this country, and it covers the time from pre-Korea to the 1st day of July 1951, a period of 1 year. The surplus of butter has declined from 185,000,000 pounds to 42,000,000 pounds, which is a very small surplus of butter to have for the population of the United States. The dried-milk surplus has declined from 469,000,000 to 130,000,000 pounds; cheese, from 254,000,000 to 195,000,000 pounds; canned vegetables, for stocks on hand, from 75,000,000 cases to 64,000,000 cases. Canned fruits have declined from 21,000,000 cases to 16,500,000 cases. The over-all picture shows that our supplies amount to but one-half what they were on June 25, 1950. They are not surpluses. Any ordinarily prudent nation would carry over a small amount of food in reserve.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have seen in the press certain statements which have led me to ask the military department for a report. I have in my office a letter, for instance, regarding butter. I am sorry I do not have the letter with me. Has the Senator investigated to determine whether the Commodity Credit Corporation's stock which is to be sold to the Army, to the military forces, and so on, is accumulated in such a way that the military can buy it? For instance, I read that the Army was buying butter at a substantially higher price than the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation was selling it. Upon inquiry I found that the Commodity Credit Corporation had the butter in tubs, whereas the Army could not buy it in tubs. Has the Senator inquired into that situation at all?

Mr. RUSSELL. Insofar as butter is concerned, the testimony before the committee was that the CCC had no butter at all, but had disposed of all of its stocks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The circumstance to which I refer occurred a little while ago, but the CCC disposed of the butter at substantially lower prices than the prices at which the Army was buying from other sources.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may be. Of course, we feed our troops the very best available food that can possibly be purchased. Some people prefer fresh butter to tub butter which has been in storage for some time. The mess officers of the Army, when fresh butter is available, purchase it rather than tub butter which is in storage.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to show the Senator the letter to which I referred. I regret that I do not have it with me at the moment. As I understand, it was not a question of the quality of the butter, but rather a question of the method by which the butter was stored.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is wholly possible. There arises the question of the specifications in the purchase of the commodity. I am advised by the Senator from Texas, whose subcommittee has inquired into that subject very thoroughly, that there was a question of standards and specifications, and that the Department of Agriculture and the Military Establishment are now undertaking to reconcile the standards and the specifications followed by the military with those applied to the commodities which are handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to recur to the question I asked the Senator from Georgia in relation to tubs of butter. Does the Senator recall that colloquy?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I recall it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would be well if the present colloquy could be transferred to the point at which the previous discussion about tubs of butter took place. I refer the Senator to a letter which I received dated June 19, 1951. It was written to me by Karl R. Bendetsen, Assistant Secretary of the Army. His letter to me was in response to several questions I asked him in a letter I addressed to him. With the Senator's permission, I should like, at the conclusion of what I am going to ask him, to place the letter in the RECORD, as the basis of my question, if the Senator will permit me to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection whatever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I asked Mr. Bendetsen about powdered eggs. Mr. Bendetsen said:

> You will note that the study indicates that powdered eggs in the CCC stocks do not meet the specification required by the Army, both as to quality and type of packaging.

I called his attention to the three words "type of packaging."

My other question related to butter. Mr. Bendetsen stated in his letter in respect to that question:

> Here again, the butter stocks held by CCC are not processed in the manner which would be acceptable to the Army. Our understanding is that their stocks are in large bulk tubs. This is not susceptible to the Army's method of distribution.

That is what I specifically called to the Senator's attention.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and as I recall, I replied to the Senator from Massachusetts that that condition undoubtedly existed, and that the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense were now engaged in conferences in an effort to come to some agreement on the specifications of the Military Department as compared with the method of handling by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, with the Senator's permission, I ask unanimous consent to have included, as the basis of my questions on this subject, a letter written to me by Karl R. Bendetsen, Assistant Secretary of the Army, dated June 19, 1951.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1951.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: In response to your request of the other day wherein you were interested in the matter of procurements made by the Army relating to foodstuffs and the possibility of utilizing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, I have investigated this matter for you and am attaching a paper on this matter for your information.

You specifically asked about powdered eggs. You will note that the study indicates that the powdered eggs in the CCC stocks do not meet the specifications required by the Army, both as to quality and type of packaging. Your other question related to butter and, as I recall, you mentioned a price of 16 cents a pound. We have failed to identify any price approximating that figure inasmuch as we are advised that CCC butter is selling for approximately 60 cents a pound. Here again, the butter stocks held by CCC are not processed in the manner which would be acceptable to the Army. Our understanding is that their stocks are in large bulk tubs. This is not susceptible to the Army's method of distribution.

I wish to assure you that the Army will continue to deal with the CCC by maintaining direct liaison with them and, wherever possible, purchases will be made from their stocks when available in accordance with the limitations of their policies and when the goods are acceptable in accordance with Army specifications.

I believe the material submitted herewith will clarify the situation which has concerned you.

Sincerely yours,

KARL R. BENDETSEN,
Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. The next chart, Mr. President, relates to the carry-over of the three great basic commodities, cotton, corn, and wheat. The carry-over of cotton in 1951, despite all the condemna-

titon of the loan program, was about 2,000,000 bales, which is about a 2 months' supply for the cotton mills of the United States. In other words, if there were a crop failure in cotton, there would be a tremendous shortage in the supply of cotton for the looms of the American textile industry and for the backs of the American people. Even if there were to be a 16,000,000-bale crop this year, as anticipated, which was the target, there would be only a 2,000,000-bale carry-over in 1952, because the foreign countries demand 5,800,000 bales of export cotton.

The chart also shows the corn carry-over. It shows that we will have, in 1952, an estimated carry-over of 447,000,000 bushels of corn. I should like to point out that the carry-over in 1949 was 825,000,000 bushels; in 1950 it was 860,000,000 bushels; in 1951 it comes down to 665,000,000 bushels; and in 1952 it is estimated that the carry-over of corn will be only 447,000,000 bushels. It has been only a comparatively short while since we had a great controversy as to whether the Commodity Credit Corporation should assist in increasing the corn carry-over by making loans to farmers for receptacles in which to store corn; but we now have more storage space than we have corn to place in it. The desirable carry-over is between 800,000,000 and 1,000,000,000 bushels. The carry-over is only 20 percent of our annual requirement of corn to fatten the beef, the pork, and the mutton which the American people consider the most important part of their diet, when they have the money to pay for it, as they have today. A substantial crop failure, such as this country has seen in the past, might place us in a situation with respect to grain where we could not possibly fatten livestock on the farms of this country.

We do not often consider, Mr. President, how good providence has been to us since 1940. We have not suffered a single crop failure since 1940 throughout any substantially wide area of the Nation. If a crop failure, such as this country has seen in the past, should occur, we would be in a terrible predicament to secure sufficient quantities of cotton, wheat, and corn.

The next chart shows the wheat carry-over. It shows how it has gone down to an anticipated 324,000,000 bushels. That is only 29 percent of our annual requirements. It is conservatively estimated that we should have a carry-over of at least 500,000,000 bushels of wheat so as to assure the American people of bread in the event of a partial crop failure.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. These two charts are very ominous, from the standpoint of the beef interests, in connection with the capacity to increase production in order to hold down prices of meat. How can we greatly expand production as an antidote to higher prices if there are shortages of corn and wheat?

Mr. RUSSELL. It fixes a very definite limit on the amount to which beef and other meat production can be expanded. If we wish to gamble on the future, there is a considerable quantity of corn which is available for feed. We have developed great pastures, and a considerable percentage of the beef reaching the market now is pasture fed.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield to one of the most valuable members of my subcommittee.

Mr. THYE. I should like to comment concerning the wheat carry-over. All the factors were taken into consideration when Congress approved the shipment of wheat to India. We took into consideration the oncoming crop, and we also recognized we might possibly draw on our reserve of wheat to a minimum, but, nevertheless, with a fair crop this year, and, in some areas, a crop that is excellent, we believed we would have a sufficient supply of wheat coming on to assure ourselves of an ample supply. But if we had not made the commitment of wheat to India, we would have had a much larger reserve than we now have. However, all that was taken into consideration at the time of the action of the Congress.

M. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution. What he has just said is correct. The commitment of wheat to India appealed to the charitable and humanitarian instincts of the American people, and I believe we would have taken a little greater chance in order to ship food to the hungry people of that nation.

The next chart merely shows that we are using supplies at a greater rate than we produced them in 1950. Of course, it should be said, in all fairness, that the 1951 crop will be considerably larger than was the 1950 crop. In 1950 there were in effect acreage allotments and marketing quotas with respect to a number of commodities. All those have been removed, and we have encouraged the farmers to increase their acreage, so there will be a considerably larger production. It still appears that the 1952 demands will exceed the 1951 production, and we need every ounce of production we can squeeze out. That, as I stated before, was the reason for the appeal of the Department of Agriculture to the defense agencies for assistance in procuring steel for the production of our war machine.

The next chart shows, Mr. President, that all-out production will help fight inflation. Consumer spending continues at a high level, and defense expenditures are still increasing. High-level production is the greatest contribution our food plant can make to price stability. Without regard to the position of any Member of the Senate, I believe that all will agree that increasing production is, in the last analysis, the most effective weapon that can be used against inflation.

Mr. President, the next chart is, to me, a tremendously interesting one, because it shows that despite the increase in the cost of the food basket of the American people, the average value of an hour of employment of factory labor has increased at such a rate that as great or greater amounts of all foods, except round steak, can be purchased with 1 hour of factory labor than was the case in 1939. In other words, while there have been increases in the cost of foods, the increases in wage rates have been sufficient to keep pace with it and, in most instances, to outstep it.

With reference to bread, 1 hour of factory labor in 1939 would buy 7.9 loaves of bread. In 1949 and 1951, 1 hour of factory labor would buy 10 loaves of bread.

With respect to steak, 1 hour of factory labor in 1939 would buy 1.8 pounds of round steak. In 1949, it would buy 1.6 pounds, and in 1951 it will buy 1.5 pounds.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator have any figures showing what 1 hour of labor in this country would buy in a comparison with other countries?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not ask for those particular charts, but I have seen them, and I might state that they present a dramatic picture, showing the blessings of American citizenship in as spectacular a way as any song or sonnet that man might write. I can get the charts for the Senator, if he so desires.

With respect to bacon, in 1939 1 hour of factory labor would buy 2 pounds of bacon. In 1951 1 hour of factory labor will buy 2.3 pounds of bacon.

With reference to butter, it is unusual, but butter has remained absolutely stationary. One hour of factory labor would buy 1.9 pounds of butter in 1939, in 1949, and in 1951.

When we come to milk, however, we find that 1 hour of factory labor will buy more milk today than it would in either of the other periods. In 1939, one hour of labor would buy 5.1 quarts of milk. In 1949 it would buy 6.7 quarts of milk, and in February, 1951, it would buy 6.9 quarts of milk.

Likewise, in the case of eggs, there has been an increase in the purchasing power of an hour of labor as compared with its previous purchasing power. In 1939, one hour of labor would buy 1.9 dozen eggs. In 1951, one hour of labor will buy 2½ dozen eggs.

The other commodity shown on this chart is potatoes. In 1939 one hour of labor would buy 25.3 pounds of potatoes but in February of 1951, one hour of labor would buy 36.3 pounds, an increase of 11 pounds of potatoes when exchanged in terms of one hour of factory labor.

Mr. President, the statement has been made that, factory wages as such have increased in greater ratio than have other wages, and I think that statement is correct. But the chart I now exhibit shows the percentage of the per capita food costs of the people in whatever occupation engaged, as compared with the base period of 1935–39. Bear in mind that this chart reflects the per capita food costs as compared with the percentage of disposable income, which means that the taxes have been deducted from the gross income, and therefore the higher taxes which have been imposed upon the people of the United States are not

reflected in this chart, because such taxes have been deducted in arriving at the purchasing power of disposable income.

In the 1935–39 base period 23 percent of the average disposable income went into foods. The same amount of food of the same kind can be purchased today for 19 percent of the disposable income. Of course, when the American people have sufficient income they eat much better. That is a source of gratification to all of us. So it requires 26 percent of the disposable income for the market basket of today, which contains a great many items that would have been considered luxury items in the 1935–39 period.

That same percentage exists for the second quarter of 1951. There has been practically no change in the relative position of the percentage of the disposable income of the American citizen required of him to feed his family.

I present another chart. This chart does not directly reflect upon the points that will be at issue in the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill, but it is rather interesting. It shows that the farm output has risen by 28 percent since 1940. It shows that that has taken place on a cropland acreage that has increased only 3 percent. We must bear in mind, Mr. President, that only a limited amount of soil in this country is tillable and productive. Without the great strides forward we have made in research and in improved breeding of plants and animals and in research in combating diseases, we would have already fallen upon very scarce days because there has been no increase in our tillable acreage. The increase in production which has caused the American people to eat more than ever before and has enabled us to meet a constantly increasing population and supply their needs, has all taken place on the same acreage.

It is interesting to observe, as is shown on the chart, the decline in the use of horses and mules in American agriculture. Since 1940 there has been a reduction from 14,000,000 horses and mules on the American farms, down to 7,000,000. Of course, that is one of the reasons why we have been able to get more meat production, because it takes as much corn or other cereal to feed a work horse or a work mule as it does to fatten a steer. So by the mechanization of American farms we have been able with the same number of bushels of corn and wheat produced, to feed about 7,000,000 more head of livestock for the meat market than we could have under the old system of farming.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator from Georgia has just answered one of my questions. There are certain matters that do not appear on the chart the Senator has just exhibited. Perhaps reference is going to be made to them. The chart does not show the increase in the use of farm machinery, whereas it does show the decrease of horses and mules. Nor does the chart show under the cropland acreage the increase in number of beef cattle and hogs that are slaughtered.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not have figures for those items. Such figures do not appear anywhere on these charts. But, of course, there has been a very substantial increase in the farm population of beef and hogs during the past 10 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that the term "cropland acreage" would include not only the raising of corn, wheat, potatoes and vegetables, but also pasturage?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the chart does not include pasturage. It merely includes the tilled acreage, the cultivated farm acreage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the chart contains no statistics respecting the number of beef cattle and hogs.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I do not have those figures immediately at hand. They can be secured.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before the Senator goes on to another chart, will he yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I gladly yield. The Senator from New Mexico should be standing here in my place to answer that question.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] asked the Senator from Georgia some questions as to the number of hours of work it took to acquire certain food commodities in foreign countries as compared to the United States. Those figures are not contained in the chart. I wonder if the Senator would not ask permission to insert that material later in connection with his presentation. It is available. I have seen it. I agree with what the Senator from Georgia stated and what the Senator from Arizona stated in that respect. It is a very remarkable story. Whereas it requires 22 hours of work to purchase certain food items in certain countries, it requires less than 1 hour of work in this country to acquire the same food items.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall the figures directly, but it seems to me that an industrial worker in Russia is compelled to work about 30 times as long in order to buy a loaf of bread as the American worker is compelled to work to buy the same bread.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator from Georgia would be good enough to place in the RECORD in connection with his presentation a table, which would be extremely useful, showing how many hours of labor are required to purchase various food items in various foreign countries. It would be extremely useful and a fine thing to have in the RECORD in connection with the presentation the Senator is making.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall endeavor to obtain such information. I do not know whether we can have such a chart printed in the RECORD. But I wish to say, that if any man has any doubts about the glories of living beneath the Stars and Stripes, if he will look at the comparative figures of what an hour of work in this country will buy as compared with what an hour of work will buy in any other nation in the world it will immediately extinguish his doubts.

The next table is not directly pertinent to this discussion. It was used to demonstrate the need for priorities on the various commodities. However, it deals with the question raised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as to the increase in the use of power and machinery on the farm. It shows that it has increased by 135 percent since 1940. Of course, that is one of the answers to the question as to how it was possible for the American farmers so greatly to increase their production when they had less labor and no more acres of tillable land.

The next chart contains one significant statement which is not often enough borne in mind by some of those who demand quick and drastic changes in the farm program. It shows that the "lead time" for agriculture is a full crop year or more. Food production cannot be turned on and off at will. We cannot produce an increased crop or cut it down, like turning a spigot on and off. It requires considerable planning and considerable work to get ready to increase or plant a crop. When it is once planted there is an investment, and it must be harvested, even if the farmer is compelled to do so at a loss, because whatever he produces reduces the loss.

Mr. President, I was greatly interested in these charts. I thought other Members of the Senate might also be interested. They showed the great accomplishments of American agriculture over the past 10 years in responding to the demands for ever-increased production. They show the very vital need for a real farm program today if agriculture is to reach its requirements and be enabled to furnish the food and fiber which are essential to any defense program. Of course, they are also fundamentally necessary for the existence of the American people, even if there were no defense program. Napoleon well said that an army travels on its belly. We can acquire all the planes, all the tanks, all the mechanized equipment, electronic equipment, and everything else embraced in the $60,000,000,000 military appropriation bill, but unless we give adequate consideration to the needs of a farm program for the American farmer the defense program will avail us nothing, because the one fundamental requirement for an army is food and clothing.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Is it not true that the bill was reported with practical unanimity? I believe there was entire agreement. Perhaps one Senator reserved certain rights, but otherwise it was reported with practical unanimity by the full committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think two members of the committee expressed some misgivings about certain items in the bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not think they expressed them with sufficient force to represent a substantial difference among the committee in disposing of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that, upon reflection, they will not express them at all, but will support the committee in its effort to give the country the farm program which is necessary.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to that fighting friend of agriculture, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator from Georgia would give us his opinion as to what is the reason for the continuous attempt at harassment of the farmers of the United States today. What is behind the apparently well-organized campaign to blame them for everything that goes wrong? Why are they under continuous attack by the metropolitan press and others, when the country depends upon them more than upon any other single segment of our economy? This morning I received a letter from a woman who was actually petulant because most of the farmers in the community owned automobiles, as though there were something wrong about that. Just what is the reason for it, and what is hoped to be accomplished by the continual campaign against the farmers of America? We know that there are some farmers—I call them Waldorf farmers—who earn their money at something else, and then spend it rather recklessly on the farm. Why are they held up before the public as typical wealthy and greedy farmers? What is behind the apparently well-organized campaign to discredit the farmers of the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to say a word?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I am absolutely sure that no such view is taken by a single member of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont has no doubt about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think there is a single Member who has that attitude, or anything approaching it. I do not believe that such a campaign as the Senator suggests has a particle of influence in determining these questions. We hrave tried in every way to make the farmer copartner with the Government in bringing about greater production, and bringing about a better condition of life for the farmers, upon whom we all depend.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with everything the Senator from Tennessee has said. I was not referring in any way to any committee of the Congress, because I think the Congress, and especially the Senator from Tennessee, understands and appreciates the problems of the farmers. I was referring to the campaign from outside.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have my own theory as to what inspires the efforts to which the Senator from Vermont alludes.

In the first place, there was a long period of time when there was a tremendous disparity between living conditions on the farm and in the cities or smaller communities, and there was a great migration from the farms to the cities. It became rather commonplace to look down upon those who lived on the farm. A person would expect his next-door neighbor to own an automobile, but if he saw a farmer with an automobile, there was something wrong about it. The man in town expected to send his son to college, but if he heard that a man living in the country, through superhuman effort and sacrifice, was able to send his son to college, he rather looked down his nose at him. He did not think it was necessary for the farm boy to go to college.

That has a great deal to do with the attitude to which the Senator refers. I do not like the expression "second-class citizen." I think it is badly abused by a considerable segment of the press. However, it defines the difference between the outlook of various persons with respect to what a farmer should require or what he should be entitled to, and what his more fortunate brethren in the city should have.

Further, I think a great deal of it is attributable to downright ignorance. I believe that a good many people do not understand the disparity between farm income and the income of those who do not live on the farm. I do not believe that they understand the hours of labor which are necessary for a farmer to produce the food which keeps the critic alive and the fiber with which he is clothed. Many persons are not aware of the facts. We have got far away from the roots of the country. In the past farming was the principal vocation of our people and most of the people lived on the farm. If people in the cities today are told that the farmer thinks nothing, in the gathering season, of working 14 hours a day for 6 days a week, they do not believe it. They ask, "What does he get for overtime?" He saves his crop. That is all he gets for overtime. In such a period he may work 14 hours a day. I believe a great deal of the criticism to which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has referred is based upon plain, downright ignorance. Such people have no conception of what farm life in this country means.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. A moment ago the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] asked some questions with reference to the livestock population. I ask the Senator from Georgia to permit me to say that on January 1, 1940, the livestock population was about 68,300,000, of which approximately $36,400,000 were dairy cattle. Today the livestock population is about 84,000,000, of which about 37,500,000 are dairy cattle, and approximately 46,500,000 are normally used for the production of beef. Of course, a great many dairy cattle go into the production of beef. However, the increase in the beef population has been from slightly under 32,000,000 or 31,900,000 to about 46,500,000 in the 11 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for giving the detailed figures. When I was asked about the livestock population of the country, I had the figure of eighty-and-some-odd million in my mind, but I could not break it down as between dairy herds and beef cattle. I did know an increase had taken place in the beef industry. Some things happen slowly, but are, nevertheless, very spectacular to me. For example, the increase in the amount of milk that we have been able to get from the average cow in the past 15 years is the direct result of the research conducted in the Department of Agriculture and the labor on the part of the dairy herd owners.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With the same amount of acreage we are raising more corn, which is used to raise more beef, which in turn is making us stronger. With the same amount of acreage we are raising more corn, more milk, and more dairy cows.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. It is the kind of protective type of food which is needed by the human being.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for the clarity with which he has presented the subject of the production brought about by the farmers of the United States. I believe the farmers should be congratulated for the record of production they have made, especially during the war. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has already indicated that it was due largely to the educational programs of the Department of Agriculture. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not agree that it was also due to some programs which were inaugurated, some of which the Senator has sponsored, such as the soil-conservation program; and if he does not believe also that if some of the cuts which have been proposed are made in the bill they may also involve cuts in the national defense of our country?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question in my mind that the soil-conservation program is essential to the survival of American civilization. We have only so many million acres of tillable land. I believe it is about 460,000,000 acres. Our population is increasing at a tremendous rate. As I stated earlier today, it is increasing at the rate of more than 6,000 a day, as a net gain. Unless we can save the soil of this country, which is a priceless asset to every citizen—even to the citizen who would not know which end of the cow to try to milk—I do not see how we can hope to be a self-sustaining people.

We can go back into the history of the great civilizations of the past, and in many cases we find that their decline was due to the fact that they neglected to preserve the fertility of the soil, and therefore they could no longer sustain

themselves. They were thus compelled to import foods from other lands and became dependent upon other people. The head of the Soil Conservation Bureau told our committee a few years ago that it was his belief that some parts of the Sahara Desert in north Africa was at one time a fertile land, supporting large cities and a great number of people. Today it does not produce anything, except sandstorms.

Unless we conserve our forests and our soil fertility as national assets, in which all of our people have a decided interest, we shall fail in our duty to those who will come after us. It is not fair to succeeding generations to mine and deplete the fertility of the soil of this country and thereby cause them to wage a hopeless struggle for existence on eroded, worn out, and depleted land.

The English economist, T. R. Malthus, the author of the Malthusian theory, with which I am sure many Senators are familiar, maintained that the time would come when the increase in population would be so great that the trend in population would start downward, because there would not be sufficient land on which to grow the amount of food necessary to feed the people. In other words, nature would adjust the population of the country to the resources of the land. I want to avoid that evil day in this country for as long as it can possibly be avoided. I believe the soil-conservation program is one of the most effective weapons with which we can fight in our effort to assure us that our country will not be victimized by the application of the Malthusian theory.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that during the past 20 or 25 years, because of such measures as the Senator has spoken of, there has been more done in the way of improvement of the farmers' condition and of farming conditions generally than had ever been done in our entire history?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe there can be any question about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not also true that during the 25 years, because of our fair dealing with the farmers, our country has been prosperous and has made more progress than it had ever made in its entire history?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is impossible to have prosperity in this country unless we also have a reasonable amount of prosperity on the farms.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to suggest that it is highly important to remember that in acting upon the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill we do not base our actions on our dislikes of certain political activities which some persons connected with official agriculture have exercised, and thus forget the great development to which the senior Senator from Tennessee has just referred, which has made the United States the greatest and most productive nation the world has ever known. In other words, political prejudices should not guide our actions. Perhaps the term "political prejudices" is too strong a term. However, let us not go overboard and do something for which we will be sorry later.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, we should always keep national welfare and national interest paramount in our minds, without regard to our views as individuals.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that I agree with every word the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said. I wish to say further that he has done very much to help in every way he possibly could to better the conditions of the farmers and to try to treat them justly, so far as the Government can do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I believe there can be no doubt as to what my State of Vermont thinks of certain political activities of the Government. However, the Vermont Legislature unanimously approved a resolution asking Congress to appropriate the full amount for soil conservation and soil-improvement work at this session of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I congratulate the Legislature of Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. They did it in spite of certain political activities, and not because of them. They put the economic welfare of agriculture and the country above politics.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to compliment the Senator from Georgia upon his presentation of the agricultural appropriation bill. As a member of the committee, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the presentation the Senator has made, and it gives me a better background on which to decide the questions which arise in connection with the bill.

Following what the Senator from Vermont has said in regard to New England farmers, I should like to say that no finer group of citizens is to be found. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia accompany me to our eastern States Fair some autumn, and there show him the fine type of men and women who attend that fair.

Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that although Massachusetts is an industrial State, agricultural commodities still constitute the second largest single production in Massachusetts.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, all the farm groups of North Dakota do not always agree, but all of them are agreed in regard to this bill. They have telegraphed to me their approval, and they want these appropriations made, particularly those with respect to the school-lunch program.

I wish to join the Senator from Vermont in what he said a moment ago in tribute to the Senator from Georgia, who has done a very, very fine job.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I join in that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senators. I know I can always depend upon both these Senators when the welfare of the American farmer is concerned.

TIDELANDS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to take some of the time of the Senate today to discuss a question which soon will come before the Senate; I refer to what is known as the tidelands case.

Propaganda methods long have been recognized as a vital part of the machinery of dictator governments.

No one in the Senate has observed more closely than I the workings of those propaganda machines that have helped to crush liberty and freedom abroad.

That is why I rise to protest the use of propaganda and double talk to mislead the people of the United States.

In a few days, I am informed, the House of Representatives will consider the so-called tidelands controversy; and it appears that action also may be forthcoming soon in this Chamber.

CAMPAIGN OF CONFUSION

As the time for decision approaches, a campaign of confusion and untruths has been launched against the Congress.

Some very unfair statements are being made, and they reflect not only on the honor of patriotic American citizens, but also upon some Members of this Congress.

Seldom a day passes that someone does not write a letter or get someone to print an alleged article that says the oil barons and the so-called oil lobby are the ones behind the State-ownership bill in the tidelands case.

There are in this country people who still believe that a contract should be kept; people who still believe that the theory of a Federal Union of several States should be preserved; people who believe that we should consider long, and with caution, further extension of powers of the Central Government.

I think those people should be allowed to have those beliefs without being smeared by being called tools of the oil barons.

OIL COMPANIES NOT INVOLVED

Let us get some truth into this business about the big oil companies.

Their first concern is producing and searching for oil. Under one plan that would take the submerged lands from State control, there is a promise to sustain the leases the oil companies made under State control. In other words, promises have been made to respect the leases of the oil companies, so that they will receive the benefit, regardless of what bill is enacted.

So it is plain to see that regardless of whether the States do the leasing or whether the Federal Government does the leasing, the oil companies will be protected.

The question in this case is not one of oil companies. The question is whether the Federal Government is going to become a common claim jumper.

Today, the claims which the Federal Government would jump involve a resource called oil. Tomorrow, unless we stop this march toward nationalization, the resource may be something else—something in the submerged lands of Maine, or Illinois, or Florida, or any other State.

OIL INDUSTRY FOR FEDERAL LEASING

There is much talk about the oil lobby. The oil lobby has been around the Capitol recently, but what has it been lobbying for? Has it been going all out for the State-ownership bill?

No; it has been plugging for an interim arrangement that would put leasing in the hands of the Federal Department of the Interior. That not only is the truth, but is the truth supported by the record.

Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Wyoming is not now on the floor. He has a bill on this subject. I hope that he will enter the Chamber before I conclude my remarks, because I wish to make some comment about his bill.

The oil companies will make money under Federal ownership. And, if past experiences in Federal leases of uplands is any yardstick, the oil companies would get those leases a great deal cheaper under Federal control than under State control.

In spite of the truth and the record, the advocates of Federal seizure—and it is Federal seizure—of these submerged lands continue to smear as "oil barons" those who favor State ownership.

WHO FAVORS STATE BILL?

Let us see who the real supporters of State ownership are. They are some of the finest, most patriotic citizens in this country. Here are a few of the organizations which have endorsed State ownership of submerged lands:

The Council of State Governments.

The National Governors Conference.

The National Association of Attorneys General.

The National Conference of Mayors.

The American Association of Port Authorities.

The American Municipal Association, representing more than 10,000 municipalities in 42 States.

The American Bar Association. Is the American Bar Association an oil lobbyist?

The United States Chamber of Commerce.

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The National Reclamation Association. Is the National Reclamation Association an oil lobbyist?

The National Water Conservation Association.

The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, representing more than a thousand cities.

The National Asscciation of County Officials.

Mr. President, these are some of the organizations which are advocating State ownership and are denying the right of the Federal Government rudely and ruthlessly to seize and deprive the States of what must justly and honestly be admitted to be their property. These are some of the groups which have been fault is that they sincerely believe, as do many of our greatest legal authorities, that the seizure of submerged offshore lands would be a dangerous precedent, which could lead, in time, to Federal consmeared as an oil lobby. Their only fiscation of almost any kind of property. If the Federal Government may go forth and seize submerged land and appropriate it to its own use and benefit, why can it not seize any other property?

It would require many hours for me to refute all the misleading statements that have been made. I will touch on only a few errors of fact.

EVERY STATE IS CONCERNED

Some recently published articles have implied that the State-ownership bill would restore title to submerged lands to only three States. This is false. A mere reading of the bill pending in the House will reveal that it restores ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries to each of the 48 States.

Another false statement, which reflects on at least 35 Members of the Senate who have endorsed State ownership, is that anyone who is against Federal ownership is against using these submerged-land resources for public education. That is not true. Texas, for instance, devotes all of the revenue from its submerged lands to its public-school fund. Most of the other States have the same or a similar plan for the use of revenues from submerged lands, and any State can so dedicate the income from resources of lands which it owns.

JUSTICE IS NOT A GIFT

There is a great deal of loose talk about three States, those which have been sued thus far, wanting a gift from the Government.

When you have owned something for more than a hundred years and someone is trying to take it away from you, you do not consider it a gift if the robbery is stopped.

The only gift involved in this proposed legislation is the sacred gift our Constitution gives to every American to hold and cherish his property, which is simple justice.

The three States that are being assailed are performing a patriotic duty to all the 48 States. They are trying to protect the other States from confiscation of their properties.

CASE OF WYOMING LAND

There is nothing unusual about the Congress acting to remove a cloud from a State's title to property.

I regret that the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has not yet entered the Chamber.

There was a similar case in Wyoming at one time. The Supeme Court of the United States took from Wyoming a section of school land which the State had claimed in good faith for half a century. Valuable resources were involved. The Congress passed a quit-claim bill which restored to Wyoming the section of land, and the Congress did this in the face of objections of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice. We supported that bill. We thought it unjust and unfair that the Federal Government should seize and appropriate what had theretofore been, for 50 years, the property of the State of Wyoming, with no question as to its title or ownership.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that the incident to which he has referred occurred during the time when I happened to be Governor of the State, and I took exactly the position which the Senator is taking, that we had held that land in good faith since 1915. It had been producing oil since 1927. The State had been getting royalties all that time. Then, out of a clear sky, we were told by the Federal Government that we no longer owned the land. It was taken from us by a Supreme Court decision, but, through the generosity of the Congress, it was returned to the State of Wyoming.

Mr. CONNALLY. It was not on the ground of generosity, but on the ground of justice, equity, and fairness, and out of respect for the title which the State had theretofore enjoyed.

Mr. HUNT. The Senator is entirely correct; but we in Wyoming greatly appreciated the action and the attitude of the Congress, whether it was prompted by generosity or not.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that theory is good for Wyoming, why is it not good for all the other States of the Union? If it was good for Wyoming to have had restored to it a tract of land, or to have had its title to land revived, why is not that doctrine sound as to all 48 of the St tes of the Union? That is all we are contending for.

CLAIM JUMPERS FOR FEDERAL BILL

One of the lobbyists for the "top leasers" and "claim jumpers" who hope to make a fortune out of oil-lands confiscation, has been writing letters to Members of the Senate and to the President of the United States vigorously supporting Federal ownership. He writes Senators that if they vote for State ownership they will be "betraying the interests" of the American people.

I have the highest respect for the convictions of my colleagues, whether they are the same as mine or are opposed to mine. As for me, however, I feel that Federal seizure of submerged lands would be a long step in the direction of socialistic theory. I intend to vote against anything that I believe might lead in the direction of socialism.

I SHALL NOT VOTE FOR SOCIALISM

Our day will have reached the twilight of honor if a vote against socialism shall be called betrayal. If my vote against something which I believe to be

tainted by socialism be a betrayal, someone will have to make the most of it.

Will the Congress of the United States repudiate the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in 52 cases, and 244 decisions of State and Federal courts during the past 100 years, in order to strip the States of their title and ownership to all navigable waters within State boundaries, and to hand these valuable properties to the Federal Government, which never even claimed title to them prior to the decision in the case of the *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S.)?

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mineral deposits under the Great Lakes would also be included in the ownership of the Government in the event the Government controlled those areas, as well as the tidelands.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. If the Government can seize resources under the surface of the soil, it could appropriate them to its own use. And the question is not restricted to oil; it could be iron ore, or copper, or any other resource.

Mr. THYE. There are iron-ore deposits under lake bodies in the Iron Range area of the State of Minnesota, and the iron ore would become the property of the Government rather than the property of the State, together with the right to contract with the miners. For that reason the Attorney General of Minnesota has been authorized legislatively, and appropriations have been made, to join with other States in the presentation of the arguments and suits brought against such governmental seizure. Consequently I have been compelled to seek to protect the interests of the State of Minnesota by endeavoring to see to it that the United States Government shall not take claim to the iron-ore deposits under the lake bodies in the State, which may be found under Lake Superior and the other lakes lying in the heart of North America. The question affects not only tidelands; it involves deposits all over the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct. It is not confined simply to submerged lands and what might be under them. If the doctrine advocated by some is sound, the Government can appropriate to its own use anything that is under the soil.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I commend warmly the distinguished Senator from Texas for making his able address today and for calling the attention of the people of the country to the fact that undoubtedly a campaign is under way—propaganda of the clearest sort—seeking to discredit those who are standing merely for the protection of rights of the several States which have been recognized as such ever since those States assumed statehood until the California decision.

I particularly commend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] for calling attention in his timely suggestion to the fact that the question applies to anything, iron ore or any other thing of value, that may be contained in or under the marginal waters and within the State limits.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Texas, so that he may mention the fact before he concludes, to the ownership by the States of fish, shellfish, and shell deposits worth many millions of dollars, which are used for many purposes; also to the sand and rock and the sponges which are found, especially off the shores of my own State, within the constitutional limits of the State.

If the Senator will yield further, I would like to say that I am particularly amazed at the fact that the very agencies of the Federal Government which pleaded with the States, including my own State of Flordia, during World War II, to accomplish speedy agreements by which the production of rare minerals, such as rutile and molybdenum, could be obtained from the sands of the sea which underlie the sea water off the shores of Florida and other States, those very agencies which recognized the right and title of the States and encouraged the States to do everything possible in this field for the national welfare, and which was done, now say that the States do not have any such right at all, but, to the contrary, that the Federal Government has the sole right.

I hope the Senator from Texas will make it crystal clear that there is involved not only the matter of claiming a right to the oil, the "black gold," which the Federal Government seems to be particularly avid in claiming now, but that this effort is an entering wedge into the sovereignty of the States of the Union, both those which have salt-water frontage, and those, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, which front upon the Great Lakes and upon other bodies of water of large scope. Our rights are being challenged, and the claim being urged is nothing but an entering wedge of the first magnitude to interfere with the sovereignty and property rights of the States and of persons who claim under the States.

I commend the Senator warmly upon the stand he has taken. I hope he will call this propaganda just what it is, vicious and deliberate propaganda to discredit persons who are standing up for their own States and their own States' rights, many of whom served as State officers in dealing with persons and industries who in good faith took expensive steps to comply with their contractual responsibilities to the State governments, with no return or little return up to this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Florida very warmly for his contribution, with all of which I heartily agree.

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

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. I was referring to the California case, and that makes it pertinent to the Senator's request that I yield. Even in that decision, it was acknowledged that the Supreme Court had asserted in the Pollard case and other cases the title to such lands to be in the respective States.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to join with my colleagues from Florida and Minnesota in the remarks they have made in commending the able Senator from Texas on the speech he has been making.

The State of California came into the Union 100 years ago last year. We celebrated our centennial last year. During a large part of that period, with the exception of the past few years, when the right of California's title in the tidelands was challenged by the Federal Goverment, a long series of opinions by administrative officers of the Government, as well as by the courts, had indicated that there was no question of doubt that the States had title to their tidelands.

When California was admitted into the Union it came in under a constitution which provided that the boundaries of the State should extend 3 English miles into the Pacific Ocean. We feel that such a claim as is made is as much a trespass on and an attempt at seizure of that which belongs to the State of California as would be an attempt by the Federal Government to claim title to the interior Central Valley of the State.

It is high time that the Congress of the United States recognized the situation. The Senator from Texas is performing a very useful service by pointing out that it is not a question which concerns a few oil companies alone, because, as he has stated, it makes very little difference to them whether they obtain their oil under a lease from the Federal Government or under a lease from a State government. But there is a broad public interest, affecting in my State 10,000,000 persons. It is not a partisan issue. Without regard to partisanship, the Governor, who is a Republican, and the Attorney General, who is a Democrat, have joined with the Members of the House of Representatives and with the Members of the Senate from California in believing that equity and justice require that titles to the tidelands, which have been recognized, as the Senator pointed out, for over 150 years, or in the case of my State for 100 years, shall be lodged where they rightfully belong.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the distinguished Senator from California. In connection with his remarks I will remind him that former Secretary Ickes, who now opposes State title to tidelands, who favors Federal ownership, in an official letter while he was Secretary of the Interior, written to a man who wanted to secure a Federal lease in California, clearly pointed out—and I shall quote him in a little while—that it was the settled law that the State, and the State only, had jurisdiction to make leases for tidelands oil, because they involved State property. That was Mr. Ickes. He had

competent legal advice. He knew what the decisions had been. He took that position, although he now favors Federal ownership.

CONGRESS MUST ACT

Congressional legislation is necessary for each of the 48 States in order to restore and confirm their ownership of navigable waters and submerged lands within their respective boundaries. House bill 4484, introduced by Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and now pending in the House, if enacted, will restore and confirm the law of State ownership of such property. Such a bill should be enacted.

A quitclaim to the States is no gift. It is a recognition of the justice and equity of the title in the States, which has been accepted by the Federal Government for 100 years.

The State of Texas devotes all the revenue from submerged lands to public education. There is no exploitation by the State or under its sanction of funds from such a source.

The charge that an oil lobby is advocating State ownership is untrue and ridiculous. The only oil lobby involved is opposing State ownership, in order to obtain cheap Federal leases.

It is also a false statement that only three States will be benefited by confirmation of State title. Every State in the Union is affected, because all States have valuable resources under submerged lands within their boundaries, as was so well pointed out by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. There are varieties of products under submerged lands, such as shellfish and a great number of others, which would be affected just as would oil.

EARLY SUPREME COURT RULE

An early statement of the rule by the Supreme Court was made in *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212, 229), decided in 1844, as follows—and I hope Senators will pay attention to this recitation:

> First. The shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively.
>
> Second. The new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States.

The Pollard case has been cited with approval in 52 Supreme Court decisions and 244 State and Federal court decisions during the past 100 years.

Will the Congress refuse to recognize this just, equitable, and sound rule, sanctified by the rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States and 244 State and Federal court decisions during the past 100 years? Will the United States Congress, actuated by greed and driven along by unfair and unjust motives, seize the property of individual States and appropriate it to Federal use? That is the policy of the highwayman. That is the motive of the robber—take it because you are stronger; take it because you are more powerful; take it because you want it; take it and deprive the just and honest owner of its benefits.

LET US BE FAIR

Let the Congress be fair. Let it be just. Let it confirm to the States what is theirs. Let it recognize that which it has acknowledged for more than 100 years.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss, without too much reading, some of the aspects of this measure. There is no question that all 48 States are concerned—not simply the three States which are referred to in the Supreme Court case. It is a century-old rule that this property is owned by the individual States rather than by the Federal Government. This long-recognized rule, applicable to the waters and submerged lands of every State, has been destroyed and State titles clouded by the Supreme Court in its Tidelands decision. The way has been opened for foreign nations to claim resources within our territorial waters.

THE RECORD OF TEXAS

Mr. President, I wish to discuss very briefly my own State's record in this regard. The State of Texas, as all Senators know, was an independent republic. It won its independence from Mexico with arms, with swords in the hands of its men, and with long rifles which the men knew how to shoot. For 9 years Texas was an independent republic. It had its ministers in foreign courts. It had all the prerogatives of an independent nation. During that time who owned these lands? Who owned the lands in the Gulf of Mexico adjoining Texas? Did the Federal Government own them? Of course not. It had no interest and no title in the Republic of Texas, or in the Gulf of Mexico adjacent to the Republic of Texas. That property belonged to the Republic of Texas. Finally Texas joined the Union, and at that time it was specifically provided that it should retain all its public lands. So those lands were still the property of the State of Texas and its people.

When did those lands go to the Federal Government? They never went to the Federal Government until the Supreme Court, with its long fingers reached out, and said "We will take that land. We will make it Federal property by decision of four judges to three." It was not a decision by a majority of the Supreme Court. Four judges against three held that that property could be appropriated by the Federal Government and that the State could be deprived thereof. Is that justice? Is that fairness?

RULE OF 100 YEARS REVERSED

Mr. President, not only was that the case in the instance of Texas, but for 100 years the Supreme Court has held that the ownership and title to submerged lands inhered in the State.

Fifty-two times the Supreme Court made that decision. There were 244 decisions by State and Federal courts, all one way. There was never any other decision until the California case, in which the Supreme Court enunciated this new doctrine, the doctrine of the highwayman, the doctrine of robbery, the new doctrine of asserting the strength of the arm of the Federal Government.

If the Federal Government, under the decision of the Supreme Court, can take our land, why can it not take our horses, our cattle, or our other resources on our lands, whether they be submerged or not? What is to prevent the Federal Government from seizing our resources and appropriating them to its own use and benefit? Compensation? No; no compensation. Seize them and appropriate them, without recognizing the rights of former owners.

ALIEN DOCTRINE ESPOUSED

Mr. President, that is a doctrine which is alien to every concept of our constitutional system. That is a doctrine which runs contrary to the fundamental precepts of the United States and its constitutional system. Why did they sleep for 100 years? Why did they leave it alone for 100 years? If it was theirs, why did they not assert ownership 50 or 60 years ago? They had the decisions of the Supreme Court that such lands belonged to the States, and they dared not touch them. They dared not lay their unholy hands upon them. It was only when they got the present Supreme Court decision, 4 to 3, that they were able to see the light on their side of the doctrine, and undertake to deprive us of justice.

EARLIER DECISIONS DISCARDED

The bill which will come before the Senate simply confirms the right and title to these lands in each State, within its boundaries, just as the Supreme Court decided for a hundred years. What about the doctrine of stare decisis—stand by the decisions? They threw the decisions in the wastebasket. They discarded the solemn pronouncements of the Supreme Court, and held up a 4-to-3 decision of the Supreme Court as sacred, against the solemn pronouncements of 52 Supreme Court decisions in 100 years.

There is no question about a gift in this case. We are not seeking alms. We are not holding out our hands and begging for a gift. We ask that those who unlawfully and unjustly and inequitably seized our property give it back to us, turn it loose, remove their tyrannical hands from it, and let it go back where the Supreme Court for 100 years said it belonged. It said that it was ours.

The bill which I mention applies not only to the 28 coastal and Great Lakes States, but to each of the 48 States. It affirms their title, their right, and their ownership in a property which is theirs. Such title, right, and ownership are confirmed only with respect to lands within the original State boundaries. Nine-tenths of the Continental Shelf lies outside the original State boundaries, and title to such lands is vested by the bill in the Federal Government. We are making no claim to the shelf beyond the proper bounds.

CONGRESS BYPASSED IN POWER GRAB

The Congress has power to act in this controversy. It has been ignored and circumvented by executive officials in the attempted seizure of this property from the States.

The principles of the tidelands decision, if not erased from the law of the land by act of Congress, could lead to

the nationalization of private lands as well as State lands, without compensation. The only oil lobby involved in this legislation is opposing State ownership in order to obtain cheap Federal leases. The idea of devoting the revenue from these lands to Federal aid to education was originated by this lobby for use against State ownership.

MANY RESOURCES BESIDES OIL

Mr. President, oil is not the only resource being produced by the States from their submerged lands. As I suggested a while ago, they have many resources. Maine has its great kelp beds, on which leases have been made within the 3-mile marginal belt for the production of iodine. Arizona, Kentucky, and Missouri sell sand and gravel from their river and lake beds. Colorado and Idaho lease their lands for gold production. Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, and Rhode Island sell leases and permits for oyster, clam, and shellfish cultivation. Iowa, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia produce oil from their river beds; and Minnesota and Wisconsin have rich deposits of iron ore under the Great Lakes, which lie partially within their boundaries. New York has millions invested in filled land within the marginal sea at Coney Island and on Long Island. The same is true at Atlantic City, N. J., and at Miami and other Florida resorts.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator from Texas has brought out the last point, because, as he has indicated, this careless tampering with established property rights has shaken the titles to fills of great value, and to great piers which have been built not only out into the coastal bays, but out into the open Atlantic, in literally dozens of places along the Atlantic seaboard and along the Gulf coast.

It has worked havoc with property rights running into millions of dollars, leaving such rights, which have been regarded as settled and incontestable because they have been granted by the States, subject to question and to litigation, the most evil and mischievous consequence which could possibly be conceived.

I am glad the Senator has called attention to the fact that so many other things besides the mere question of oil are involved in this vast question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

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

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

There is nothing distinctive about oil, which makes it other than property. It is property. Other things besides oil, which represent resources, are property. If oil can be taken without compensation, why cannot other resources be taken without compensation?

Mr. President, this is a wholesale hold-up of the submerged lands in the 48 States.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Texas would take enough time to say just who is taking this land away from the States? I am in sympathy with the distinguished Senator's point of view but what has happened?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Supreme Court, by a 4-to-3 decision in the case of Texas, has taken it away from them.

Mr. WHERRY. What has happened with respect to the actual possession of the land?

Mr. CONNALLY. I point out to the Senator that nothing has happened with respect to the actual possession of the land, because the Federal Government itself cannot take any measures to appropriate this property and develop it unless Congress authorizes it; and Congress has not yet authorized it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. The result is that there is a stalemate at the present time, a stalemate produced by the decision of the Supreme Court, a 4-to-3 decision.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. I thank the Senator for his observations. It seems to me it is a point which the Senator could dwell on further. Because of a Supreme Court decision there exists a possibility that the Federal Government would control the land. What I should like to know is whether the Federal Government, through any bureau, actually has tried to take possession of the land.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not that I know of.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is advocating legislation which would clarify the situation to the effect that the land which belongs to the States would be——

Mr. CONNALLY. That the title of the States would be confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. By quitclaim deed, or other means.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the States would have control of the land.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator to say that the land was to be turned loose. Do I understand that there has been no act by any bureau to take possession of any of the land involved in the discussion?

Mr. CONNALLY. I believe the situation remains just as it was. The State leases and Federal leases are just hanging in the air. What I meant by my statement was that I wanted the Federal Government to withdraw its unlawful, illegal, unjust, and inequitable claims to the submerged lands, which belong to the States, not to the Federal Government.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am particularly happy that the Senator from Nebraska raised the question which he raised, because the present demands of some of the ardent advocates of Federal ownership of the submerged lands show clearly that in good conscience they realize they do not have any title. This fact is shown by the fact that they come in now with a so-called interim bill, which proposes to divide the royalties or proprietary revenue 50–50, as between the Federal Government and the State governments. Mr. President, the same people who claim that the Federal Government owns all of the property rights under the marginal waters, say, "We do not want the States to be too greatly disappointed. If we can have just the management, control, and operation, in a big Federal bureau, of this property, we are quite willing to see the States have half of the royalties."

I wish to state that if this philosophy be sound, if this be done with reference to oil, the same principle could apply also with reference to fish, with reference to shell fish, with reference to sponges, with reference to the great structures which have been built out into the ocean and into the Great Lakes, with reference to iron and other mineral deposits which lie under the bed of the Great Lakes, and with reference to so many other property values which are involved. If that be the case, we would at once cloud large groups of property values, title to which is settled in individuals who have dealt with the States in good faith and then have gone ahead and put in millions of dollars into development.

Before closing I would suggest to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and likewise to my friend from Nebraska, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] that, instead of bringing good management and efficient management into this matter, the advocates of Federal ownership, control, and operation of these vast assets propose to take over a little shoestring of an operation all the way around the continental land mass, as well on the land masses of various States which do not have salt water frontage, and propose that, by dividing jurisdiction between the ninety-nine one-hundredths area, which is under State control, and the one one-hundredth area, which would be in the shoestring and under Federal control, there would be less confusion and more efficient and business-like handling of the problem than is found under State control. The monstrous irresponsibility of such a statement is self-evident. It is a mere grasping for power by those who believe in a Federal superstate, and who do not believe in preserving settled property rights and laws under which we have progressed so far under State sovereignty.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WHERRY. I, too, wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I am quite satisfied that his statement throws considerable light on the point which the junior Senator from Nebraska raised. I believe it is very important to acquaint all Senators with what is happening relative to this great issue.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, let me read again the first great decision on this subject by the Supreme Court in *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212, 229), decided in 1844:

> First. The shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them—
>
> And the soils under them—
>
> were not granted by the Constitution to the United States; but were reserved to the States respectively.

Second. The new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States.

What did the present Supreme Court do when it reached its decision in the Texas case, with four judges on one side and three judges on the other side? What did it do? Did the Court go back and examine the decision in the Pollard case in 1844? Did the Court investigate the 52 decisions in which it followed that rule? No. The Supreme Court seized the Pollard decision by the nape of the neck and threw it into the wastebasket. It said, "Avaunt! Away with you! We, four judges to three judges—by a majority of one judge—overturn a 100-year-old rule of the Supreme Court, without any equivocation, without any deviation."

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course a decision of four to three is a decision of a minority of the Court, is it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Tennessee is absolutely correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. When in the future new members take their places on the Supreme Court, and another vote is taken, two newcomers may associate themselves with the three who voted the other way, and the decision would be reversed. That is possible, is it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. So it is a minority opinion of the Supreme Court.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is a minority opinion. Four justices of the Court do not constitute a quorum. We know what it takes to make a quorum. Four judges do not represent a quorum of the Supreme Court. They do not constitute a majority, but a minority, as suggested by the eminent Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I hope the Members of the Senate will consider the matter and look into it. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the brief from which I quoted rather generously.

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

EVERY STATE HAS SUBMERGED LANDS

(True reasons why congressional action confirming State ownership of submerged lands (H. R. 4484) is favored by the Council of State Governments, the Governors Conference, National Association of Attorneys General, National Association of Public Land Officials, National Association of County Officials, National Conference of Mayors, American Association of Port Authorities, the American Bar Association, American Title Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, National Water Conservation Association, American Municipal Association (representing 10,150 municipalities), National Institute of Municipal Law Officers)

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PUBLICATION

A barrage of false and misleading propaganda emanating from Federal lease applicants and executive agencies of the Federal Government has clouded the issues involved in the Federal-State controversy over ownership of submerged lands. These propagandists would have the public believe that the issue involves nothing but tidelands oil and that corrective legislation (H. R. 4484, by WALTER) restores and confirms submerged-land ownership to only three States.

The truth is that each of the 48 States has submerged lands and many valuable resources to which State ownership would be restored and confirmed by H. R. 4484. The ownership of each of the States to this type of property would be destroyed by the theory of the Supreme Court's tidelands decisions. All of the States want their ownership and control of this property recognized and confirmed, and that is precisely what H. R. 4484 would do. It does not apply only to oil or to coastal States. It specifically confirms the title of all the 48 States to all of their submerged lands exactly as the law existed for over 100 years.

The purpose of this publication is to correct the false impressions which have been created by those who would nationalize this property under the socialistic scheme of Federal control and to present the true reasons why State-ownership legislation is supported by the public officials and national organizations listed on the cover of this brief.

HALL HAMMOND,
Chairman, Attorney General of Maryland,
PRICE DANIEL,
Vice Chairman, Attorney General of Texas,
HAROLD R. FATZER,
Attorney General of Kansas,
EDMUND G. BROWN,
Attorney General of California,
GEORGE W. NEUNER,
Attorney General of Oregon,
BOLIVAR E. KEMP, Jr.,
Attorney General of Louisiana,
A. E. FUNK,
Attorney General of Kentucky,
National Association of Attorneys General, Submerged Lands Committee.

STATEMENT OF THE REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF H. R. 4484 BY WALTER

1. Each of the 48 States owns and possesses valuable submerged lands within its boundaries, the revenues from which are devoted to education and other important functions of State government.

2. The title of each of the 48 States to its submerged lands, whether inland or coastal, has been held under a century-old rule of law that this property is owned by the individual States rather than by the Federal Government.

3. This long-recognized rule of law, applicable to the waters and submerged lands of every State, has been destroyed and State titles clouded by the Supreme Court's tidelands decisions. The way has been opened for foreign nations to claim resources within our territorial waters.

4. Legislation is necessary for each of the 48 States in order to restore and confirm their ownership of navigable waters and submerged lands within their respective boundaries.

5. H. R. 4484 by WALTER, of Pennsylvania, restoring the law of State ownership of this property, applies not only to the 28 coastal and Great Lakes States but to each of the 48 States.

6. A quitclaim to the States is no gift. Equity and justice demand restoration of the property which the States have held and developed in good faith reliance upon 53 previous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

7. Nationalization of this property would result in less development of resources. The States and their local units of government are more closely concerned and better equipped to manage and develop the property, and State ownership has not interfered and would not interfere with the Federal powers of national defense, navigation, etc.

8. H. R. 4484 by WALTER confirms State ownership of only those lands lying within original State boundaries. Nine-tenths of the continental shelf lies outside of original State boundaries and is vested by this bill in the Federal Government.

9. Congress, which has final power to act in this controversy, has been ignored and circumvented by executive officials in the attempted seizure of this property from the States.

10. The principles of the tidelands decisions, if not erased from the law of the land by act of Congress, could lead to nationalization of private lands as well as State lands without compensation.

11. The only oil lobby involved in this legislation is opposing State ownership in order to obtain cheap Federal leases. The idea of devoting revenues from these lands to Federal aid to education was originated by this lobby for use against State ownership legislation.

1. Each of the 48 States owns and possesses valuable submerged lands within its boundaries, the revenues from which are devoted to education and other important functions of State government. Every State in our Nation has lands beneath navigable waters which produce valuable resources and revenues. A list of the States, showing the amount of acreage claimed by each, is printed below.

As shown in House and Senate committee hearings during the past 3 years, every State receives valuable revenues from these lands. Oil or oil lease revenues are now being received from submerged lands not only by Texas, Louisiana, and California, but also by Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, Maryland, Washington, Oregon, and the inland of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Kansas, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Utah, West Virginia, and the Great Lakes States of Indiana and Michigan.

Oil is not the only resource being produced by the States from their submerged lands. Nature's law of compensation has cared equally well for those States whose rivers, lakes, and marginal seas have not yet been tapped for petroleum. Maine has its rich kelp beds on which leases have been made within its 3-mile marginal belt for production of iodine. Arizona, Kentucky, and Missouri sell sand and gravel from their river and lake beds; Colorado and Idaho lease their lands for gold production; Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, and Rhode Island sell leases and permits for oyster, clam, and shellfish cultivation. Iowa, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia produce coal from their river beds, and Minnesota and Wisconsin have rich deposits of iron ore under the Great Lakes which lie partially within their boundaries. New York has millions invested on filled lands and within the marginal sea at Coney Island and on Long Island, and the same is true at Atlantic City in New Jersey and at Miami and other Florida resorts.

All of the States have one or more valuable resources within or beneath their submerged lands from which they are now receiving revenues for their schools or other public funds. All States are also jealous of their water and water rights in navigable streams, this being perhaps the most valuable resource of all, and it is one that the Department of Interior longs to control.

Contrary to the general impression created in the public press, H. R. 4484 relinquishes Federal claims to far more than the "tidelands" of the coastal States. As shown by the list below, the eight Great Lakes States, with a total of 38,595,840 acres of submerged lands, far outnumber the total of 17,029,120 acres within the marginal sea belt of the coastal States. Likewise, 28,960,640 acres of land under rivers, lakes, and other inland waters, greatly exceed the coastal acreage.

Approximate areas and present uses of submerged lands within State boundaries

[Expressed in acres]

State	Inland waters [1]	Great Lakes [2]	Marginal sea [2]	Present uses and revenues include—
Alabama	339,840		101,760	Sand, gravel, shell, oysters, oil and gas leases.
Arizona	210,560			Sand and gravel.
Arkansas	241,280			84,641 acres under oil and gas lease; sand and gravel.
California	1,209,600		2,540,800	Oil, gas, sand, gravel, kelp, and shell.
Colorado	179,200			Sand, gravel, and gold.
Connecticut	70,400		384,000	50,000 acres of marginal sea under lease; shell fish, sand, gravel, oysters, clams, mussels.
Delaware	50,560		53,760	Oyster bed leases, sand, gravel.
Florida	2,750,720		4,697,600	903,000 acres of Gulf of Mexico under lease. 2,748,000 acres of land under inland waters and under lease; oil, gas, sand, gravel, sponges, oysters.
Georgia	229,120		192,000	Sand and shell, approximately 1,000 acres of land in marginal sea leased.
Idaho	479,360			Sand and gravel. 1,302.96 acres under lease for gold and gravel.
Illinois	289,920	976,640		Sand, gravel, coal, and clay.
Indiana	55,040	145,920		Sand, gravel, coal, oil, mussel shells, peat, and marl. The revenues during 1948–49 included: sand and gravel, $50,563.68; oil, $101,413.51; coal, $4,453.56.
Iowa	188,160			Sand and gravel, coal, stone, ice, shell.
Kansas	104,320			Sand, gravel, oil, and gas. 6,944.96 acres of submerged lands under mineral leases.
Kentucky	183,040			Fish, mussel, shells, coal, gas, oil, sand and gravel.
Louisiana	2,141,440		2,668,160	Sand, gravel, oysters, and other marine products. 2,191,179 acres under lease in coastal waters.
Maine	1,392,000		759,680	Kelp, clams, lobsters, mussels, fish. Total income of $14,000,000.
Maryland	441,600		59,520	Oil and gas leases on entire marginal sea. Receive $20,557 annual rentals.
Massachusetts	224,000		368,640	Clams, lobsters, mussels, sand, rock.
Michigan	764,160	24,613,760		Leases cover oil and gas, sand and gravel.
Minnesota	2,597,760	1,415,680		Sand, gravel, clay.
Mississippi	189,440		136,320	Sand, gravel, oyster shell.
Missouri	258,560			Sand and gravel.
Montana	526,080			Do.
Nebraska	373,760			Do.
Nevada	472,320			Do.
New Hampshire	179,200		8,960	Kelp leases, sand and shell.
New Jersey	200,960		249,600	$55,000,000 improvements below high-water mark, including Atlantic City piers.
New Mexico	99,200			Sand and gravel.
New York	1,054,080	2,321,280	243,840	Recreation beaches, surf; removal of sand and earth. Millions of improvements on filled-in lands.
North Carolina	2,284,800		577,920	Oysters, shellfish, clams, sand, seaweed, shrimp.
North Dakota	391,040			Sodium sulphate, good prospects for oil, sand and gravel. Revenues dedicated to school fund.
Ohio	64,000	2,212,480		Sand and gravel.
Oklahoma	470,040			Mineral leases, sand and gravel.
Oregon	403,840		568,320	Sand and gravel, oil, gas, kelp.
Pennsylvania	184,320	470,400		Oil sands, clays, and coals.
Rhode Island	99,840		76,800	Sand, gravel, oysters.
South Carolina	295,040		359,040	Sand and gravel. All lands leased for oil and gas explorations.
South Dakota	327,040			Sand and gravel. Possibility of oil under submerged lands.
Tennesee	182,400			Sand and gravel.
Texas	2,364,800		2,466,560	Sand, gravel, oysters, shell, shrimp, sulfur, oil, and gas.
Utah	1,644,800			Mineral leases for salt; sodium sulphate, oil and gas.
Vermont	211,840			Sand, gravel, and quarries.
Virginia	586,240		215,040	Sand, gravel, oysters.
Washington	777,600		300,800	Placer gold, gold, copper, lead, silver, zinc, coal, limestone, marl, peat and salines, sand and gravel, and rentals on 130 oil and gas leases: 1 producing oil well in the tidelands area.
West Virginia	58,240			Sand and gravel, and prospecting for coal, oil and gas.
Wisconsin	920,960	6,439,680		Sand, gravel and marl.
Wyoming	261,120			Sand and gravel.
Total (expressed in acres)	28,960,640	38,595,840	17,029,120	

[1] Areas of the United States, 1940, Sixteenth Census of the United States (Government Printing Office, 1942), p. 2, et seq. The figures are very approximate but are absolute minimums.

[2] World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1947, published by the New York World-Telegram (1947), p. 138; serial No. 22, Department of Commerce, U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, November 1915. In figuring marginal sea area, only original State boundaries have been used. These coincide with the 3-mile limit for all States except Texas, Louisiana, and Florida Gulf coast. In the latter cases, the 3-league limit as established before or at the time of entry into the Union has been used.

2. The title of each of the 48 States to its submerged lands, whether inland or coastal, has been held under a century-old rule of law that this property is owned by the individual States rather than by the Federal Government. State ownership of this type of property, whether beneath rivers, lakes, bays, marginal seas, or Great Lakes, has been recognized in at least 53 previous Supreme Court decisions as a right of State sovereignty.[1]

[1] See Point I, Memorandum Brief in Appendix.

The legal theory of State ownership is based upon the fact that the Constitution granted no ownership of submerged lands to the Federal Government, and they were therefore reserved to the States by the tenth amendment.

An early statement of the rule by the Supreme Court was made in *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212, 229 (1844)), as follows:

"First. The shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively; second, the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States."

This Pollard case has been cited with approval in 52 Supreme Court decisions and 244 State and Federal Court decisions during the past 100 years.[2]

Before the recent California tidelands case (*U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19)), no distinction had ever been made between lands under inland waters and those under that part of the marginal sea within State boundaries. This was admitted by the Court in its opinion in the California case, as follows:

"As previously stated this Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times. And in doing so it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

If the rule of State ownership was stated by the Supreme Court over those many years in language "strong enough" to indicate that our highest Court "then believed" that the States owned the soils under all navigable waters within their boundaries, "whether inland or not," then no one should deny that the States were justified in the same belief and that their use, possession, and ownership has been in good faith.

Here we have 53 opinions of the Supreme Court indicating the law to be in favor of the States, both inland and coastal, and only 3 recent opinions to the contrary by divided vote of the present Supreme Court.[3] Congress is fully justified in following the 53 previous court decisions rather than the 3 recent decisions in determining the law for the future on this subject.

Quotations from two other court decisions illustrate the long-accepted rule, as follows:

County of St. Clair v. *Lovington* (90 U. S. 46, 68 (1874)):

"By the American Revolution the people of each State, in their sovereign character, acquired the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soil under them. The shores of navigable waters and the soil under them were not granted by the constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively."

Commonwealth v. *Alger* (61 Mass. (7 Cush.) 53, 82 (1851)):

"This right of dominion and controlling power over the sea and its coasts, shores, and tide waters, when relinquished by the parent country, must vest somewhere; and as between the several States and the United States, whatever may have been the doubts on the subject, it is settled that it vested in the several States, in their sovereign capacity, respectively, and was not transferred to the United States by the adoption of the constitution intended to form a more perfect union."

A detailed brief on this point is contained in point I of the Appendix hereto.

3. This long-recognized rule of law, applicable to the waters and submerged lands of every State, has been destroyed and State titles clouded by the Supreme Court's tidelands decisions. The way has been opened for foreign nations to claim resources within our territorial waters. The Federal attack upon the basic foundation of this rule of property law is an attack against the whole rule as it applies to inland as well as coastal waters. The theory of the Federal claim constitutes an attack upon State sovereignty.

[2] See Shephard's United States Citations for list of cases citing *Pollard* v. *Hagan*.

[3] *United States* v. *California*, supra; *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950)); and *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699 (1950)).

At page 11 of their brief in the California case, Federal attorneys said:

"We submit that ownership of submerged lands is not related to sovereignty at all, and that the decisions of this Court dealing with the tidelands and lands under inland waters have proceeded upon a false premise."

Again, on page 72 of the Government's brief, the rule with respect to tidelands and inland waters is attacked as being erroneous and unsound. At other places in the brief, the rule is called unsound, erroneous, wrong, patently unsound, fallacy, and a legal fiction (pp. 143, 144, 148, 150, and 153.)

The Supreme Court pitched its California decision not on ownership but on paramount national powers, which are said to transcend ownership and State powers. The Court said:

"The crucial question on the merits is not merely who owns the bare legal title to the lands under the marginal sea. The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner."

Those two capacities were held to be the national responsibility for national defense and the right to conduct international relations.

If this precedent is implemented rather than overruled by Congress, the Constitution of the United States will no longer control future internal disputes between State and Federal Governments, because the Federal Government has national defense powers over every foot of land in the Nation and practically all governmental functions are related to the national defense. As stated in the able dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Reed in the California case:

"The power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation."[4]

Obviously, State titles to all submerged lands are clouded by the Federal claims and the tidelands decisions. No ownership was decreed to the Federal Government, but the newly decreed "paramount power" includes the right to appropriate all the "resources of the soil under that water area" without compensation to the States.[5] It is not limited to oil. The theory is broad enough to cover the water itself, fish, oysters, sand, shell, gravel, iron ore, coal, kelp, gas, and all other things of value which now bring revenues to the States.[6]

POSSIBILITY OF CLAIMS BY FOREIGN NATIONS

By departing from the long-established rule that lands under territorial waters within the boundaries of the States are American soil and controlled by the State laws of property ownership, the Supreme Court has for the first time in our history opened the door for foreign nations to assert claims to resources within our boundaries.

For the first time the Court has treated lands beyond low tide along our beaches (but within our seaward boundaries and territorial waters) as international domain. The Court said in the California case that "The very oil about which the State and Nation here contend might well become the subject of international dispute and settlement."[7]

In the Texas case the Court said, "As pointed out in *United States* v. *California*, once low-water mark is passed the international domain is reached."[8]

Eminent authorities on international law believe that Federal control of these submerged lands under the theory of the Supreme Court that they are part of the international domain may result in Russia or other countries making some claim to share in the resources. Judge Manley O. Hudson, chairman of the United Nations Commission on International Law, Dean Roscoe Pound, Dr. Charles Cheney Hyde, and other experts in the field recently made this joint statement:

"Implicit in the denomination of the area as international domain is the possibility of other nations having rights therein other than innocent passage through the waters. Spain, Mexico, France, England, Russia, and other nations can make no reasonable assertion of an interest in the oil and other minerals within the 3-league gulfward boundary of Texas so long as this Court recognizes that the area was removed from international domain when it became a part of the Republic of Texas. * * * A contrary conclusion by the United States Supreme Court could well be used by other nations as an opening for claims not now asserted."[9]

This is in accord with the brief of former Congressman Hobbs and other originators of the theory of the California decision in which Mr. Hobbs said the beds of the marginal seas are the common property of the family of nations.[10] Ownership by the family of nations is also subscribed to by the minority report of the House Judiciary Committee on H. R. 4484 in which the minority members say at page 79 of Report No. 695:

"The title to all of the oceans, including surface, body, and bed, is in the family of nations—it belongs to the world."

This theory is contrary to all recognized authorities on international law and contrary to the views of our own State Department. The only way to close the opening thereby offered to foreign nations is to enact legislation which restores the domestic status of marginal sea lands within State boundaries and Territorial waters as property of the respective States the same as lands under inland waters.

4. Legislation is necessary for each of the 48 States in order to restore and confirm their ownership of navigable waters and submerged lands within their respective boundaries. Since the California case was decided in 1947, officials from 46 States and the national organizations listed on the cover of this brief have submitted arguments, briefs, or resolutions to congressional committees insisting that every State needs legislation such as H. R. 4484 to remove the cloud from State ownership of submerged lands.

Claims already asserted by Federal officials indicate the real need for this legislation. The claims may be summarized with respect to the various types of submerged lands as follows:

MARGINAL SEA OF COASTAL STATES

Of the 21 coastal States, only California, Texas, and Louisiana have been sued, but Attorney General McGrath and Solicitor General Perlman claim that the decisions in these cases apply equally against all 18 of the other coastal States.[11] In the case of *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385 (1948), the Supreme Court described its California opinion as applying to the Thirteen Original States and their successor States. It is certain that this area, together with all artificially filled lands along the beaches, and all bays wider than 10 miles (such as Boston and Chesapeake Bay) are now being claimed by the Federal Government.[12] This claim covers everything below low-tide along the beaches, including water, sand, shell, fish, kelp, oysters, clams, and other resources.[13]

GREAT LAKES

Since the Great Lakes have been held to be "open seas," and State ownership of the beds of the Great Lakes has been held to be the same as "lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea," one must agree with officials of the eight Great Lakes States that this legislation is necessary to remove the cloud of the recent tidelands cases from their titles. With twice as much land under the Great Lakes (60,306 square miles) as under the coastal belt (26,608 square miles) and with equally good prospects for oil, gas, iron ore, coal, and other minerals, these eight States stand to lose more property and revenues than the 21 coastal States if this legislation is not enacted.

INLAND WATERS

The Judge Advocate of the Navy and former Congressman Sam Hobbs, with the assistance of Navy, Justice, and Interior Departments, as early as 1938 advanced the theory that State ownership of inland navigable waters is qualified to the extent that minerals, fish, oysters, and other resources may be taken from the soils for national defense without compensation to the States.[14] The majority opinion by Mr. Justice Black in the California case speaks of such ownership under inland waters as being qualified.[15] In an attempt to split the ranks of the States, the Attorney General of the United States has prepared and recommended enactment of S. 1540 to quitclaim the beds of inland waters to the States. (The Great Lakes are omitted from S. 1540.) State officials oppose this (1) as an effort to divide their forces, (2) as unfair to the coastal and Great Lakes States, and (3) because S. 1540 would recognize State titles only to the beds of the streams with no mention of waters and minerals but with specific reservation of all rights relating to the national defense (sec.

[4] *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 42–43).

[5] *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 38–39).

[6] Former Congressman Sam Hobbs, ardent advocate of Federal control of these lands, contended before the committee hearings that the Federal Government could take the oysters to feed the Navy from Mobile Bay and Alabama River without compensation to the State of Alabama. Mr. Justice Black, during arguments in the California case, questioned the need for payment to the State for fish needed for national defense, and in the subsequent case of *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385, 406 (1948)), the Court said the power of South Carolina to regulate fishing in the marginal sea area within its boundaries may be exercised only in the absence of a conflicting Federal claim, citing *United States* v. *California*.

[7] *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 35).

[8] *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707, 719).

[9] Joint Memorandum in Support of Rehearing in *United States* v. *Texas*, No. 13 Original, Supreme Court of the United States. This memorandum was signed by Joseph Walter Bingham, C. John Colombos, Gilbert Gidel, Manley O. Hudson, Charles Cheney Hyde, Hans Kelsen, William E. Masterson, Roscoe Pound, Stefan A. Riesenfeld, and Felipe Sanchez Roman.

[10] Point 1, Brief of Sam Hobbs, pp. 30–45, hearings before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys on S. J. Res. 83 and 92, 76th Cong., 1st sess., March 1939.

[11] Hearings before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 155, S. 923, S. 1545, S. 1700, and S. 2153, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), 22.

[12] Memorandum of the United States in response to request of special master of June 29, 1949, pp. 19–21, *United States* v. *California*, No. 11, original, Supreme Court of the United States.

[13] Hearings before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 940, March 28, 1951, reporter's transcript, 175, 181.

[14] See brief of Navy by Philip Buettner, Joint Hearings Before the Committees on the Judiciary, 80th Cong., 2d sess. (1948), 1108, and brief of Congressman Hobbs, Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys on S. J. Res. 83 and S. J. Res. 92, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939), 30.

[15] *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 30).

104, S. 1540). State officials term this as a joker which would allow future Federal officials to assert the same rights advocated by the Navy and Congressman Hobbs over the resources of these lands for national defense without compensation.

Even now, the Attorney General of the United States is claiming that the Federal Government has paramount rights to the waters of the Santa Margarita River in California, in complete disregard of appropriative rights held by riparian owners for over 75 years.[16] He is suing over 10,000 private appropriators and users of water on the same theory as was applied in the tidelands cases.

Also, the Department of the Interior has for many years asserted ownership and right of control over waters of inland rivers and lakes. It intervened in the case of *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (295 U. S. 40 (1935)), alleging "that the United States is the owner of all unappropriated water in the North Platte River, irrespective of any appropriation made or to be made by it under the law of any State." The claim was denied but on grounds other than a final determination of the issue raised.

The concern of the inland State officials over the tidelands decisions is shown by the following statement in the House Judiciary Committee report on H. R. 5992, Eightieth Congress, second session, at page 11:

"State officials from every inland State in the Union, except three, testified or submitted statements that in their opinion the decision (*U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19)) has clouded the long-asserted titles of the inland States to lands and natural resources below navigable waters within the boundaries of the inland States."

"The Supreme Court has as much power to overrule its prior decisions laying down the inland-water rule as it had power to change its belief regarding ownership of the marginal belt within the boundaries of the States; and it may well do so in view of its holding in the California case, unless Congress acts to establish the law for the future."

Federal officials now admit that they claim paramount rights over the lands of twenty-eight coastal and Great Lakes States lying below low-tide and outside of inland waters. In what appears to be a "divide and conquer" technique, Federal officials are trying to lull the remaining twenty inland States into a sense of security by saying that they have not claimed and will not claim their submerged lands. Senator O'MAHONEY has recently written the Governors of the interior States that they should have no fear of losing their river beds, lakes, and other lands beneath inland waters because "the Executive Branch of the Government has never asserted title to the lands beneath inland navigable waters." The answer is that neither had Federal officials asserted claim to the marginal belt of the coastal States for over 100 years. According to the Supreme Court's California tidelands opinion, the recognition by Federal officials of State ownership is not binding.

H. R. 4484 is the only fair and just manner of removing this cloud on the title to inland waters, because it treats the inland and coastal States alike. Far more land lies beneath inland waters, and Commitee hearings show that ten times as much oil is produced from beneath inland waters. It would be a discrimination against the 28 coastal and Great Lakes States to treat them differently from the inland States, especially since all of them have held their titles under the same rule of law for over 100 years.

[16] *United States* v. *Fallbrook Public Utility District et al.*, No. 1247, United States District Court for Southern District of California, Southern Division.

5. H. R. 4484 by WALTER of Pennsylvania, restoring the law of State ownership of this property, applies not only to the 28 coastal and Great Lakes States but to each of the 48 States. One would gain the impression from notices in the public press that H. R. 4484 applies only to three coastal States. This is untrue. As heretofore pointed out, the bill applies equally to each of the 48 States, confirming in each of them the title to all lands beneath navigable waters within their original boundaries.

A mere reading of the following portions of H. R. 4484 shows that it restores ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within the respective State boundaries to each of the 48 States:

"SEC. 2. When used in this act—

"(a) The term 'lands beneath navigable waters' includes (1) all lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which were covered by waters navigable under the laws of the United States at the time such State became a member of the Union, and all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line 3 geographical miles distant from the coast line of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Great Lakes or Gulf of Mexico) beyond 3 geographical miles, and (2) all filled in, made, or reclaimed lands which formerly were lands beneath navigable waters, as herein defined. * * *

"(h) The term 'State' means any State of the Union;

"SEC. 3. Rights of the States: It is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and the right and power to control, develop, and use the said natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the property law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof."

6. A quitclaim to the States is no gift. Equity and justice demand restoration of the property which the States have held and developed in good faith reliance upon 53 previous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Probably the most insulting charge against this legislation is that it would be giving away Federal property to the States. Federal officials oppose this alleged donation to the States which form our own Nation at the same time they are advocating that billions of dollars be donated to foreign countries.

We feel that the economic and governmental success of the individual States is as important as the economic and governmental success of foreign nations. In this day of decreasing State revenues, the income from their submerged lands is vital to their economy. Its loss would greatly weaken governmental functions to which these revenues have been dedicated for over 100 years.

Even if it were a donation, which we specifically deny, it would be to sovereign States which are a part of the United States. There is no wealth or property within a State which is not also a part of the total wealth of our Nation.

However, this legislation merely confirms title to lands which are now and have always been in the possession of the States. As heretofore shown, no title has been adjudged to the Federal Government. The National Government has never possessed these lands and cannot now take possession or use them unless Congress passes an act authorizing such possession and use.[17]

For over 100 years the States have been in possession of and claiming and using the submerged lands within their boundaries in good faith.[18] Fifty-three previous Supreme Court decisions said just as clearly that the States own all lands beneath all navigable waters within their boundaries as the present Supreme Court has spoken to the contrary. It is not a gift in any sense of the word to allow the States to keep what they had and what the Federal Government never had and never thought of claiming until recent years.

As between individuals a court of equity would settle this title question promptly in favor of the person who had possession of the land in good faith for over 100 years. Equity would not allow recovery under a newly discovered superior claim by one who had been out of possession and made no claim for over 100 years. By enacting H. R. 4484, Congress would apply the same rule of equity as between the Federal and State sovereigns. Is that asking too much of a fair and just Government?

WYOMING OFFERS PRECEDENT

Legislation similar to that contained in H. R. 4484 was passed for the benefit of the State of Wyoming after the decision in *United States* v. *Wyoming* (331 U. S. 440 (1947)). In that case, which Senator LESTER C. HUNT said was an "almost identical situation" with the California case, the Supreme Court took from Wyoming a section of school land which that State had claimed in good faith for 57 years. Oil, valued at more than $3,000,000, had been discovered on this section of land. In this situation, Senator O'MAHONEY authored a bill in Congress quitclaiming this section of land to Wyoming, in spite of the Supreme Court's decision and in spite of the argument of the Department of Interior and the Department of Justice that it belonged to all the people and should not be quitclaimed. Congress restored title to Wyoming on that part of the section on which oil was being produced.

The principles of equity and justice which caused Congress to restore to Wyoming lands which it had held in good faith for 57 years likewise demand the restoration to all of the States of lands which they have held and developed in good faith for over 100 years. The oil under coastal State lands is no more valuable for national defense than the oil under Wyoming land, and the Federal Government is as much obliged to defend Wyoming as it is to defend the coastal States. The truth is that regardless of which government owns or administers the land, oil and other necessary resources will always be available to our Nation for defense, and it is sincerely believed that with the long experience and present machinery in operation, more oil can be produced in this emergency under State control than would be produced if this added burden is placed upon an already overburdened Federal agency.

7. Nationalization of this property would result in less development of resources. The States and their local units of government are more closely concerned and better equipped to manag and develop the property, and State ownership has not interfered and would not interfere with the Federal powers of national defense, navigation,

[17] Both the Department of the Interior and the Attorney General agree that none of the lands may be leased until Congress authorizes such action. Opinion of the Solicitor, Interior Department, August 8, 1947, and letter from Attorney General to Secretary Krug, August 29, 1947.

[18] This point is fully developed at pages 1-iv of the memorandum brief in the appendix.

and so forth. State officials are patriotically interested in national defense, but we contend that in our system of Government nationalization of minerals and property would retard production and development of resources. This has been the history of national ownership of coal in England, oil in Mexico, and general nationalization of minerals in Russia.

Our own Federal Government is not famous for its operations in the oil business. The Teapot Dome scandal grew out of Federal dealings with an oil reserve by Navy, Interior, and Justice Departments—the same three Departments which are now seeking even greater Federal control of minerals. The Elk Hills Naval Reserve was a pitiful failure during the past war and was finally turned over to Standard Oil for operation.

The various committee hearings and reports on tidelands legislation reflect the excellent and honest job performed by State officials in the conservation and production of oil for two world wars. State operations on submerged lands constitute a going concern, with long experience and trained personnel. Transfer of these operations to the Federal Government contemplates an entirely new Federal bureau to be organized and trained to handle these local matters from Washington. Nothing would be more certain to slow up production. The Federal Government now owns 24 percent of all the land in the United States. The Department of Interior has more land under its control now than can be properly managed and developed by a centralized Federal agency.[19]

Under our system of government, nationalization of minerals is unnecessary to obtain and conserve them for national defense. During the last war the Federal Government exercised constitutional powers of priority purchase of oil and also set the price to be paid therefor. This was the proper and successful procedure then, and there is no reason to depart from it now in favor of a procedure which has failed in this and other countries.

It must be conceded that the Federal Government has paramount political powers over all navigable waters in this Nation for navigation, interstate and foreign commerce, and national defense purposes. No State has ever denied that. Every State recognizes that its ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters is subject to and must not interfere with the paramount governmental powers of the National Government. That is why a State cannot build a bridge across a navigable river or drill a well in the bed of a navigable water without approval of the United States engineers who certify in advance that the structure will not interfere with navigation or defense. In the three submerged lands cases thus far brought to trial, not one instance of conflict has been cited between the exercises of ownership rights by the States and the exercise of paramount governmental powers by the Federal Government.

To be sure that the national defense powers are protected, H. R. 4484 contains the following provision:

"SEC. 6. * * * (b) In time of war when necessary for national defense, and the Congress or the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price, all or any portion of the said natural resources, or to acquire and use any portion of said lands by proceeding in accordance with due process of law and paying just compensation therefor."

All other constitutional Federal powers in national defense, international affairs, commerce, and navigation are also recognized and preserved by section 6 (a) of this bill. It is clear, therefore, that State ownership of this property cannot and will not interfere with paramount Federal governmental powers.

The distinction between ownership and governmental powers is covered in detail under point II, Memorandum Brief, in the appendix.

8. H. R. 4484 by WALTER confirms State ownership of only those lands lying within original State boundaries. Nine-tenths of the Continental Shelf lies outside of original State boundaries and is vested by this bill in the Federal Government. As shown by section 2 (a) of H. R. 4484, it confirms State ownership of only those lands within the original boundaries as they existed "at the time such State became a member of the Union." These original seaward boundaries extend only 3 miles from shore on the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans and three leagues (9 marine miles) from shore on the Gulf of Mexico.

The total area within these original State boundaries (26,608 square miles) is only about one-tenth of the total area of the Continental Shelf (262,500 square miles).

Under section 8 of H. R. 4484, the natural resources underlying that portion of the Continental Shelf outside the original State boundaries (nine-tenths of the Continental Shelf) are placed under the "jurisdiction, control, and power of disposition" of the Federal Government. The adjacent coastal States would receive under section 12 of the bill 37½ percent of all moneys received by the United States "as bonus payments, rents, and royalties with respect to operations for oil, gas, or other minerals in lands in the Continental Shelf which would be within the boundaries of such State, if extended seaward to the outer margin of the Continental Shelf; * * *" This is the same percentage received by the States under the Federal Mineral Leasing Act from all federally owned lands within their respective boundaries.[20]

9. Congress, which has final power to act in this controversy, has been ignored and circumvented by executive officials in the attempted seizure of this property from the States. There is no dispute that Congress has the power to restore and confirm State ownership of this property. This was recognized by the Supreme Court in the California case, where it was said that—

"Article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution vests in Congress 'power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.' We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. *United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29–30). Thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power" (332 U. S., at 27).

The Court said further:

"We cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission" (332 U. S., at 40).

The power of Congress over this area has been recognized also by the executive department of the Federal Government, as shown by the following statement in the supplemental brief of the United States in the California case:

"In this connection it is pertinent to note, as stated by the Attorney General at oral argument, that the President has authorized him to say that there is no desire on the part of the President or of any Federal official to destroy or confiscate any honest or bona fide investment, or to deprive the State or its subdivisions of any reasonable expectation of return from the areas that have been developed.

"The President recognizes that in the event the decision of this Court is favorable to the United States, it will be necessary to have congressional action looking toward the future management of the resources of this area. And he also intends to recommend to the Congress that legislation be enacted recognizing, both prospectively and retrospectively, any equities of the State and those who have operated under it, to the fullest extent consistent with the national interest."

However, the Congress has been ignored by the executive officials who conceived this new and startling theory set forth in the tidelands decisions and presented it to the Supreme Court in the name of the United States of America. In fact, Congress has been flaunted by the national officials who went to court and asserted Federal claims to these lands and minerals in spite of the fact that they had twice previously sought authority from Congress to file such suits, and once asked Congress to assert claim to such property, but on each occasion Congress refused to assert claim and refused to grant permission to file the suits.

Before the California case was tried and before the Texas and Louisiana cases were filed, it was quite apparent from votes of both Houses on quitclaim bills that a substantial majority of the Members of Congress favored continued State ownership and opposed the attempted seizure of such property on behalf of the Federal Government. Because they have ignored Congress and proceeded contrary to the evident will of the majority of the policy-making branch of the Government, these executive officers have now produced the stalemate which has stopped development of additional resources from these lands.

10. The principles of the tidelands decisions, if not erased from the law of the land by act of Congress, could lead to nationalization of private lands as well as State lands without compensation. State officials and many others were alarmed at the revolutionary theory of the California tidelands decision, in which the Supreme Court said that needs and powers of the national sovereign are paramount to bare legal title and transcend the rights of a mere property owner, and that such paramount governmental powers give the Federal Government the right to use and control property within the established boundaries of a State without having ownership or paying compensation.

This alarm has not been lessened by the subsequent opinion in the Texas tidelands case, in which Justice Douglas, with approval of three other members of the Court, said:

"Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign" (339 U. S. at 719).

---

[19] In the five public-land States producing oil and gas, the Federal Government owns approximately 36½ percent of the acreage but produces only about 13 percent of the oil and gas produced in these States. The 1946 total production from these lands was approximately 62,000,000 barrels, while the production from State and privately owned lands in the same States was in excess of 380,000,000 barrels. Thus, it will be seen that in these five public-land States, where Federal- and State-owned lands are in direct competition with each other, development has been much faster and production has been much greater under State regulation than under Federal control. The total annual production of oil from the vast federally owned domain in 1946 was less than 12 days' production of the Nation. It must be conceded that the Federal Government has made a pitiful showing with respect to the development of public lands for oil and gas purposes. (House Judiciary Committee Report No. 1778, on H. R. 5992, 80th Cong., 2d sess. (1948)).

[20] 41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 181 and the following.

The American Bar Association and the American Title Association have pointed out that this new doctrine is a threat to private ownership of land and minerals, because the Federal Government has the same needs for national defense and the same paramount powers and responsibilities with respect to private lands and minerals as it does with respect to lands and minerals beneath navigable waters.

The basis of this fear was alluded to by Mr. Justice Reed, who said in his dissenting opinion in the California case that—

"The power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands precisely the same as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation" (332 U. S. at 42–43).

Mr. Justice Frankfurter made a similar statement in his dissent with reference to uranium under private lands, and in their dissenting opinion in the Texas case, Justice Reed and Justice Minton said:

"The needs of defense and foreign affairs alone cannot transfer ownership of an ocean bed from a State to the Federal Government any more than they could transfer iron ore under uplands from State to Federal ownership. National responsibility is no greater in respect to the marginal sea than it is toward every other particle of American territory" (339 U. S. at 723).

It is this new and far-reaching principle of law, first announced by the Supreme Court in the California tidelands case and reiterated in the Texas and Louisiana cases, that frightens the officials of inland as well as coastal States and startles such organizations as the American Bar Association and the American Title Association. It is a principle by which nationalization of oil and other natural resources can be accomplished in the United States, with even greater ease than it was accomplished in Mexico, South America, England, Russia, and Iran.

To those who have expressed fear that the same principle of nationalization of minerals may be applied to private lands, some people answer that such a thing could never happen in our country. They say Congress would never let it happen. Others answer that it has already happened to three coastal States of the American Union in spite of Congress, and unless the Congress asserts itself and enacts a law saying that ownership of property shall continue to be separate from political powers, further nationalization of both State and private property can and will occur in this Nation.

11. The only "oil lobby" involved in this legislation is opposing State ownership in order to obtain cheap Federal leases. The idea of devoting revenues from these lands to Federal aid to education was originated by this "lobby" for use against State ownership legislation. The advocates of Federal control of the "tidelands" area have sought to create the impression that the oil companies are lobbying for H. R. 4484. This is not true. The sponsors of State ownership legislation, as shown by the cover hereof, are the following organizations: The Council of State Governments, the Governors Conference, National Association of Attorneys General, National Association of Public Land Officials, National Association of County Officials, National Conference of Mayors, American Association of Port Authorities, the American Bar Association, American Title Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, National Reclamation Association, National Water Conservation Association, American Municipal Association, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

No one can seriously contend that these groups are an "oil lobby," and no one can find any oil lobbyists directly or indirectly influencing their actions on tidelands legislation.

Companies holding leases from the States have been neutral since the promise of Federal officials to confirm the State leases under which they now hold. All of the Federal bills would confirm these leases. Good faith lessees of the States have nothing to lose whichever way the fee title and the royalties may go.

Those oil interests which are not neutral are opposed to State ownership and are now fighting against H. R. 4484. They are the 1031 Federal lease applicants who have blanketed the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana with Federal applications at 25 cents per acre (the amount payable under Federal law before the 50-cent amendment). A list of these applicants appears at pages 1286–1294 of the Joint Hearings Before the Committees on the Judiciary, Eightieth Congress, second session (1948), on S. 1988 and similar House bills.

On the above list appears the name of I. A. Smoot, former postmaster of Salt Lake City, Utah, who was reported by Drew Pearson to have complained to President Truman about the tidelands oil lobby. Mr. Pearson reports that the President told Mr. Smoot he would not let these lands go back to the States as long as he was President. Whether known to the President or not, Mr. Smoot himself was lobbying in support of his own Federal oil-lease application. Mr. Smoot is an applicant for a Federal lease on 800 acres of land off the coast of Long Beach, Calif., which he hopes to get for $200 under the 25-cent-per-acre Federal leasing act in effect when he filed. It is now worth $1,000,000, according to the California Land Commissioner.

Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler and Mr. James A. Murray, son of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, are registered lobbyists and attorneys for some of the Federal lease applicants, and are doing all within their power against the State ownership bill.

It was these Federal lease applicants who first persuaded then Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes to reverse his opinion about State ownership and to launch the campaign to wrest the tidelands from the States. Previously, in a letter dated December 22, 1933, Secretary Ickes wrote Olin S. Proctor, a Federal lease applicant, that "it was a matter of settled law" that "title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California." He said that the land could "not be appropriated except by authority of California."

Later, however, Secretary Ickes changed his mind. His explanation for this change, as stated at a congressional hearing in 1946, was the insistence of applicants (for Federal leases) and their lawyers. It is these Federal lease applicants who expect to cash in if Federal control wins out.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

At the request of former Senator Wheeler, now attorney for the Federal lease applicants, Mr. Ickes has appeared before congressional committees and presented arguments in their behalf. It is significant that they, not Federal officials or present proponents of the idea in Congress, originated the argument that revenues from these lands should be divided up among all the States as a means of Federal aid to education. This was first proposed by Mr. Ickes in 1948. Actually, it is not contained in any bill sponsored by the executive officials. It is nothing more than an effort to offset the fact that the lands of Texas, Louisiana, and California are being taken away from their public-school funds.

All submerged-lands revenues in Texas have been devoted to public education for more than 30 years. All or part of such revenues are devoted to education in most of the other States. The latest available total of all revenues received by Texas, Louisiana, and California to date from oil and gas leases and royalties is $77,292,000. This has meant a great deal to the public education and other State functions in those States during the past 30 years. If divided among the 48 States it would have amounted to only $1,610,000 per State.

Even if the figure would be much larger in the future, it is doubtful if any State in the Union would be willing to surrender to the Federal Government the title of its own submerged lands for one forty-eighth part of the total revenues received from all the States through Federal ownership and management. Yet that would be the inevitable result of such a socialistic scheme.

The Federal Government today owns 24 percent of all the land in the United States, and the revenues therefrom are not being earmarked for education. Grants of this property direct to the States would enable them to be self-sustaining and retain control of their educational systems. Of course, this also would be opposed by Mr. Ickes and other advocates of Federal control, because their primary interest is the centralization of property and power in the national sovereign rather than the support of public education. The Federal aid to education plan is a mere attempt to gain votes for Federal control of submerged lands now being used by the States in support of their own systems of public education.

THIS LEGISLATION IS NOT A PARTISAN ISSUE

State ownership legislation, on previous votes in the House and Senate, has been supported by a majority of the Members in both major parties. Both Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Minority Leader JOE MARTIN have spoken in behalf of the legislation.

In the Senate, the 35 Members who are coauthors of similar legislation are almost equally divided in their party affiliation.

In the last presidential election, only the Progressive Party advocated Federal control of these lands.[21] A Federal control plank advocated by Harold L. Ickes was defeated by the Democratic Party platform and resolutions committee.[22] The Republican Party and States Rights Party favored State ownership.[23]

APPENDIX

MEMORANDUM BRIEF

I. Use, possession, and claim of ownership by the States of lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries has been in good faith and supported by all previous decisions of the Supreme Court, other Federal courts, State courts, and administrative agencies for more than 100 years

It is significant that the latest authority for the above statement of the rule recognized by former decisions of the Supreme Court is the opinion by Mr. Justice Black in *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 36 (1947)), as follows:

"As previously stated this Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times. And in doing so it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

The above-mentioned Pollard case, decided in 1844, has been cited with approval in 52 United States Supreme Court decisions and 244 State and Federal court decisions

---

[21] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 12, p. A5092.

[22] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 3, p. 4152.

[23] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 12, pp. A4661 and A4679.

during the past 100 years.[1] If the rule of State ownership was stated by the Supreme Court over those many years in language "strong enough" to indicate that our highest court "then believed" that the States owned the soils under all navigable waters within their boundaries, "whether inland or not," then no one should deny that the States were justified in the same belief and that their use, possession, and ownership has been in good faith. Many great Justices of the Supreme Court used this "strong language" and "then believed" as the States did. The list includes Chief Justice Taney, Mr. Justice Field, Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Chief Justice Taft, Chief Justice Hughes, and 46 of the 54 other Supreme Court Justices who concurred in such opinions between 1842 and 1947.

Despite this long line of decisions, in the California case the Supreme Court sought to limit the long-recognized rule to a "qualified" ownership of land under inland waters and no ownership at all of land under coastal waters within State boundaries. This is an obvious error in the California decision. There is no English or American decision indicating that the sovereign right theory of ownership is only an "inland water" rule. On the contrary, all court decisions on the point indicate and say that the rule of State ownership applies to all lands which are (1) beneath navigable waters, and (2) within State boundaries. In fact, it is a navigable water rule which grew from the sovereign ownership of the adjoining navigable sea bed and was extended to inland navigable waters as "arms of the sea." This accounts for the fact that all previous members of the Supreme Court have written the rule broad enough to cover "all navigable waters * * * whether inland or not." There is no dispute that the tidewater areas within the marginal sea are navigable both in law and in fact, and that all such areas covered by this legislation are within the lawful boundaries of the respective States.

In the above-mentioned Pollard decision (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212, 229)), Mr. Justice McKinley expressely said that "the territorial boundaries of Alabama have extended all her sovereign powers into the sea" (p. 230), and stated the broad question of the case as being "whether Alabama is entitled to the shores of the navigable waters, and the soil under them, within her limits" (p. 225). Holding that Alabama's sovereign municipal power was the same on the sea as on the shore within her boundaries, the Court said.

"First. The shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively. Second. The new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States." (3 How. at 230.)

Note the emphasis and the controlling points for State ownership of all lands beneath all navigable waters within State boundaries in the following excerpts from other learned justices:

Chief Justice Taney, in 1842, in the first case establishing the rule said:

"For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them." [2]

Mr. Justice Clifford in 1867 said:

"Settled rule of law in this court is, that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders. When the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them.[3]

Mr. Justice Field in 1873, for a unanimous court that included Chief Justice Chase, said that "all soils under the tide waters within her limits passed to the State." [4]

Mr. Justice Bradley in 1876 said:

"In our view of the subject the correct principles were laid down in *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367), *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 312), and *Goodtitle* v. *Kibbe* (9 How. 471). These cases related to tidewaters, it is true; that they enunciated principles which are equally applicable to all navigable water * * * it (the bed and shore of such waters) properly belongs to the State by their inherent sovereignty." [5]

Chief Justice Waite in 1876 said that "each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction." [6]

Mr. Justice Gray in 1894 said:

"The new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the original States in the tide waters, and in the lands under them, within their respective jurisdictions." [7]

Chief Justice White said in 1912: "Each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction." [8]

Chief Justice Taft in 1926 said that "all the proprietary rights of the Crown and Parliament in, and all their dominion over, lands under tidewater vested in the several States." [9]

Chief Justice Hughes said in 1935:

"The soils under tidewaters within the original States were reserved to them respectively, and the States since admitted to the Union have the same sovereignty and jurisdiction in relation to such lands within their borders as the original States possessed." [10]

Probably the strongest case directly on State ownership of land under the marginal sea is *Illinois Central R. R. Co.* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387 (1892)), in which title to the bed of Lake Michigan was in issue. Holding that the Great Lakes are "open seas" and should be governed by the same property rule as applies to tidewaters on the coastal seas, the Supreme Court said:

"It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tidewaters, within the limits of the several States, belong to the respective States within which they are found * * * subject always to the paramount right of Congress to control their navigation so far as may be necessary for the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the States * * *.

"The same doctrine is in this country held to be applicable to lands covered by fresh water in the Great Lakes over which is conducted an extended commerce with different States and foreign nations. These Lakes possess all the general characteristics of open seas, except in the freshness of their waters, and in the absence of the ebb and flow of the tide. In other respects they are inland seas, and there is no reason or principle for the assertion of dominion and sovereignty over and ownership by the State of lands covered by tidewaters that is not equally applicable to its ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by the fresh waters of these Lakes. * * *

"* * *. We hold, therefore, that the same doctrine as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under the navigable waters of the Great Lakes applies, which obtains at the common law as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea." (146 U. S. at 435–437.)

II. State ownership (jus privatum or dominium) of lands under navigable waters is separate and distinct from State and Federal governmental powers (jus publicum or imperium) over said lands for public uses of navigation, commerce, and fishing. Ownership cannot interfere with governmental control for public uses, because the latter is paramount to the former. Likewise, exercise of the paramount governmental powers cannot acquire or destroy any of the proprietorship, except so much as may be necessary to keep the waters open and suitable for navigation.

In English and American jurisprudence two separate and distinct sovereign rights have always existed with relation to navigable waters and the soils beneath them. These rights are: (1) proprietorship (jus privatum or dominium), and (2) governmental control for public use (jus publicum or imperium). Proprietorship (jus privatum—using, leasing, collecting revenues) must not and cannot interfere with the regulatory control (jus publicum), because the latter has always been paramount for the protection of the public uses of commerce, navigation, and fishing.

In England both ownership and regulatory control (jus privatum and jus publicum) were vested in the King. Under our constitutional system in the United States, the sovereign right of ownership (jus privatum) is vested in the respective States. The sovereign right of governmental control (jus publicum) is divided between the dual State and Federal sovereignties, with the States reserving all of such rights which were not delegated to the Federal Government. Under such a division of sovereign rights, State ownership of lands beneath navigable waters has not in the past and will not in the future interfere with that portion of the jus publicum contained in the paramount constitutional powers of the Federal Government for regulation and control of navigation, national defense, and other Federal powers.

Some of the English and American cases recognizing these fundamental and historical distinctions between proprietorship and governmental powers are as follows:

Blundell v. *Catterall* (5 B. & Ald. 268, 106 Eng. Rep. 1190, 1199):

"As he (Hale) also there lays it down, in the main sea itself, adjacent to his dominions, the king only hath the propriety, but a subject hath not * * *.

"By the common law, though the shore, that is to say the soil betwixt the ordinary flux and reflux of the tide, as well as the sea itself, belongs to the king; yet it is true that the same are also prima facie publici juris, or clothed with a public interest. But this jus publicum appears from Lord Hale to be the public right in all the king's subjects, or navigation for the purpose of commerce, trade, and intercourse, and also the liberty of fishing in the sea or the creeks or arms thereof."

[1] See Shepard's U. S. Citations for list of cases.

[2] *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Peters 367, 410 (1842)).

[3] *Mumford* v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423, 436 (1867)).

[4] *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57, 66 (1873)).

[5] *Barney* v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324, 328 (1876)).

[6] *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391, 394 (1876)).

[7] *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 57 (1894)).

[8] *Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166, 174 (1912)).

[9] *Appleby* v. *New York* (271 U. S. 364, 381 (1926)).

[10] *Borax Consolidated* v. *Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10, 15 (1935)).

Shively v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 13 (1894)), opinion by Mr. Justice Gray:

"In England, from the time of Lord Hale, it has been treated as settled that the title in the soil of the sea, or of arms of the sea, below ordinary high-water mark, is in the King, except so far as an individual or a corporation has acquired rights in it by express grant, or by prescription or usage; (citing cases) and that this title, jus privatum, whether in the King or in a subject, is held subject to the public right, jus publicum, of navigation and fishing * * *.

"And upon the American Revolution, all the rights of the Crown and of parliament vested in the several States, subject to the rights surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution of the United States."

Narragansett Real Estate Co. v. *McKenzie* (82 Atl. 804, 810 (R. I. Sup. 1912)):

"It is well settled in England that the title in the bed of the ocean is in the sovereign, subject to the jus publicum—the right of navigation and fishery of which the public cannot be deprived. In this country, where the people are sovereign, the title to the bed of the ocean is in the state, which represents the sovereign power."

Corfield v. *Coryell* (6 Fed. Cas., 546, 551 (1823)):

"The grant to Congress to regulate commerce on the navigable waters belonging to the several States, renders those waters the public property of the United States, for all the purposes of navigation and commercial intercourse; subject only to congressional regulation. But this grant contains no cession, either express or implied, of territory, or of public or private property."

Pollard v. *Hagan* (3 How. (U. S.) 212, 230 (1844)):

"To give to the United States the right to transfer to a citizen the title to the shores and the soils under the navigable waters, would be placing in their hands a weapon which might be wielded greatly to the injury of State sovereignty, and deprive the States of the power to exercise a numerous and important class of police powers. But in the hands of the States this power can never be used so as to affect the exercise of any national right of eminent domain or jurisdiction with which the United States have been invested by the Constitution."

The distinction between proprietorship and governmental rights was recognized also by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion in the California case and by Justices Reed and Minton in the Texas case. Mr. Justice Frankfurter said:

"To speak of 'dominion' carries precisely those overtones in the law which relate to property and not to political authority. Dominion, from the Roman concept dominium, was concerned with property and ownership, as against imperium, which related to political sovereignty. One may choose to say, for example, that the United States has 'national dominion' over navigable streams. But the power to regulate commerce over these streams, and its continued exercise, do not change the imperium of the United States into dominium over the land below the waters. Of course the United States has 'paramount rights' in the sea belt of California—the rights that are implied by the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, the power of condemnation, the treaty-making power, the war power. We have not now before us the validity of the exercise of any of these paramount rights. Rights of ownership are here asserted—and rights of ownership are something else. Ownership implies acquisition in the various ways in which land is acquired—by conquest, by discovery and claim, by cession, by prescription, by purchase, by condemnation. When and how did the United States acquire this land?

"The fact that these oil deposits in the open sea may be vital to the national security, and important elements in the conduct of our foreign affairs, is no more relevant than is the existence of uranium deposits, wherever they may be, in determining questions of trespass to the land of which they form a part. This is not a situation where an exercise of national power is actively and presently interfered with." (322 U. S. at 43–44.)

In the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Reed, in which Mr. Justice Minton joined, in the Texas case, the following is said:

"The necessity for the United States to defend the land and to handle international affairs is not enough to transfer property rights. * * * The needs of defense and foreign affairs alone cannot transfer ownership of an ocean bed from a State to the Federal Government any more than they could transfer iron ore under uplands from State to Federal ownership. National responsibility is no greater in respect to the marginal sea than it is toward every other particle of American territory." (339 U. S. at 723.)

The States admit that the Federal Government has paramount powers over navigable waters to improve and keep them open for public use, and that the Government has the same paramount powers over these lands in national defense, commerce, and international affairs as it has over all private and public property in the Nation. They ask merely that governmental powers be maintained separate and distinct from proprietorship, and that no exercise of governmental powers be allowed to acquire without compensation resources that have heretofore been considered as part of and attached to ownership of the soil.

H. R. 4484 has been drawn to follow the established "real property concept" and the heretofore established separation of proprietorship from governmental powers, giving due respect to both, but making certain that the right to use, develop, and control natural resources of and beneath the submerged soils is vested in the respective States as recognized for more than 100 years prior to the "tidelands" decisions.

EVERY CITIZEN IS THREATENED

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the bill to which I have referred is not a private bill which can be called up on calendar day and shot through the Senate. It is one of the most important measures that will ever come before the Senate. It affects every citizen of the United States. The present attitude of the Supreme Court and the Federal officials in favor of Federal ownership casts a cloud on the property rights of every citizen of the United States. If the Federal Government, desiring the submerged lands which belong to the States, can seize them and appropriate them to its own use, without compensation, it may take similar action with regard to any commodity or resource which it may need or require.

Every resource is owned by someone. Some citizen's interests would be invaded, and some citizen's interests would be transgressed if the Federal Government, or any other government, could ruthlessly and without reason seize a citizen's property and appropriate it to its own use.

PRESIDENT SHOULD SIGN BILL

Mr. President, this is an important matter. It cannot be laughed off. It must be decided. I hope the President of the United States, when the Senate shall have passed the bill again, as it did on a previous occasion, and when the House of Representatives shall pass it again, as it did on one occasion, will not exercise the tremendous power of the veto, but will respect the will of the American people, as expressed through the House of Representatives and the Senate, will allow the bill to become the law of the land, will restore to the people of the United States what has been filched from them and rudely snatched from their possession and their ownership, and will ratify and confirm to the States the title to the soil beneath their submerged lands.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and the other Members of the Senate for listening to my remarks.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Nation today is experiencing another disastrous flood. Again we have seen the waters of the great Missouri and Mississippi Rivers sweep out of their banks, through cities ond over farm lands. Again we have seen families impoverished, homes and farm produce destroyed, businesses and industries ruined. Again we have witnessed disheartening scenes of suffering—and death.

Mr. President, I think that we Members of Congress should take very much to heart this picture of national suffering, and should ask ourselves whether we have been diligent or neglectful of our responsibilities in producing a national water policy.

For many years now we have been appropriating millions of dollars annually for flood-control work. We have built levees along the great rivers—built them higher and higher and higher. Then when the floods come, we pile sandbags on top of the levees, as we are now doing south of St. Louis.

I believe that it is time to ask ourselves just how wasteful it is to build these local, or levee, flood-control works without also controlling the water in the headstreams.

Fortunately, in the Tennessee Valley Authority, we have visible and concrete evidence of what proper flood-control methods at the source of the water can do in preventing disastrous floods.

The dams on the Tennessee River—and in particular, the Kentucky Dam—are so placed and so planned that the water in the river can be turned on or off as though it were controlled by a spigot.

If the crest of the river at Cairo, Ill., is such that the Mississippi River cannot safely take the full force of the Tennessee River, all the United States engineers have to do is advise TVA of that fact.

TVA then can and does close off the Tennessee River, releasing only so much water as the engineers advise can be safely released.

By this method it is possible to reduce the crest of a flood at Cairo by as much as 2 to 4 feet, according, of course, to how much water is in the Tennessee and its tributaries at that time. During the

past 14 years, the engineers have called on TVA to pull down the crest of a flood at Cairo seven times. Each time they have done so. I am advised that they have never had to reduce it by more than 1.9 feet, but they could have reduced it even more if necessary. All of us must remember that it is the last inch that breaks the levee—that opens up the gaps through which the swirling floodwaters sweep, inundating homes and farms and businesses.

With proper headwater control, then we need local flood-control works to assure complete protection; but without proper headwater control, it seems to me that the local works are rather useless.

It is a poor brand of economy when we refuse to make available the funds necessary for the construction of dams on our Nation's rivers and tributaries, without which such headwater control is impossible.

Between the year 1936, when the first dam upstream from Chattanooga was completed, and the year 1950, we have saved, according to the estimates of the Tennessee Valley Authority, approximately $45,000,000 in damages that otherwise could not have been averted in my home city of Chattanooga alone. During those 14 years the actual damage from floods in Chattanooga amounted to $600,000, and that included everything—flooded basements, incidental damages, and so on. If we had not had this upstream control, reliable and conservative estimates show that the damages would have been $45,566,000, rather than $600,000.

In 40 years the power consumers of TVA will pay for the part of its construction that is allocated to power. Power really is just an incidental by-product of the water control function of TVA, so we can see that the kind of economy we employed in the construction of TVA is the kind of economy that makes this Nation great.

The crest of the present flood has not yet reached Cairo. I do not know whether TVA will be called upon to lower its crest. If they are, they will be able to do so.

However, the important thing in the present flood is a consideration of what could have been accomplished if we had a Missouri Valley Authority, if we could have turned the Missouri River on and off like the water from a faucet, as we have been able to do in the Tennessee Valley.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I wish to commend the able Senator from Tennessee for bringing up this discussion at this particular time, when the eyes of the entire country and, indeed, of the entire world, are directed toward the devastation which has been wrought in the fertile valley of the Missouri River and in the cities and industrial areas and farm areas all along that river.

Naturally, I share with the Senator from Tennessee a feeling of justifiable pride in the work which has been done in the Tennessee Valley and the program which has been developed there, which have made it possible to do what the able Senator has suggested, namely, to control the water, almost as if by turning on or off a faucet.

Is it not true that the rainfall in the Tennessee Valley area is about as heavy as that which occurs in any other valley area of the United States? I do not have at hand the exact figures, but I dare say that there is not another river valley in the entire Nation which has a heavier rainfall than that which occurs in the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his observation. Of course, his work for the TVA has been most outstanding over the years.

The Senator is correct in saying that the rainfall in the Tennessee Valley is as heavy as that which occurs in any other basin. In the eastern section of Tennessee and the western section of North Carolina the rainfall is about the heaviest which occurs in any area of the entire Nation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I recall, the total rainfall in the entire Tennessee Valley area last year was approximately 64 inches, which is an unusually heavy rainfall for an area of that size, which covers sections of seven different States.

My point is that if the waters of that watershed—as tremendous as is the TVA watershed, and as heavy as is the rainfall there—can be controlled in that manner, is it not reasonable to assume that a program could be developed which could adequately control the waters of every area of the United States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly that is true, and that is what we should do. One of our greatest assets is the waters of our rivers, which can be used for the Nation's economy, and can be controlled in such a way as to prevent disastrous floods such as the ones we are now experiencing. As will be seen from this report, and as I shall point out later on, if a plan for the Missouri Valley, of a type similar to the Tennessee Valley development, had been put into effect, we would not have had the present disastrous flood, which has caused so much human misery and wasted so much material wealth.

Let us consider the development of plans for the Missouri River and where they now are.

The present stage of efforts toward comprehensive development of the Missouri Basin may be portrayed in large part by tracing the history of the Army Engineer-Bureau of Reclamation plan, commonly called the Pick-Sloan plan, together with attempts to create a Missouri Valley Authority.

According to the President's Water Resources Report, the history of the Missouri River development is that, pursuant to a 1943 resolution of the House Committee on Flood Control, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors reviewed certain 308 reports to determine if any modification should be made with respect to Missouri River main-stem flood control. The report of this review was submitted in 1944. After its preparation but prior to its submission, it was circulated for comment to the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget.

About the same time, the Bureau of Reclamation submitted its general plan for development of the Missouri River Basin, saying:

> This report deals with a plan for the conservation and control of the water resources of the entire Missouri River Basin, which includes the northern Great Plains, and the use of such resources in watershed development. Every water resource and all feasible beneficial uses of water, such as aids to navigation, flood control, the irrigation of land, the producing of power, the restoration of surface and ground-water levels, and of domestic and municipal water supplies, the abatement of stream pollution, silt control, fish and wildlife preservation, and recreation, were taken into account in an effort to formulate a basin-wide plan most likely to yield the greatest good to the greatest number of people. * * * Agriculture is and always will be the primary basis of the economy of the Missouri River Basin. * * * This fact has been recognized in designing a plan for water-resource development for the basin.
>
> The plan here tendered incorporates the Corps of Engineers' proposed plans for flood control and the aids to navigation in the river below Sioux City, with some modifications of Army plans for developments on the upper river * * *.
>
> A general statement with respect to the Missouri River Basin and its economic problems, and a comprehensive plan for developing and utilizing its water resources is contained in this report.

Because of differences between the two reports, a committee composed of two representatives each from the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation was appointed to review and reconcile the engineering differences of the two plans. It prepared a joint engineering report pointing out that by making appropriate modifications it was possible to eliminate the differences, and it enunciated the following basic principles:

> (a) The Corps of Engineers should have the responsibility for determining main stem reservoir capacities and capacities of tributary reservoirs for flood control and navigation.
>
> (b) The Bureau of Reclamation should have the responsibility for determining the reservoir capacities on the main stem and tributaries of the Missouri River for irrigation, the probable extent of future irrigation, and the amount of stream depletion due to irrigation development.
>
> (c) Both agencies recognize the importance of the fullest development of the potential hydroelectric power in the basin consistent with the other beneficial uses of water.

As thus modified, the plans of the two agencies were approved and the initial stages authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The approved plan became known as the Pick-Sloan plan. Additional stages of the Army plan were authorized in 1950.

In addition, the Department of Agriculture has recently prepared and submitted to Congress a long-range program for land rehabilitation and use in the Missouri Basin covering conservation and improvement measures on grassland and cropland, forests and forest ranges, stabilizing measures for small water

courses, irrigation, and drainage. This program the Department designed as "an integral part of the coordinated Missouri Basin development."

During congressional consideration of plans for the Missouri Basin proposals for a Missouri Valley Authority were also discussed. In transmitting the report of reconciliation to Congress the President said that the revised reports of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation should be authorized as a basic engineering plan to be developed and administered by a Missouri Valley Authority, such as I have already recommended in my message of September 21. The MVA proposals failed to receive committee approval, and an amendment from the floor to create an MVA was withdrawn after assurances were given that hearings would be held early in the next Congress.

Accordingly an MVA bill was reintroduced the following year, and since it embraced matters within the jurisdiction of several separate congressional committees, the Senate ordered its Committees on Irrigation and Reclamation, on Agriculture and Forestry, and on Commerce each to report on those features of the bill falling within its jurisdiction. The first two of these committees recommended against adoption of the proposal, contending that approval of the Pick-Sloan plan had made it unnecessary, and that existing agencies were doing a satisfactory job. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry merely recommended postponing further hearings indefinitely. Subsequent MVA proposals have been introduced, but no further action has been taken.

It would seem to me that it should be obvious that the time for interdepartmental arguments, that the time for debate is past, and that the time for action is here.

During the past few years I have been working off and on during the time that I could spare on a National Valley Development Act, looking toward the unified control and development of the water resources of this country.

I am now working on a final draft of this bill, and hope to have it ready for introduction within the next few weeks. I hope that we will give it the consideration it deserves in view of the obvious need for some over-all policy—a need for which nature is offering striking evidence today.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has made a comprehensive study of the so-called Pick-Sloan plan, and of the so-called, or suggested, Missouri Valley Authority. I, myself, for the past 4 or 5 months, have been undertaking the same sort of study. I find in my own section of the country that there is considerable division of respectable opinion regarding the two plans, as to whether the one or the other should be adopted, or as to whether a combination of both would best serve to protect the great Missouri Valley and the great Mississippi Valley, comprising about 25 percent of the territory of the United States. That, of course, would include the Kansas River, or the Kaw River, in Kansas, and the Arkansas River, in the State of Kansas.

I should like very much if the Senator from Tennessee would elaborate today, if he can, somewhat upon the differences, as he has arrived at conclusions regarding them, between the construction under the terms of the Pick-Sloan plan, the building of the reservoirs and other necessary corollary functions, and the plan of construction—not of management—under the so-called MVA plan; the differences between the work to be done by the Army engineers, if the Senator's endorsement of the MVA contemplates work by the Army engineers, and what the Senator's views are as to the construction of holding basins in the upper reaches of the Missouri and Kansas Rivers and their tributaries.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I am not today in a position to discuss the details of the structural differences or of the engineering differences between the Pick-Sloan plan and the Missouri Valley Authority plan. I do not think the differences go so much to the matter of how or where the dams are to be constructed, as they do to the method by which the valley would be controlled. As one of the Missouri Valley planners over a period of years, and also, as coming from and having had some experience with the Tennessee Valley Authority, where, under the general directions of the TVA all of the agencies seem to be able to operate in harmony, and where the activities can be localized and operated from the valley, I have always been a great adherent and a strong proponent of the valley plan, because it seems to me that the project succeeds a great deal better if decisions can be made in the valley itself, rather than having to refer questions to the various departments, numbering perhaps 25 or 26, which may have an interest in the subject in Washington.

Of course, I know the Missouri Valley has problems more numerous and more perplexing in character than the problems arising in the Tennessee Valley, because in the Missouri Valley there is a larger area, there are many more people, and there are irrigation and reclamation problems which we do not have in Tennessee. The Missouri Valley embraces a great deal more territory than the Tennessee Valley, but the differences in the proposals are set forth rather fully, as the Senator from Missouri will have found, in the President's water resources report, which I know he has studied, and a copy of which I have before me. But, in any event, at the same time, as has been suggested by the Senator from Missouri, the time for interdepartmental argument is over, the time for debate has passed, and the time for action is here. The Congress should act now, in view of the situation which has developed, and in view of the fact that a great many of the disastrous results could have been avoided. Had a dam been built on the Kaw River, as has been suggested over a period of years, a number of miles above Kansas City, of which the estimated cost was, I think, $64,000,000 or $66,000,000, a large part of the present damage could have been avoided.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. It is true, however, is it not, that the dam could be built under the present authorization?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; there is no question about that.

Mr. WHERRY. It is merely a question of appropriations, is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is a matter of appropriation, but I think the division or difference among the various departments, as shown by their reports, as to what plan ought to be developed, with the attendant indecision as to which method to follow in the development of the valley, has been partially the cause of some of the delay which has been occasioned.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no doubt about the recommendations of the Army engineers, the appropriations which have been asked for, and the authorizations which have already been made. There is a dispute as between the amount asked for by the Army engineers and the amount which has been appropriated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that is correct. I believe that as to the particular dam which would have done the most good, while it had been suggested and recommended by the Corps of Engineers, actually there never has been an estimate by the Bureau of the Budget for its construction.

Mr. WHERRY. It would not make much difference whether it were built by the MVA or by the Army engineers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. There is a similar question as to two dams in the Cumberland Valley which have been recommended by the Corps of Engineers. The House did not include the funds. It is not important as to who builds the dams. The important thing is to have the work done. The question of who would operate them, who would have charge of their operation, whether the Corps of Engineers, the Missouri Valley Authority, or, in the case of the Cumberland Dam, the Corps of Engineers or the TVA, can be settled in years to come.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I wanted to make was that, so far as I know, the recommendations which have come from the Army engineers have exceeded the authorizations made by the Congress and have been away beyond the amount allocated by the Bureau of the Budget. There are involved the difficulty in getting a proper recommendation from the Bureau of the Budget and the question of whether the appropriation should be made by the Congress.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, if he will permit me, that I, too, am agreeable to the building of the dams. I think my record will so show. Whether the money has been held up either through being impounded or not being appropriated,

we ought to accomplish the objective for which the distinguished Senator is now arguing. I am in accord with him.

With reference to Gavins Point in Nebraska, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended it but the House has failed to act favorably upon the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. Although the testimony shows that in order to get firm power the project must be constructed. Forty percent of the power will be lost unless it is firmed up. The fact that the dam is not being built is certainly not because of the recommendations made by the Army engineers. I think it is because of a policy promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget of no new starts being undertaken. There are differences of opinion as to what is a new start. I think we are penny-wise and pound-foolish with reference to appropriations which have been made for projects which would be of great benefit to the national defense effort.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, it is too bad that all the Members of the United States Senate could not have made the trip which 11 of us from the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Appropriations Committee have just completed. We left here Saturday noon and returned at 6 o'clock this morning. We saw devastation for many miles. We saw the wreckage, waste, and destruction of homes and businesses which will never be replaced. They are irreplaceable largely because the owners could not obtain flood insurance. We saw stark tragedy. We were taken by bus over the devastated area. The sights were sickening and heart rending. The people up and down the Missouri valley, as well as on the lower Mississippi, did not seem to be so much concerned at this time as to whether we have an MVA or continue the Pick-Sloan plan, so-called, although, of course, we must come to some decision as between those alternatives and perhaps others in the near future. The people who have felt the impact of the waters and the destruction of their accumulation of a lifetime want the work done and done promptly.

As Senators know, General Pick testified last week that $300,000,000 expended upon the necessary holding basin and reservoirs on the Kansas and Missouri Rivers and their tributaries would have saved in excess of $1,000,000,000, which would be only a part of the money cost of the flood, to say nothing of the impairment and the desolation of the human spirit which have resulted, together with the loss of life, on which, of course, no value can be placed.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding. I should like to emphasize, without trespassing too long upon his time, that the main consideration is to begin the work, to proceed with it promptly, so that a similar disaster can never again occur. Such disasters waste natural resources and the wealth of the Nation, when we need all we can get or save in order to resume our proper place of leadership in the world. We cannot do it if we are going to permit the wealth of the Nation to be washed down the streams, never to be recovered.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has made a very forceful argument for what we all feel is the necessity of terminating the debate about how the improvements shall be made and proceeding at once with the work so that people in other sections will not be visited with this kind of destruction.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree completely with the statements made by my distinguished colleague from Missouri, but there are one or two comments which I should like to make, if the Senator from Tennessee will permit.

It seems to me that, of course, the necessary work of conservation of our natural resources and of security of life and property will have to go forward with increased speed. In the very nature of things, this will take time. The work will be done in various places, some at the headwaters, some at the places which are sustaining and which have sustained such terrible damage, some at intermediate points.

We had the opportunity to see visual demonstrations of the fact that tremendous good can be done by flood-control dams or catch-basins in the upper waters. We also had an opportunity to see that appropriately safe, sound, and secure levee systems can be built in many places and are of tremendous value.

Those things are known, and I think Congress will certainly accentuate the long-range program and hasten the work because of the devastating experience which has been visited upon such a large section of productive midwestern America.

But, Mr. President, while we are continuing and hastening those matters of tremendous but long-range importance, it seems to me, looking at the tragic scenes which we visited in the past 3 days, that the problem of what to do in the appropriate spheres in which our Federal Government can assert itself, and what to do in the effort to bring human relief, rehabilitation, and reestablishment, is going to be the most immediate problem which the Congress must immediately take up.

Mr. President, when one goes into an area of a city where thousands of homes have been either destroyed entirely, as in the case of many, or so thoroughly despoiled that it is a question as to whether there is enough value left to undertake rehabilitation, and when all the contents of those homes have been swept away, and when even the top soil upon which the grass and the herbs were planted, along with everything that tended to make them homes is gone, and when instead there is a deposit of debris and of from 2 feet to 8 or 10 feet of river mud or silt, making the task of hopeless one as those people trek back to the places where their former homes stood, and when one sees similar situations in the vast areas of countryside that are affected, it seems to me that what the Congress is going to have to do at once is to enlarge and perhaps adjust some of its existing programs to give immediate relief and succor.

We have, under the Farmers Home Administration, a program which has been exceedingly useful to my own State in many cases of individual suffering in the last two great floods we have had, in that individual farmers whose credit was already stretched beyond the breaking point have been allowed, through Government loans obtained through the Farmers Home Administration, to reestablish themselves. That our people do not treat that kind of loans as grants or doles is amply shown by the experience there, where already a great majority of the funds so loaned have been repaid.

I am satisfied that we are going to find that we will not only have to enlarge the sums of money to be made available to that particular agency, but we will have to amend and make more flexible laws, because the various kinds of cases which will call for help in the flooded areas will be greater in number and more varied in character than anything we have seen before, at least which has been observed by the Senator from Florida.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the case of Florida was able to and did render material assistance, particularly to home owners whose homes, for instance, were swept off their foundations, and were damaged badly, requiring much emergency expenditure of funds where those people already had FHA mortgages on them, or other mortgages, so that there was no additional commercial borrowing capacity. In our State the RFC, under its disaster loan program, did an immeasurable amount of good in cases such as that, and also in the cases of helping small-business men who were wiped out as to their entire stocks of goods, or maybe as to their places of business, to help them get started again.

I am satisfied that additional funds and perhaps greater flexibility must be provided under the RFC program.

The only thing I should like to say at this time, because our distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], undoubtedly will make a comprehensive report upon this whole subject when he returns, is this, that it seems to me that the human problems are going to have to be placed first, and that we must move very speedily, because the misery and the completely appalling sense of having lost everything, except life itself, was so manifest in the faces and demeanor of literally thousands of people whom we saw in the flooded area.

I do not mean they are quitters. I do not mean they are crying. I do not mean they are beggars. That does not happen in any American community. But I mean they have just got to have help, and I do not know any other place where they can get help except from the United States and through action by the Congress.

I come back from that experience to report just briefly at this time that I think our very first effort must be made in this field of the alleviation of human suffering and the rebuilding of human morale, and the giving of an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves to these people who by the thousands have literally been wiped out as to everything material which they possessed.

I wish to say to my distinguished friend from Missouri and the other Senators from the areas which were affected, that coming from a part of the Nation that does not happen to have been affected at this time, as before, on occasions I am prepared to make that a first order of business. I hope the Senate will do just that. I am sure that those who visited the flooded areas, regardless of what portion of the country they may have come from, regardless of which side of the aisle they may sit, will feel that this human problem is the one which requires immediate, definite, and helpful action on the part of the Congress of the United States. I feel sure, that we are ready to take that kind of action, and that we want to uphold the hands of the direct representatives, of the Senators and Representatives from the stricken areas, and to work with them, and for the Nation, in doing those things that can properly be done, and which are of immeasurable importance in the rebuilding of some measure of morale and stability and security out there to those many people who literally lost their very all insofar as material property is concerned.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, of course, in pointing out that certain flood control work and dams for reservoirs should have been built years ago in the Missouri Valley, and also that we need a long-range program for the development and the control of the rivers of the Nation, I do not mean to minimize the necessity, so well stated by the distinguished Senator from Florida, of doing everything possible within our power to take care of the human element at this time. I am sure all of us agree that those things must be done. I believe the recommendations represent a starting point, and I am sure they will be of value to us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his comment. I should like the RECORD to show that by no means was the Senator from Florida reflecting upon the careful study of this situation which the Senator from Tennessee is so ably making. But coming back from the visit to the scene of the disaster it seemed to the Senator from Florida that it was his duty to bring out this thing which to him has seemed so appalling as he has gone out there and seen the untold devastation which has been accomplished. Everyone who knows the distinguished Senator from Tennessee knows perfectly well that sympathy possesses his whole heart when fellow humans suffer.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply wanted to associate myself with what the Senator from Florida has said. I have not been out to the scene of the disaster, as some of the Members of the Senate have been. I know, without going there, what it looks like, because we went through such a thing ourselves in New England not many years ago.

I would particularly endorse what the Senator from Florida said as to the immediate need to take care of those people who are washed out of their homes, and who need help either to relocate or to get on their feet again. That is an immediate need.

I also want to endorse what the Senator said about the Farmers Home Administration being able to do a great deal of this work if the law is modernized, brought up to date. Our law is antiquated so far as the Farmers Home Administration is concerned. Not so many months ago we had a hurricane in western Vermont. It is unusual for us, but we had one. Hundreds of farm homes were damaged and barns blown down. Thirteen or fourteen hundred cattle were killed. The Farmers Home Administration has been in there, and with its limited means has done remarkably good work. However, as to the long-range program, it appears to me that that necessitates careful planning. There is hardly an area of the United States but that has suffered disaster in one form or another at some time or other. There is hardly an area of the Nation but what needs programing to either protect its resources or develop them.

There is a strong tendency to concentrate our good deeds in the area which has suffered the latest disaster. I hope that we shall not plunge into a long-range program with such haste that we may start it wrong, or perhaps enter into this particular long-range program to the disadvantage of other parts of the country.

I listened attentively to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] telling how badly a dam was needed in Nebraska to firm up power so that Nebraska could get more power at reasonable rates. If Members of the Senate only knew how desperate the northeastern part of the United States is for power, and at what cost we are getting it today, I am sure that they would be more sympathetic toward some of the proposals which some of us have made to correct the critical situation in which we find ourselves.

I intend to cooperate fully in immediately alleviating the distress of the people afflicted by the Kansas-Missouri floods, and I also intend to cooperate in any long-range program; but I think we should be cautious and not let our sympathies carry us away.

I do not know whether this was what the geologists call a 100-year flood, a 500-year flood, or a 1,000-year flood. They may have another such flood next year, or they may not have another in a thousand years. No one knows.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I think I can enlighten the Senator from Vermont on that point.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as the long-range program is concerned, it might be better to take a few months more and plan the work right and coordinate with the needs of other areas than to be carried away by our emotions at this time.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield. I should like to yield the floor, as soon as I can.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Vermont that since 1944 there have been at least four particularly devastating floods. The flood of 1844 is considered to be the greatest previous flood in history, so far as we know, in magnitude approaching the present flood. In 1947, 1943, and upon two occasions in the thirties, as well as in the year 1903, there were floods not equaling, but approaching, in some sections, the substantial destruction and distress occasioned by the recent flood in the Missouri Valley, which is now going down the Mississippi, the crest of which has not yet even reached the Arkansas line.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in response to the observations of the Senator from Vermont, I feel that there are certain well-proved projects which have great value, both from the standpoint of flood control and from the standpoint of power production, and which may be built by some authority, by the Corps of Engineers, or by the Bureau of Reclamation. As to those projects, of course it requires a long time to build a dam. We ought to try to go ahead with the programs as fast as possible and, after giving the matter full thought, try to arrive as quickly as we logically can at a national program for the development of our water resources. Certainly no one wishes to go into something hastily if it is not going to be in the public interest. However, there are many projects with which we could proceed now. Later we can determine whether they are to be operated or controlled by an authority, by the Corps of Engineers, by the Bureau of Reclamation, or by some other agency. As to such projects, the time to terminate debate has arrived. Debate should be terminated. The time for action to prevent another catastrophe such as we are now witnessing is at hand.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

HOUSING CONDITIONS AT AND NEAR MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, last week the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee issued a revealing document based on their investigations at several Army camps. The miserable housing and rent-gouging tactics by which servicemen and their families are victimized and exploited are set forth in graphic and unvarnished terms.

While the report deals primarily with investigations conducted at only three Army camps, including Fort Leonard Wood in my own State of Missouri, it is perfectly apparent that the shocking situations described in the report are not confined to these three installations.

I have read every word of the report, and I read it with growing bitterness and indignation. The facts presented

paint a sordid picture of brazen, irresponsible greed and exploitation and profiteering at the expense of the men serving in the Armed Forces of our nation—the men who are defending with their service and with their lives the freedom of these very same profiteers.

In the case of Fort Leonard Wood, the facts were not new to me. Earlier this year when I appealed, through the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee for continuation of rent controls in the extension of the Defense Production Act, I cited briefly the conditions prevailing there. Even though rent control is in effect in the Fort Leonard Wood area, I pointed out, full protection is not available to servicemen and their families, due to the fact that the present law completely exempts from control certain types of accommodations, including motor courts, trailer courts, hotels, and particularly new construction and conversion completed since February 1, 1947. I referred to a recent survey of rents paid by military personnel at Fort Leonard Wood which showed that 130 servicemen were paying an excess of $28,000 a year more in rent than they would have had to pay if the law provided the authority to give them protection against exorbitant rents.

Not only are the rents outrageous but the converted shacks and boxes which go under the name of housing accommodations are simply unfit for houman occupancy. I am appalled and ashamed that the citizens in my own State of Missouri could display such casual indifference and permit such humiliating conditions to exist in their own front yard. I am confident that the number of unscrupulous landlords who are responsible for such conditions is small, and it is gratifying to know that there are in the area many more families who are earnestly trying to provide decent living quarters for soldiers and their dependents, even where it means personal inconvenience or sacrifice for themselves.

Mr. President, this report should be required reading for every Member of the Congress. Sometimes required reading is bitter to take—and this is—but it is the sort of thing which we as Americans and we in the Congress particularly have to face up to realistically. It is not sufficient to decry conditions and unleash some impassioned oratory and point the finger and declare with patriotic fervor that we must "do something for our men in uniform."

The plain fact of the matter is that where these shocking housing conditions and rent gouging exists, the unscrupulous landlords who are extorting outrageous rents for dilapidated, filthy hovels are doing so, in most cases strictly within the limits of the law. I strongly doubt that the American people will permit the Congress to disclaim responsibility for these conditions and unless we act and act promptly and soundly to provide effective and enforceable legislation, we shall have failed not only the servicemen, but the whole Democratic ideal which is, in fact, the only reason for their being in uniform and subjected to these unwholesome and inexcusable indignities.

I am very happy that Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., is taking immediate steps to attack this whole problem.

I have prepared two bills which I believe meet the problem in a positive way. The first of these is an amendment and extension to the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 recontrolling all types of housing accommodations in critical defense housing areas, including motor courts, trailer courts, hotels, and new construction and conversions, setting up certain standards against gouging and profiteering and unfair eviction, and providing penalties for circumvention and evasion. The second measure would provide a means of expediting the construction of military or civilian housing projects vital to the national defense where private enterprise is unwilling or unable to undertake or finance such projects from an investment standpoint.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the two bills, and to have printed in the RECORD a brief explanation of each of the two measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred, and the explanations will be printed in the RECORD.

The first bill (S. 1893) to amend and extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanation of the first bill presented by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

EXPLANATION BY SENATOR HENNINGS ON THE BILL TO AMEND THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

The purpose of this bill is to recontrol all housing accommodations without exception in critical defense-housing areas, to set maximum rents for such accommodations, to provide minimum standards for decent living accommodations, to provide authority against circumvention and evasion, and to provide for enforcement through adequate criminal and civil sanctions.

Section 1 abolishes the office of the Housing Expediter and transfers the functions of that office to the President.

Section 2 provides for the establishment of maximum rents for all housing accommodations in critical defense-housing areas (which are defined in this bill in the same way they are defined in the Defense Production Act of 1950) at the highest rent charged during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950.

It also sets standards for individual or general rent adjustments on the basis of (1) increase or decrease in cost of operation; (2) comparability either above or below rents generally prevailing in the area during the period from May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950; (3) adequacy of housing accommodations for normal decent family life; (4) overcrowding of housing accommodations. This section also provides maximum rents for all accommodations rented for the first time subsequent to this base period including, but not limited to, conversions and new construction. Under this section the landlord must petition for the establishment of a maximum rent. In order to afford adequate opportunity for consideration of such petition and consideration of all the standards enumerated above, a temporary maximum rent may be established for such housing accommodations for a period not to exceed 90 days.

Local advisory boards in critical defense-housing areas are authorized to make recommendations to the President concerning improvement of housing conditions and alleviation of hardship resulting from housing shortage for military personnel and their dependents. Maximum rents in these areas shall not be subject to termination by local advisory boards or by State or local action.

Section 3 authorizes regulations, orders and requirements which the President may deem necessary to prevent circumvention and evasion, including such practices as requiring tenants to buy, lease, or rent services, equipment, furnishings, effects, facilities, or similar devices.

Section 4 sets liability for unlawful overcharge which is demanded, accepted, or retained at $50 or three times the amount of the overcharge, whichever is greater plus attorney's fees and costs. It also sets the liability for unlawful eviction at (1) 1 month's rent or $50, whichever is greater, or (2) not more than three times the monthly rent or $150 whichever is greater.

Section 5 provides for adequate criminal and civil sanctions including up to $5,000 fine and 1 year imprisonment for willful and flagrant violation of this act.

The second bill (S. 1894) to assist the national defense by authorizing the provision of housing at reactivated military installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanation of the second bill by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

EXPLANATION BY SENATOR HENNINGS ON THE BILL TO ASSIST THE NATIONAL DEFENSE BY AUTHORIZING THE PROVISION OF HOUSING AT REACTIVATED MILITARY INSTALLATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The purpose of this bill is to provide a means of expediting the construction of military or civilian housing projects vital to the national defense where private enterprise is hesitant or unwilling to undertake or finance such projects from an investment standpoint. The projects would be financed under insurance by the Federal Housing Administration pursuant to the Military Housing Act insofar as practicable.

The bill authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, directly and through the facilities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to organize building companies to construct, manage and liquidate such projects. The bill is modelled upon S. 4145 of the last Congress, which passed the Senate by unanimous vote on September 15, 1950. The only substantial modification is the increase in the limitation of total expenditures from $130,000,000 to $200,000,000.

The program provided by the bill is patterned after the program of Defense Homes Corporation in World War II. DHC was organized and operated first as a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and thereafter transferred to the Public Housing Administration. The Corporation constructed necessary defense housing projects at a cost of approximately $100,000,000, operated the projects on a businesslike basis, and when the emergency ended disposed of the projects without loss to the Government.

A section-by-section analysis of the bill follows:

Section 1 authorizes RFC, upon request by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, to purchase stock in building companies to be formed to develop rental housing projects, in aggregate amount not exceeding $50,000,000.

Section 2 directs RFC to transfer such stock to Administrator, against cancellation of equivalent obligations by Treasury.

Section 3 provides that officers and employees of building companies be employees of HHFA and serve without additional compensation.

Section 4 directs the Administrator to cause building companies to procure and develop housing necessary for national defense, including prefabricated or other portable or mobile housing; provides power of condemnation to Administrator for such purpose; authorizes Administrator to utilize facilities of RFC to assist building program.

Under the bill, the Administrator may form one company to construct some or all of the projects, or may form separate companies for separate projects. The formation of separate companies would be required where the financing is insured by FHA, and has certain advantages in any event, particularly with respect to facilitating disposition of the Government's equity.

Section 5 authorizes RFC to make loans to the building companies to finance construction of their projects in aggregate amounts not exceeding $150,000,000, with the proviso that to the greatest extent practicable, such loans must be insured by FHA.

Section 6 directs the Administrator to liquidate the projects, and the RFC to liquidate its loans, as expeditiously as may be practicable.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 3, line 16, after the word "trends", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 10, after "(7 U. S. C. 951–957)", to strike out "$2,850,000" and insert "$2,848,304."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Administrator," on page 4, line 23, after the word "Center", to strike out "$560,000" and insert "$541,440", and on page 5, line 24, after the word "greater", to insert "except for the alteration of one building at Greenfield, Mass., at a cost not to exceed $7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research on agricultural problems of Alaska," on page 6, line 16, after "Alaska", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$261,550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Experiment Stations," on page 7, line 23, after the word "Alaska", to strike out "$37,500" and insert "$52,500", and on page 8, line 2, after "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$12,416,208" and insert "$12,431,208."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 8, line 14, after "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$390,000" and insert "$367,090."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 9, line 22, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "$3,200,700" and insert "$3,320,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 9, after the word "products", to strike out "$7,750,000" and insert "$7,731,022."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 3, after the word "virus", to strike out "$49,300" and insert "$47,906."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Dairy Industry," on page 11, line 20, after the word "butter", to strike out "$1,450,000" and insert "$1,491,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry", on page 12, line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$7,200,000" and insert "$7,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Delaware withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to withhold consideration of the next amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The only reason I rose was that I understood the item relating to the appropriation on page 12, line 22, was to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment will go over.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask that the item go over, because I understand the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] desires to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on line 6, page 12, has been agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on page 12, lines 22, 23, and 24, is to go over.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will go over.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings incident to the call of the roll be suspended, and that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment on page 12, in line 22, was passed over; was it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 3, after "(20 U. S. C. 191–194)", to strike out "$148,600" and insert "$136,920."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and expenses," on page 14, line 15, after the word "application", to strike out "$3,525,000" and insert "$3,797,725."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 16, after the numerals "1948", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$4,716,062."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Control of Forest Pests," on page 18, line 8, after "594–1—594–5)", to strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$3,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 22, line 5, after the word "forests", to strike out "$27,122,025" and insert "$27,522,025."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I cannot object to the amendment, but I should like to address an inquiry to the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to this item. Is this the item with reference to the Forest Service's management of timber sales?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood that this is the item on page 22, line 5, relating to the general administration of the national forests.

Mr. CORDON. That is the item which includes the moneys for the handling of sales of forest timber, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The fact that the request made to the committee was for about $1,500,000 more than the amount allowed by the House, and the fact that the Senate committee allowed only an increase of $400,000, raises a question as to the adequacy of the amount proposed to be appropriated to handle the making of sales and the processing of sales of national forest timber in the several States. The figures, which were given to the committee, as I recall them, indicated that the cost of the making of sales of forest timber and of processing the sales after they were made was, on the average, about 25 percent of the receipts. Frankly, that seems to me to be a rather high percentage, and to indicate that a saving percentagewise could and should be made by the Forest Service in this item. It would seem that the cost is somewhat exorbitant on the basis of 25 percent of the receipts from such sales.

I have made some inquiry into the matter, and in the revested railroad lands in Oregon, the highest percentage cost of making and processing sales is 9 percent of receipts. The State of Oregon, which has a very considerable forested area, puts a ceiling of 10 percent on the making and processing of sales. A private industry in the pine region has found that the cost of both the making and the processing of sales never runs

less than 4 percent, and never more than 10 percent. So if we may assume that the percentage of cost to income can be reduced somewhat, it may well be that with the $400,000 extra which the Committee on Appropriations has recommended there can be quite a considerable increase in the volume of sales and processing over that estimated by the Forest Service.

I assume that if the requests for purchases, and the necessities for processing, because of increased operations, keep on increasing, and assuming the $400,000 can be retained in conference, the Forest Service might reasonably ask for a supplemental budget item, sometime within the fiscal year, if it finds that the necessities go beyond what this amount could reach. I would ask the Senator for his thoughts about that matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon is not only greatly interested in the work of the Forest Service, but he is a member of the subcommittee which handles this item, and in the past has been a member on the part of the Senate of the conference committee meeting with the House conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill. So, he is thoroughly familiar with the difficulties which we have encountered in attempting to obtain an increase in this item.

I completely agree with his statement that 25 percent is entirely too great an amount of overhead to be involved in these sales. I do not believe the present timber sales program contemplates anything like 25 percent, but there was some figure indicating that the Forest Service expected to increase their income by about four times the amount of this appropriation, or something approximating that amount; so it is perhaps not unfair to say that 25 percent of the increase was contemplated, as compared with the return to be expected. If, of course, the demand for timber for defense needs increases, and if the Forest Service could make a case that they could increase materially the revenue to the Federal Treasury from the sale of timber of the national forests by a reasonable amount of overhead, I should think they would be justified in requesting an additional appropriation. Even though I am opposed in principle to the incurring of deficiencies, where the Congress has denied appropriations, I make this statement because this item relates to obtaining revenue for the Federal Treasury, rather than to a completely out-of-pocket expense.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Georgia also agrees does he not, that there is the aspect of abnormal need of forest products, which may increase because of the emergency, and particularly in connection with the defense housing program, which is now getting under way?

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about timber being in short supply, and apparently the demand is increasing faster than the need can be supplied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 22, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 4, after the word "economics", to strike out "$5,220,500" and insert "$5,108,603."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

USE OF CLERK HIRE ALLOTMENTS FOR PAYMENT OF TELEGRAPH CHARGES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this is a bill to make funds which are allotted to Senators for clerical hire available for use in the payment of toll charges on telegrams. The bill is short, and I shall read it:

Be it enacted, etc., That any funds which are allotted to a Senator from sums appropriated for payment of the compensation of administrative and clerical assistants shall be available for payment of charges on official Government business paid and collect telegrams in excess of the number prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate pursuant to the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U. S. C. 46e).

Mr. President, I may say that it always seems strange to me that the amount of money allotted to a Senator is earmarked so that, although he may not use all that is appropriated for his clerical hire, he cannot apply it to the payment of charges for telegrams. For example, the Senator from North Dakota, in 1 year, did not use between $9,000 and $10,000 allotted to him, and this year he has not used in the neighborhood of $5,000 or $6,000, yet I used up my telegram allowance quite early, and am now more than $200 overdrawn for telegrams which are all connected with official business, telegrams mostly in response to messages from citizens of the State of North Dakota who wanted to have prompt replies.

I might add that I have taken this question up with the Committee on Rules and Administration at different times, and the committee has held that it does not have the power to order a transfer of any money from the amount appropriated for clerical hire to the telegram fund. The committee suggested that I introduce this bill. I may say that I took it up with the leaders on both sides of the aisle.

The bill (S. 1895) to make funds allotted to Senators for clerk hire available for use for payment of toll charges on telegrams, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

NORTH DAKOTA WHEAT YIELD GREATEST IN STATE HISTORY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am happy to report that the crops in North Dakota at the present time look very, very good, and, barring any damage by the elements or ravaging insects, we expect to have bumper crops.

The July 19 issue of the Leader, published at Bismarck, N. Dak., under the headline "North Dakota Wheat Yield May Be Greatest in State History," states:

> The biggest wheat crop in North Dakota's history will be harvested this year, the United States Department of Agriculture forecast last week. The Department's July 1 estimate put the prospective State wheat crop at 165,540,000 bushels. * * * If the crop comes through as abundantly as indicated by July 1 conditions, North Dakota will return to the No. 1 position among wheat-producing States.

When the President spoke to the Nation on December 16, 1951, relative to the international situation, he also stated that one of the two National Guard units to be ordered immediately into active duty was the Forty-seventh Division, comprised of men and boys from the Middlewestern States of North Dakota and Minnesota.

I should like, in this connection, to take this method of advising the military authorities of our Armed Forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard—of the immediate need for implementation of a harvest furlough program of at least a 30-day period in order that these men in the various services, who come from farms where the family cannot now obtain sufficient or competent help to run the power farm machinery, can return to their family farms to assist with the harvesting of the crops. I have here a number of letters which are typical of the many that I have received from desperate mothers and fathers who have written me concerning their need for the help of their sons during the harvest period, which is so eminent.

I should like particularly to call attention to two letters I have received—one from Mr. Russell D. Chase, State's Attorney of Stutsman County, Jamestown, N. Dak., and the other from Mrs. W. A. Lilyquist, of Lisbon, N. Dak., concerning this existing emergency.

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

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

OFFICE OF STATE'S ATTORNEY
OF STUTSMAN COUNTY,
Jamestown, N. Dak., July 13, 1951.

Re Stutsman County, N. Dak., farm help situation.
Re Temporary furloughs, local military personnel.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: It appears that the crop in this area is rapidly maturing and that our farmers will be in the midst of harvest somewhere around the 25th of July and that the harvest will probably continue until past the middle of September. We have a fine crop in this area with exception of a few isolated spots but the crop is not going to do our people or the country much good unless it can be harvested and saved.

There is no question about it but that there is a dire need for emergency harvest help in this area to operate threshing machines, combines, and to take care of the crop generally; our farmers are continually calling upon us to assist them in getting their

sons temporarily out of the military service so that they can come home during the harvest season and help to save the bumper crop which we have here. Many of these older farmers are not at all familiar with or qualified to handle the power machinery with which our harvesting has been done the last few years due to a general labor shortage.

Would there be some way that you could use your good offices in arranging for a temporary furlough of a month to 6 weeks for Stutsman County farm boys who are in the military service and in training still in the United States. Our information is that there are at least 300 boys who are competent power farm machine operators who should be home for this harvest season and we cannot see how the country would be in any way jeopardized if these boys could be temporarily furloughed for a month to 6 weeks starting as of the 1st of August.

Yours very truly,

RUSSELL D. CHASE.

LISBON, N. DAK.,
July 19, 1951.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The farmers in this area would appreciate it very much if you could make the Defense Department understand how urgent it is to grant 30-day furloughs to farm boys who have had to go into service through the draft and the National Guard, so that they might be at home to help with the harvesting of our bumper crop. Anything less than 30 days is not long enough to help with harvest for there is always the weather element to consider too, as you well know.

It is impossible to get farm labor in this community. A large group of farm boys left with the National Guard. Our high school boys who were always available in other years are working at full-time summer jobs which leaves the poor farmer alone with 400 to 500 acres of excellent crop to handle without any help. Most of them are overworked and tired out already. Their boys in service who understand the operation of the machinery and farm work are greatly needed to get this crop harvested. Sending in inexperienced labor is a hindrance and very costly in repairs to machinery which was proven a few years ago.

I have been the American Red Cross home service chairman for this county for 9 years. I have had more requests this month for help to get servicemen home than ever before. It is hard to make the parents understand that the American Red Cross does not have the authority to get the boys home, that it is entirely up to the War Department. Would it be possible for the Defense Department to make some kind of arrangement for farm furloughs? Food is a vital commodity for the war effort and the growing season very short.

The situation here is really critical. Harvest will be on in 10 days and our farmers are worried as to how they can handle it without the help of their boys.

Thank you for any assistance you can give in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. W. A. LILYQUIST.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to read a letter dated July 20, 1951, which I received from T. W. Lynch, service officer, Veterans Service Office, LaMoure, N. Dak. It reads as follows:

VETERANS SERVICE OFFICE,
LAMOURE COUNTY,
LaMoure, N. Dak., July 20, 1951.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have had numerous individual inquiries concerning the possibility of receiving help from military personnel to harvest this year's crop. I believe that there exists a real need and hope that there is something that can be done by your office to fulfill this need.

It appears that the over-all picture of employment needs shows that workers are available. However, most of the men on these employment lists are not capable of handling the power machinery used by farmers. A type of worker who is not dependable on these machines is worse than no help at all and naturally many times as expensive.

It would be a shame to see this crop hurt even to a small extent by failure of competent labor which is now in Army camps.

Very truly yours,

T. W. LYNCH.

Although I have already brought Mrs. Lilyquist's letter to the attention of the Secretary of Defense, I cannot emphasize too strongly this threat to the Nation's welfare, which can become a reality if immediate steps are not taken to get our farm boys home from military service for a temporary period to reap the abundant harvest which we are so fortunate to have, and which will so vitally affect every civilian family and our Armed Forces in the months to come. I hope that the military authorities will take immediate action in recognition of this emergency, before it is too late.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

THE TIDELANDS OIL CONTROVERSY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I listened very carefully to the speech delivered earlier today by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in connection with the tidelands oil question. I desire to make it very clear, in spite of the fact that numerous Senators rose and stated that they agreed with the distinguished Senator from Texas, that the senior Senator from North Dakota is unalterably opposed to the proposal with reference to tidelands oil advocated by the Senator from Texas.

In my opinion, one of the outstanding characteristics of President Truman was his absolute fearlessness prior to the last election in dealing with the tidelands oil question. If ever a man demonstrated that he could not be frightened, bullied, or influenced by others, no matter how powerful they might be, in a Democratic national convention or in any other convention, Harry Truman demonstrated it when he vetoed the tidelands oil bill.

I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from Texas had to say, because, knowing him as I do and conscious of his ability and his eloquence, I believe he would not, under any circumstances, make a statement which was not in his opinion absolutely correct. Yet, I want to invite the attention of the Senate to the veto message by President Truman. I desire to make it clear that when he vetoed the bill he was not dealing with waters inside a State at all. I now read from the veto message:

> The Supreme Court's decision in the pending case will determine rights in lands lying beyond ordinary low-water mark along the coast extending seaward for a distance of 3 miles.

Listen to this:

> Contrary to widespread misunderstanding, the case does not involve any tidelands, which are lands covered and uncovered by the daily ebb and flow of the tides; nor does it involve any lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, or other inland waters.

That is quite different from what was stated a while ago, in all good faith, I believe, by the distinguished Senator from Texas.

I read further from the veto message:

> Consequently, the case does not constitute any threat to or cloud upon the titles of the several States to such lands, or the improvements thereon. When the joint resolution was being debated in the Senate an amendment was offered which would have resulted in giving an outright acquittance to the respective States of all tidelands and all lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, and other inland waters. Proponents of the present measure, however, defeated this amendment. This clearly emphasized that the primary purpose of the legislation was to give to the States and their lessees any right, title, or interest of the United States in the lands and minerals under the waters within the 3-mile limit.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know of any instances in which the Federal Government has laid claim to the land under the fresh water inland lakes and rivers of the United States?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know of a single instance.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator agree that those who are in favor of giving to a few States the tidelands oil which has been declared to be the property of all the people of the United States, have been stocking inland lakes and rivers with red herrings?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly correct. The distinguished Senator from Vermont could not have used a better expression.

Inasmuch as we are speaking about Texas, let me say what has happened. Only a short time ago Texas passed a law—providing what? It provided for laying a claim to the waters 57 miles off the coast of Texas. Why? Because in the area under those waters there were 10,000,000,000 barrels of oil. The going price at that time was $2.65 a barrel. So we have involved the staggering sum of $26,500,000,000.

Mr. President, why should an inland State, such as Vermont, or a State such as North Dakota, or a State such as South Dakota, or any other inland State, not receive its just share of that oil, 57 miles away from the coast?

The State of Louisiana passed a law under the terms of which it claimed the oil 100 miles out in the ocean from the coastline of the State.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the California case passed upon that question. After that decision was rendered an act was passed by Congress, which was vetoed. At that time the Attorney General of the United States was a man from Texas named Tom Clark. Mr. Clark brought that action directly in the Supreme Court of the United States, after first receiving permission to do so.

What have people been trying to do to Harry Truman, Mr. President? I am sorry I did not know the subject was

coming up today, but when the bill is before the Senate I shall produce letters, which I have in my office, in which statements were made that unless Harry Truman backed up on tidelands oil he would lose the votes of the States bordering on the waters involved, particularly the States of Texas and California.

Mr. President, I do not know who originated the Dixiecrat Party. I read articles by some of the columnists who said that the oil companies financed the Dixiecrat Party. I remember one Senator who upon the Senate floor led a magnificent fight, as he did also in the committee. That was Senator Forrest Donnell, of Missouri. He delivered a speech upon the Senate floor which in my opinion was absolutely unanswerable. He led the fight in the Committee on the Judiciary. Yes; he was defeated, but he went to the Republican National Convention, and there, before the platform committee, of which the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was chairman, he led the fight to keep out of the Republican Party platform, if he could, the plank which was afterward put into the platform. What took place there, Mr. President? He was defeated, he told me, by a vote of roughly 4 to 1.

Oh, there are some Senators in this body who may wonder why Harry Truman carried the Middle West. He carried it for several reasons. One was because of the great eloquence of the candidate for Vice President upon the Democratic ticket, our present distinguished Vice President, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, who was perhaps one of the best-informed men on agriculture there was in the United States, if not the best. I heard him speak over the radio at Mankato, Minn., and in Iowa. Over and above the splendid job that was done by the candidate for Vice President, the running mate of President Truman, the farmers and businessmen of the Middle West were acquainted—and we saw to it that they were acquainted, and the Senator from North Dakota takes some credit for that—with this plank of the Republican platform, found on page 19:

> We favor restoration to the States of their historic rights to the tide and submerged lands, tributary waters, lakes, and streams.

Mr. President, there is involved $26,500,000,000, and the States receive a royalty generally of from 12½ to 15 percent. I ask, Why should that money go to Texas and a couple of other States when, as a matter of fact, the Supreme Court of the United States has said that the money received from that oil belongs to all the people of the United States? Why should not the school children of North and South Dakota and of the other inland States receive their share of it based upon population? Why should not some of that money be available for schoolhouses in the inland States?

The Supreme Court of the United States has passed upon this question. It has given a clean-cut definition. The States involved have had their day in court. As the distinguished Senator from Texas said, 44 attorneys general and the American Bar Association have been in favor of the contention that the oil belongs to the States. When the tideland cases were under consideration the leading lawyers of the country presented their arguments to the Supreme Court of the United States. When they all got through, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the oil in the tidelands belonged to all the people of the United States.

Mr. President, there is no use in going into the matter at great length today, because we are not passing upon the merits of the bill referred to by the Senator from Texas, but I, for one, want to serve notice that the senior Senator from North Dakota is going to be one Senator who will be here battling for the school children and the taxpayers of the entire United States, in an effort to make sure that they shall receive their fair and just share of the tidelands oil.

Mr. President, although I have made no preparation to discuss the subject at length, I wanted to make this statement because I did not desire the statements of the senior Senator from Texas upon the Senate floor to go unchallenged.

Mr. President, I call attention to another sentence in the President's veto message:

> The Attorney General advises me that the issue now before the Supreme Court has not been heretofore determined.

Senators can talk all they want to about 100 years of precedents, and about the 244 cases which have been determined. The Attorney General of the United States advised the President of this country that that was not true. As President Truman said:

> It thus presents a legal question of great importance to the Nation, and one which should be decided by the Court. The Congress is not an appropriate forum to determine the legal issue now before the Court. The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be interfered with while it is arriving at its decision in the pending case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President in the tidewater case, which is not very long, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The veto message is as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my signature House Joint Resolution 225, entitled "A joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles."

The purpose of this measure is to renounce and disclaim all right, title, interest, claim, or demand of the United States in "lands beneath tidewaters," as defined in the joint resolution, and in lands beneath all navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and to the minerals in such lands. The phrase "lands beneath tidewaters" is defined so broadly as to include all lands, either submerged or reclaimed, situated under the ocean beyond the low-water mark and extending out to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line or to the boundary line of any State whose boundary, at the time of the admission of the State to the Union, extended oceanward beyond three geographical miles. Lands acquired by the United States from any State or its successors in interest, or through conveyance or condemnation, would be excluded from the operation of the measure. There would also be excluded the interest of the United States in that part of the Continental Shelf (lands under the ocean contiguous to and forming part of the land mass of our coasts) which lies more than 3 miles beyond the low-water mark or the boundary of any particular State.

On May 29, 1945, at my direction, the then Attorney General filed a suit in the United States district court at Los Angeles, in the name of the United States, to determine the rights in the land and minerals situated in the bed of the Pacific Ocean adjacent to the coast of California and within the 3-mile limit above described. Thereafter, in order to secure a more expeditious determination of the matter, the present Attorney General brought suit in the Supreme Court of the United States. The case in the district court was dismissed. I am advised by the Attorney General that the case will be heard in the Supreme Court and will probably be decided during the next term of the Court.

The Supreme Court's decision in the pending case will determine rights in lands lying beyond ordinary low-water mark along the coast extending seaward for a distance of 3 miles. Contrary to widespread misunderstanding, the case does not involve any tidelands, which are lands covered and uncovered by the daily ebb and flow of the tides; nor does it involve any lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, or other inland waters. Consequently the case does not constitute any threat to or cloud upon the titles of the several States to such lands, or the improvements thereon. When the joint resolution was being debated in the Senate an amendment was offered which would have resulted in giving an outright acquittance to the respective States of all tidelands and all lands under bays, harbors, ports, lakes, rivers, and other inland waters. Proponents of the present measure, however, defeated this amendment. This clearly emphasized that the primary purpose of the legislation was to give to the States and their lessees any right, title, or interest of the United States in the lands and minerals under the waters within the 3-mile limit.

The ownership of the land and resources underlying this 3-mile belt has been a subject of genuine controversy for a number of years. It should be resolved appropriately and promptly. The ownership of the vast quantity of oil in such areas presents a vital problem for the Nation from the standpoint of national defense and conservation. If the United States owns these areas, they should not be given away. If the Supreme Court decides that the United States has no title to or interest in the lands, a quitclaim from the Congress is unnecessary.

The Attorney General advises me that the issue now before the Supreme Court has not been heretofore determined. It thus presents a legal question of great importance to the Nation, and one which should be decided by the Court. The Congress is not an appropriate forum to determine the legal issue now before the Court. The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be interfered with while it is arriving at its decision in the pending case.

For the foregoing reasons I am constrained to withhold my approval of the joint resolution.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 1, 1946.*

[H. J. Res. 225, 79th Cong., 1st sess.]

Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles

Resolved, etc., That, in recognition of the title and interest in the several States, and

in others as hereinafter mentioned, since July 4, 1776, or since their formation and admission to the Union, the United States of America hereby renounces and disclaims any right, title, interest, or claim, except as hereinafter excepted and retained, in and to all lands beneath tidewaters and all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of each of the respective States; and in further recognition of such titles and interests, the United States of America hereby releases, remises, and quitclaims all right, title, interest, claim, or demand of the United States of America in and to all lands beneath tidewaters, and all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of each of the respective States, unto each of such States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the law as established by the decisions of the courts of such State, and unto the respective grantees or successors in interest thereof, and unto the respective present lawful owners of such lands of which title has been confirmed by official action of the United States of America; excepting therefrom such lands beneath tidewaters and such lands beneath navigable waters as have been lawfully acquired by the United States of America from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the decisions of the courts of such State, or their respective grantees, or successors in interest, by cession, grant, quitclaim, or condemnation, or from any other owner or owners thereof by conveyance or by condemnation, providing such owner or owners had lawfully acquired the right, title, or interest of any such State; and excepting therefrom such lands beneath tidewaters and such lands beneath navigable waters, and such interests therein, as the United States is lawfully entitled to under the law as established by the decisions of the courts of the State in which the land is situated, or as are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians; retaining, however, to the United States of America its present powers of regulation and control for the purposes of commerce, navigation, and the national defense.

As used in this joint resolution, the phrase "lands beneath tidewaters" shall include (1) all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and oceanward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line and to the boundary line of each respective State where in any case such boundary line extends oceanward beyond three geographical miles, and (2) all lands formerly beneath tidewaters, as herein defined, which have been filled or reclaimed; the phrase "lands beneath navigable waters" shall include (1) all other lands covered by waters which are navigable under the laws of the United States, and (2) all lands formerly beneath navigable waters, as herein defined, which have been filled or reclaimed.

The United States excepts from this disclaimer and retains all right, title, and interest claimed and asserted by Presidential Proclamation Numbered 2667 of September 28, 1945, or otherwise to the subsoil and sea bed of or the resources in the Continental Shelf lying oceanward from the area described in the first clause (1) of the preceding paragraph.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President of the Senate pro tempore.

Endorsement on back of bill:

I certify that this act originated in the House of Representatives.

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to say further that I agree with every single word contained in the veto message of the President of the United States. I say again that the message proves that at a time when the enormous sum of $26,500,000,000, the value of the oil in the tidelands off the coast of Texas and Louisiana, and hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of oil off the coast of California, were involved, we had a President who was willing to and did stand firm, steadfast in behalf of the common people of the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are now considering the committee amendment on page 22 of the bill, are we not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The pending amendment is the committee amendment on page 23, line 4, to strike out "$5,220,500", and insert "$5,108,603."

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest development roads and trails", on page 23, line 16, after the word "administration", to strike out "$11,500,000" and insert "$14,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of lands for national forests—Weeks Act," on page 24, line 10, after "513–519, 521)", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Superior National Forest," on page 24, line 22, after "(Public Law 733)", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Special acts," on page 25, line 7, after the word "amendment", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$39,830"; in line 19, after "(Public Law 637)", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$34,850", and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$142,000" and insert "$141,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 11, to insert:

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 27, line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out "$6,112,800" and insert "$6,372,800", and on page 28, line 1, after the word "responsibility", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That not in excess of $60,000 of the funds made available herein may be used for surveys of the watersheds of the Big Nemaha River, Little Nemaha River, and Weeping Water Creek in Nebraska and such surveys shall be coordinated with the investigations of the Corps of Engineers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil Conservation Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 28, line 19, after the word "installations", to strike out "and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof."

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment? As I understand, the amendment he wishes to reach is on page 29, line 9. The amendment now under consideration is on page 28, line 19.

Mr. DIRKSEN entered the Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois is now present in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment on page 28, line 19, is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 9, after the word "employees", to strike out "$54,278,000" and insert "$53,474,991."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, line 9, in lieu of the figure proposed to be inserted by the committee, it is proposed to insert the figure "$40,600,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amendment to the amendment is very simple. In substance, it would reduce by roughly $13,000,000 the amount which was allowed by the Senate committee. This is a cut in the item for soil conservation, which is distinguished from soil conservation and domestic allotment in that the later item, of course, deals with soil-conservation payments which are made to farmers. This item of soil conservation is esesntially a personnel item. As I recall, roughly 85 percent of the entire appropriation is devoted to the payment of salaries of those engaged in the field, not only in experimental and demonstration work, but in the practical work of teaching farmers soil-conservation practices.

For the fiscal year 1952 I understand that the budget estimate indicates that there will be 11,825 persons engaged in

this work in various sections of the country. It occurs to me that when we reach an item like that—and I have watched soil conservation grow from $10,000,000 to well over $53,000,000—the time has come to stop and ask a few questions, to determine whether or not there is duplication of service, and whether or not, in the interest of a balanced budget and in the interest of drying up some of the public expenditures which go into the economic stream of the country and thereby become an inflationary force, a reduction could be made. I believe that such an item should be viewed with a very careful and baleful eye.

In my judgment, the proposed cut would not do too much harm to the Soil Conservation Service, notwithstanding the fact that there will be many cries to the effect that we are crippling the service, and that competent and practiced employees will have to find work elsewhere unless they are shifted to some other bureau in the Department of Agriculture.

I took the trouble to examine rather carefully all the testimony in the House hearings, and I also examined the testimony which was given before the Senate committee. I see by the tables which have been inserted in the RECORD that the soil conservation work is very, very far from completion, and far from a 100-percent job. In the State of the very distinguished majority leader [Mr. MCFARLAND] the figures indicate that the Soil Conservation Service officials themselves say that only 1 percent of the goal has been achieved.

The great and good sovereign State of Georgia is, I believe, at the top of the heap, in that about 38 percent of the tillable land has been reached by the practices which are taught and demonstrated by the Soil Conservation Service. But there are some 22 States in which this work is at a level less than 10 percent of completion. So, while a cut may delay the program a little, it cannot be very persuasively argued that such a cut would particularly harm the program or set it back very much.

The second argument which I make in behalf of reducing this appropriation is that in my considered judgment the States ought to do more of this character of work. When all is said and done, the States have an interest. Their interest is not remote from the land. After all, the land is within the confines of the States. If this work is so important as it is said to be—and I attach the necessary importance to it—it seems to me that the States could do a great deal more in the field than they have done.

I notice from the tables which have been inserted in the hearings, both on the House side and on the Senate side, that the sum total of State aid in the soil conservation field is about $10,000,000. That is something less than 20 percent of the outlay which the Federal Government is making for personal services in this field. It is worthy of note that the highway program which was instituted back in 1916 was placed on a matching basis. Various other grants in aid to the States were put on a matching basis. Yet in this instance the Federal Government is doing roughly 80 percent of the work, while the States do 20 percent, or even less. It seems that in a spirit of reexamination we ought to look at it a little more closely, and there should be some insistence on the part of the Federal Government and the appropriate agencies in the Department of Agriculture that the States give some attention to this subject and devote both time and money to the conservation of soil within the limits of the States.

The third reason which I assign for a rather substantial cut in this field is that there is a rather interesting conflict in agricultural policy. We have one agency, the Soil Conservation Service, with more than 11,000 employees going forth and teaching practices designed to conserve the topsoil, to prevent wind erosion and rain erosion, to prevent the soil from leaching away and getting into the watercourses and going into the Gulf of Mexico. They are doing all the necessary things in order to preserve the fertility of the soil and the alluvial top-crust of soil, which is indispensable, of course, to a productive agriculture. But while that is going on, we have in the selfsame Department of Agriculture policies which are designed to deplete the soil.

I know there are some farmers in my own State of Illinois who would not be too happy to hear me say this, but as I have gone around the country—and I have examined my State pretty carefully in the past 2 years—I have looked into the situation. I could take Senators to almost any crossroads, and there, gleaming in the moonlight, show them polished, corrugated containers, most of which hold about a thousand bushels of corn. They can be found by the thousands all through the Corn Belt. In those cans there is something more than corn which has been sealed under a Federal policy. In those cans is some of the soil from the great and good Middle West. With support prices, it is up to a farmer to determine whether or not he can do better raising corn for grain and selling it in the market, or whether it had better go into meat, in the form of beef or pork, and reach the palates of consumers in that way. But no matter how it gets there, it represents, in a sense, a soil-depleting crop. It seems to me that so long as the present types of separate policies prevail, we are going to have farmers who will be less interested in dairying, which is probably one of the most efficient ways to use the produce of the soil, and who will give more and more attention to the feeding of livestock and the production of pork.

The point I am making is that there is one agency giving time, attention, and utilizing very substantial Federal appropriations to conserve the soil. Then we turn around, and we fail to give proper accent to a properly balanced policy which would put an end to soil depletion.

Mr. President, I believe we are standing at the point where we ought to examine plans, bring about harmony in the policies, and find out whether we are on the wrong track. The only way to do it is to take away some of the money and curtail some of the practices until we can get a far better look at the problem.

The next point I would make in behalf of a $13,000,000 cut in the soil-conservation fund is that the time has come to give far more attention to the question of duplication in the Department of Agriculture. What I am about to say, I say with considerable modesty. At the same time, I beg the Senate's pardon when I allude to the fact that at one time I served at the other end of the Capitol, that for 12 years I served on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, and as chairman of the subcommittee during one Congress. I was very much concerned, of course, about the duplicating activities and overlapping functions of the Department of Agriculture.

I submit to the Senate that at the present time there are in the field roughly 12,000 paid personnel, who are on the staff of the Extension Service. They have a variety of functions and duties, not the least of which is to guide, instruct, and educate farmers, and to diffuse information and knowledge with respect to proper and adequate soil-conservation practices. So there are 12,000 persons in the Extension Service. There are an estimated 11,825 persons in the Soil Conservation Service. That does not include the work which is being done by special groups. It does not include the work being done in this particular field by the agencies under the leadership of the Production and Marketing Administration.

Mr. President, I submit it is duplication which fills the counties of the country with employees who, in my considered judgment, are carrying on functions which overlap and come in conflict with those of other agencies, as well as generate friction in the field.

I should like to read a portion of an article, with which I believe most Members of the Senate are familiar. It appeared in the Country Gentleman magazine. It bears out pretty nearly the facts which were adduced by the task force of the so-called Hoover Commission, which, in pursuance of authority in the Lodge-Brown resolution, carried on a very extensive exploration of the whole executive structure of the Government. Among other things, this is what they say about one county in Illinois. Incidentally, it is a very selected county, with fine soil, with diligent farmers, and with men of capability and intelligence in the field of agriculture who know what they are doing. I read from the report which relates to De Kalb County, Ill. It appeared in the March 1950 issue of the Country Gentleman. It says:

> Twenty-five of the best farmers in De Kalb County, Ill., were asked this question: "What would be your rough guess as to the number of Federal farm-agency employees—either part of full time—in De Kalb County in 1949?"
>
> Their average guess was 56 Federal hired hands in their midst. And 21 of the 25 farmers went on to say that this was too many.
>
> They were flabbergasted when they were told the right answer was more than three

times their guess. For 178 men and women were working for the Federal Government in De Kalb County last year—just to tell farmers what they should do, what they can do, and, in some instances, what they cannot do.

These 178 persons put in part or full time, and were paid from $8 a day up to $5,350 a year. They worked only on the various Federal service programs inside that one county. One hundred and twenty-three of them actually live right in the county; 55 of them live outside the county but regularly visited as part of their duties. Jobholders in State, regional, and National bureaus, who influence but never see De Kalb County were not even counted.

It took 65 De Kalb men and 5 girls a total of 590 days to sign up, check performance, figure up results, and pay out $35.01 apiece to farmers who cooperated in the Government's PMA program.

I inject parenthetically to say to my esteemed and able friend from Georgia that these were ACP payments. For one county they averaged $35.01. A large expense was involved to pay those who checked performance, produced the checks, had them signed and appropriately delivered to the farmers in that county. Knowing the type of agriculture and the type of husbandmen who live in that county, the payment of $35, in my humble judgment, would certainly not make the difference between an interest and a noninterest in soil conservation practices.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator give us the proportion of the total number of employees who are local committeemen and county committemen, who work part time on a daily basis or a few days a month?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Quite a number of them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Quite a number of them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe the great majority of them are part-time committeemen who are elected by the farmers themselves, to administer the farm program. They may have two men in De Kalb County, Ill. The Senator knows that the compensation of the local committeemen and county committeemen comes out of the funds which are allocated to the counties for soil conservation payments. It may be that in the particular county referred to, out of the 3,000 or more counties in the United States, too large a part of the payments are taken and too many committeemen are hired to do the work. If so, it is a most extraordinary county, and I assume that is the reason it was emphasized so much in the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not refreshed myself on the figure for several years, but when I last looked it up and had cognizance of it, there were 108,000 county and community committeemen in the entire country. If I am incorrect, I shall be glad to stand corrected.

Mr. RUSSELL. The figure is almost as extravagant as I believe to be the statement which the Senator is now reading.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that the Senator from Georgia look up the figures with respect to the entire part-time employment situation in the Department.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the figures before me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have my memory refreshed with respect to the figures.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of the county employees, including county committeemen, on a temporary basis, number 102,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not miss it by very much, I said 108,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought the Senator said 160,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said 108,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I misunderstood the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not having seen the figure for 3 years I believe I was pretty close to the exact figure. Perhaps the number has been cut down in some counties. I believe I can answer in part the Senator's inquiry by reading a little further from the article before me. This goes to the particular matter with which the amendment is concerned:

The Soil Conservation Service's bill was $14,040 for offering technical advice to 95 farmers—3.8 percent of those in the county. That's a cost of about $147.68 each. One "cooperator" admitted: "Oh, I just signed up to get their soil map—I'm not following the rotation they set up for my farm."

Farmers get free advice on crop rotation from at least three different Government agencies. In some instances 5, and yet more than 100 De Kalb County farmers have put up $40 apiece to hire their own farm-management consultant.

Evidently they were not too well satisfied with the kind of service they were getting from the Government, so they simply dug into their own pocketbooks and got a consultant of their own.

Congress says the Extension Service shall carry out all educational programs in farming. Yet in De Kalb County, the Soil Conservation Service is primarily educational and spends three times as much as Extension. Two full-time men with salaries totaling $7,760, plus six others who work part-time in De Kalb County, and drive five Government cars, offer farmer cooperators soil maps which most farmers want, plus advice, mainly on rotation, which many do not follow.

Mr. President, I think I can draw upon my own experience in years gone by when I examined this entire picture of duplication. I remember all of the queries we addressed to the Extension Service. I remember the bill we introduced, which was considered by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. That bill dealt with this very subject, because the duplication which existed was becoming a matter of acute concern to Members of Congress.

I think I can proceed now to prove the point even further and to indicate that today there are some areas of friction which in my considered judgment are rather unhappy.

I believe my friend, the Senator from Georgia, will recall that both last year and this year the House Appropriations Committee selected four or five investigators and put them into the field. As I understand, they had no connection whatsoever with the Department of Agriculture. They were men of some talent and some research ability and some exploratory capacity, and they were sent into the field to check on the coordination or lack of coordination and the harmony or lack of harmony in these programs.

They have filed a very interesting report. I tried to get the full text of the report; but I understand that, by agreement among the members of the committee at the other end of the Capitol, the report has not yet been released. However, some rather generous excerpts from it were included in the House hearings. I shall read now only the portions which probably are pertinent to the item now before us, although, if it is desired, I shall of course be delighted to place in the RECORD as much of the report as I have been able to procure. I hope the entire report will be printed in the RECORD, because I think it is extremely useful and informative.

The following excerpt from the report appears in the House hearings—and these are the findings of these detached, unbiased investigators who were sent out by the committee:

The national soil conservation program, as currently administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, is permeated with duplication, overlap, conflict, and lack of coordination, and what has been aptly described as a state of "civil war" exists in many areas between the Extension Service, the agricultural conservation program branch of Production and Marketing Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and Farmers Home Administration. All of these bureaus, with the exception of the Farmers Home Administration, are competing for control of this program due to the rising importance of conservation in the national economy—and service to the American farmer suffers. This situation was found to exist in the majority of the States and counties visited.

Mr. President, I think that is a rather serious indictment of what is taking place in these functional operations in the field, under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture at the present time.

The report continues as follows:

In most of the States visited, the Extension Service, as a matter of policy, is strongly opposing not only the work being done by the Soil Conservation Service, but also is in active opposition to the formation of additional soil conservation districts.

Mr. President, I should say that is rather interesting. When sweetness and light and harmony finally fade away like an old soldier, and the agencies begin to fight each other and resist each other's programs, it is rather interesting for us to know of that situation.

I read further from the report:

The policy was confirmed in conversations with the deans of the State colleges of agriculture and the directors of extension services. In one State, this bitter opposition has taken the form of Extension Service instigated suits in State courts to prevent the formation of soil conservation districts and thinly disguised propaganda campaigns against the Soil Conservation Service. A typical propaganda handbill which was placed under the mail box of each farmer

in one county on the night preceding a soil conservation referendum is as follows:

Mr. President, this is very interesting. The caption of the handbill is:

Farmers—Farm Owners.
Stop—Look—Listen.

This is the handbill which was circulated:

Do you remember?
1. When Henry Wallace drowned all the little pigs.
2. When Henry Wallace made us get permits to sell our wheat?
He also got the pet idea about us using soil districts.
What may a soil district bring to Perry County?
1. Two to five high-priced white-collar men working in the county.
2. Higher taxes.
3. Centralized Washington control.
4. Dictatorship, bureaucratic control.
5. Strangle free enterprise: (a) Force local contractors out of business.
(b) Kill individual initiative on the farm.
The Perry County farmer has prospered on the basis of free enterprise. Our forefathers came to this country so that this freedom might be theirs. We had better be fearful for the future of our country if we expect the Government to take care of us.

Mr. President, I shall place the remainder of the handbill in the RECORD, but I think what I have read is sufficient to indicate the rather interesting lack of felicity between the Soil Conservation Service, on the one hand, and the Extension Service in the field, on the other. One has 11,825 persons in the field and the other has 12,000 persons in the field, and, of course, that is exclusive of what is done in this particular field of operations by other agencies in the Department of Agriculture.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that handbill circulated by the Extension Service?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, it was; that is the interesting thing about it.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator mind telling us where Perry County is?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Frankly, I do not know. I tried to get a copy of the report, and this morning I telephoned the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations about it. They were going to take the matter under advisement.

It could be Perry County, Ill., for aught I know. However, I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. It sounds more like a feud between the Soil Conservation Service and the Production and Marketing Administration rather than with the Extension Service. However, of course, anything can happen in the Central States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, there is something here on that phase of the matter; I read the following from page 690 of the House hearings:

Typical of the current conflict between Soil Conservation Service and Production and Marketing Administration, the following are the chronological events which normally happen when a farmer builds terraces on his farm—

Mind you, Mr. President, this is taken from the investigator's report. There was one report last year and there was one report this year. As I have said, I am simply quoting from the report, which the House committee inserted in the hearings. This is what the report says:

1. He will come to the office of the Extension Service and request advice. The Extension Service will refer the farmer to the local PMA office.
2. The local PMA office will advise the farmer as to whether or not funds are available to pay for this conservation practice and if such funds are available, the farmer is advised that a PMA representative will be sent to inspect the area on his farm which he desires terraced. After inspection and approval by a PMA representative, the farmer may then go to the local office of Soil Conservation Service.

Is that borne out by the experience of my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, that is the procedure, as I understand it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Now we come to the third point in the investigator's report:

3. At the Soil Conservation Service office the farmer is advised that no terracing work can be done on his farm by the Soil Conservation Service until a land-utilization survey has been made and a farm plan developed. After the development of such a plan, Soil Conservation Service will then send technical representatives to the farm to stake out the necessary contour lines.

That is item No. 3.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator recall that in June 1948 the Senate passed a bill which was intended to correct the very situation to which the Senator from Illinois is referring, and of which he has given an accurate description; but the House flatly refused to have anything to do with that measure; the House would not cooperate at all. The House killed the bill; and in order to obtain any law at all on agriculture at that time, we had to give up that effort. However, the Senate passed the bill by a vote of 78 or 81 to 3; there were only 3 votes in the Senate against the bill.

If the House had only cooperated with the Senate at that time, although probably we would not have corrected the situation completely, at least we would have gone a long way toward correcting it.

The situation is bad. All the agencies are trying to do educational work, to teach the farmers to think their way. As a matter of fact, the Extension Service is the educational and informational agency; and, of course, it operates through the States. The Soil Conservation Service is an operational agency, and it has to be set up by the States. The PMA comes in, of course, under the price-support program.

I want to make it plain that I agree with the Senator from Illinois that the situation is bad. Certainly, coming from the State of Illinois, he knows how bad it can be in certain spots; and it must be corrected. I agree with the Senator in that respect. But I did want to point out that, so far as the Senate is concerned, we tried once to correct the condition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend from Vermont will remember that at one time the condition was even more aggravated than at present; for in the days of the Farm Security Administration, under the leadership of that very distinguished liberal—ultraliberal, shall I say?—C. B. Baldwin, who later became the campaign manager for Mr. Wallace, they had up to 20,000 people on the rolls, and they were dabbling in about every kind of agricultural function of which man has any knowledge, including functions in this field. Where they were going, running on different tracks toward one goal, was more than the Senator from Illinois could comprehend in those days. He tried his best, of course, to have the situation straightened out, and to have the particular appropriations reduced; but it was a difficult business, to say the least.

I might add that very recently—in fact, only last March, I think it was—the Secretary of Agriculture took some steps which, it was claimed, would eliminate some of this competition. But, unfortunately, he came under suspicion by all the different groups, apparently; and I would not say that he was getting anywhere very fast. This is a situation which has to be by legislation. I do not think any Secretary of Agriculture can effect the reforms needed and get by with them. He is going to have sabotage and insurrection within his own ranks when he tries it. I hope that it will be one of the early tasks of this Congress to correct the situation which the Senator from Illinois is accurately describing here today.

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

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

Mr. LANGER. Putting it in the form of a question, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois is familiar with the very fine job which Henry Wallace and Mr. Baldwin did for the Middle West when they were in charge of the Agricultural Department. The distinguished Senator will remember that during that time we had several terrible years of drought. At least, in my State they faced the problem of saving the foundation herds. They had to ascertain what cattle should be killed. I was Governor of the State at that time, and I know the great job they had to do. In my own experience, I may say, I had cattle for which I myself paid $75 a head which were taken to the sandpits and shot, and I received a check for $17 apiece.

The Senator from North Dakota fought the program of Henry Wallace to plow under every third row of cotton and wheat, but the program did accomplish one thing. The Department of Agriculture taught the farmers in the Middle West the value of strip farming

and of contour plowing. The result has been that we have now had 12 years of the most magnificent crops we have ever had in the history of North Dakota. Of course, we have had rain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to make that suggestion.

Mr. LANGER. We have had rain, but I doubt whether, had we not had strip farming and contour plowing, even with the rain we have had, we would have had the remarkable crops which have been harvested. The farmers of my State realize that, whatever they may think about Mr. Wallace's views. I might add he did not get a very large vote in North Dakota, as the distinguished Senator knows. The farmers did not admire his politics, but they did like the way he managed the Department of Agriculture, and I think it only fair to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois exactly what the facts are in that connection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would have given a slightly modified answer to my friend from North Dakota, first, by saying it would be astonishing, indeed, if an administrator in Government who had a background in agriculture such as Mr. Wallace had could not accomplish at least some good, even though it were nothing more than to eradicate Bang's disease from the dairy herds of the country, and to carry on the functions of plant entomology and quarantine, or finally, to offset moon-blindness in horses. Oh, there are a thousand and one things in the scientific field which could be done. I certainly do not agree, however, to the proposition that it is either sound or wise to throw pigs into tankage in the belief that, by diminishing the supply, the country would be taken out of the deflationary spiral in which it was at that time; and I would be the first to admit, in the interest of truth and candor, that that was the condition at that time.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator understands that I fought that part of the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I understand that. I know something of the condition which existed on the Dakota prairies. I remember that, as a student, I used to sell stock books in South Dakota. I saw the drought come, and, inside of 48 hours, one could see 320 acres of wheat on the stem come to nothing, so that it would not bring the price of a cotton suit of clothes.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have seen that happen in the Dakotas. As one who has had a good deal to do during the past 8 or 9 years with agricultural crops, I must say I have not the slightest doubt, of course, that contour plowing, strip farming, and the other devices——

Mr. LANGER. Better seed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And better seed, have improved the yields of the Dakota prairies; that I do know.

Here we are dealing with the question of inflation, and, if we fail to stop it now, and let it go deeper and deeper by making constantly increasing appropriations, when will we get out of this welter? We often say, "Oh, you must use the scalpel; you must pinpoint your economies." I am not so sure but that the medicine which is furnished by a good, ready, sharp ax is about what the Government needs, if we are to put it in order and keep the budget within proper dimensions.

To recapitulate, what was in this report. First of all, a farmer is taken through the courses.

First, he goes to the Extension Service and asks for advice, and they send him to PMA. He then goes to PMA, he makes other representations there, and they finally say, "You must go to the Soil Conservation Service."

Then comes No 4:

> 4. The farmer then must recontract PMA who sends another representative to the farm to measure the lines staked out by SCS and issue a formal permit before construction of the terraces is begun.
>
> 5. Soil Conservation Service then advises and assists in the actual construction of the terraces.
>
> 6. The farmer must again contact PMA who sends another representative to the farm to check the job and certify it for payment.

That is a fine kettle of fish. He almost gets lost in his own perplexity and in his own bewilderment, as he contacts first one agency and then another, in the same county, getting a diversity and a variety of advice. At long last, out of this professional welter, the job is done and payment is made.

It is no wonder that the farmers of De Kalb County finally went into their pockets for $40 apiece and hired a consultant of their own.

Conditions are becoming such that some of the employees of the Department are beginning to fall over each other, and I think the time has come, Mr. President, for a little examination. When all is said and done, the Congress under the Constitution is the exclusive authority, with power over the purse. The sword was entrusted to one branch of government; the purse to another. We cannot shunt that obligation or that responsibility to someone else. If duplication exists and the investigators, who were certainly not of my choosing and my naming, find it out, if they find overlapping functions to abound in the field service, then the thing to do is to use the knife and plunge it deeply and make that the starting point for a further survey of this question before the duplication goes too far.

Mr. President, I could read from other portions of the report, but it would be repetitive in character and would probably not add very much to the whole story. I think the time has come to cut the appropriation.

A few days ago I looked at a little survey of what has happened and what the box score is in the field of appropriations thus far in this session of the Eighty-second Congress. The House has passed six appropriation bills, I believe, including the first defense bill. They have shown savings under the budget of, roughly, $1,100,000,000. Three regular appropriation bills have now been acted upon by the Senate. In the independent offices bill we raised the House figure by $77,000,000, and we reduced the Labor-Federal Security bill by $113,000,000. But that, in my judgment, was only an illusory saving, because I think my friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out at the time that the money is taken out of a fund where there is going to be a build-up of the case load, and it is fair to assume that before the year is out the agency will be here asking for a deficiency appropriation. So the saving is probably more apparent than real.

So, Mr. President, I renew the question I have raised from time to time in my rather humble and feeble way: Where are we going to bring about the billions of dollars in economy to which we have so frequently alluded? Where are the billions of dollars in reductions and savings which we have suggested to the people of the country in the hope that we could ease the tax load upon the suffering taxpayers? When all is said and done, the taxpayer is still the forgotten man, even though it has been made to appear by glamor and rhetoric that the forgotten man is some rather mythical character. I remind the Senate that 68 years ago, when Dr. Sumner, of Yale University, wrote a series of treatises, he wrote one which was called The Forgotten Man, and the man he meant was the taxpayer who votes, who prays, and who pays.

So, Mr. President, wherever there is an opportunity I am going to lift my voice in the hope that some modest economies can be developed, so we can keep the budget in balance in the next fiscal year, God willing and I say it reverently—because if there is a more inflationary force, if there is a greater public inflationary force than debt and additions to that debt—and our public debt is already astronomical in its dimensions—I do not know what it is. I think there is a solemn personal duty on the part of anyone who has been elected to public office to leave nothing undone to see that all the relief is afforded that can be brought about.

Mr. President, I wish to allude to one thing that was referred to when my able friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] earlier gave his very interesting discourse from the charts. I think he sought to establish that cuts in the agricultural budget were certainly comparable personnelwise, and so far as administrative expenses were concerned, with the other appropriation bills——

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that it was cut to the same extent that the other bills have been. I made no comparison. I stated that the Department of Agriculture had had its appropriations reduced since prewar days, whereas other departments of the Government had obtained substantial increases since the war period. I stated that the Department of Agriculture had 13,000 fewer permanent employees than was the case in 1940. I should like to have someone suggest some other department of the Government which has fewer permanent employees today than it had in 1940.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust the Senate will not be deterred by its failure with respect to other appropriation bills. I think the cuts should have been much deeper.

That is why I voted against some of them. I should not hesitate to let the knife go in deeply if there is any occasion to do so, where it can be done without doing a grave injustice to agriculture or harm to the agricultural function. I do not think we should impair the productivity of American agriculture. I believe savings can be effected, and if I did not believe so, I would not want to jeopardize the basic industry of agriculture, upon which so many persons depend.

There is a sense of independence in the American farmer, for what he does is something more than a business; it is something more than the making of a mere livelihood taken out of the soil. The farmer pursues a calling which is essentially a way of life, but it does breed a sense of independence in him, and he does not ask for "Mr. Whiskers," better known as Uncle Sam, to take him by the hand and lead him constantly down the path. He knows his business. He has been coping with chinchbugs and the vagaries of the weather for years, and he has done pretty well in bringing agriculture to its present high state. We should let the farmer alone.

Agricultural organizations have suggested that the knife should cut more deeply. To be sure, I should say in fairness that they have not suggested specifically the amendment which is on the desk, but I am glad to observe that the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Illinois Agricultural Association, with more than 150,000 paid-up active members, are becoming very conscious indeed of the necessity for economy, and they have put their weight behind some economy.

I have not forgotten that in 1947 I had an opportunity to observe agricultural practices in Germany where they were carried to a very high degree. They had to do it because the contant cropping of the soil, century after century, made it necessary to conserve every ounce of fertility of the soil. But what did it amount to when they went through the inflationary period, when the value of the mark went to nothing, when there were 177,000,000,000 paper marks, and the Government had to take the ax and chop up 90 percent of all the marks in circulation and get what was in every man's purse and bank account?

Let us not be so naive as to say "it can't happen here." It can happen here. At one time there was a little more than 20 grains of gold in the American dollar, and the dollar would buy a dollar's worth of merchandise. Today a dollar will buy 54 cents worth of merchandise. There are some very sound, orthodox economists who say the dollar will go down even further.

I believe, then, that there is a solemn duty on the Congress to make sure that wherever possible we cut the budget so as to make sure that there may not befall this pleasant country the same kind of destiny which Germany suffered.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unaminous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 1146) to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was passed on the call of the calendar yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now move that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate all papers in respect to that bill.

The motion was agreed to.

CREATION OF COMMISSION TO STUDY ADMINISTRATION OF OVERSEAS ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I enter a similar motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate yesterday, on the call of the calendar, passed the bill (S. 1166) to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator state to what the bill refers?

Mr. ELLENDER. Senate bill 1166, which would create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto.

Mr. President, I now move that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate all papers relating to that bill.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. The order for a quorum call was rescinded. Does that mean that the vote on the Dirksen amendment will go over until tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. To be frank about the matter, Mr. President, the quorum call was rescinded because it was thought it would take some time to obtain a quorum. I desire to give notice now that Senators must be expected to wait upon the Senate until at least 6 o'clock in the evening, or we shall never finish with the work of the Congress. I give notice that Senators should be present tomorrow until at least 6 o'clock, or perhaps later. We want to finish consideration of the pending bill, and consider other appropriation bills. The only way we can transact business is to have a quorum present. I give notice now that tomorrow quorum calls when suggested will not be withdrawn.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There was some confusion in the Chamber, and I did not hear the request for unanimous consent to withdraw the quorum call, or I certainly would have objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Idaho that the request was made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and no objection was heard.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I regret that sincerely, because during the progress of the quorum call I observed on the floor of the Senate four or five Senators who last night flew for many hours throughout the night to return from a trip of inspection of the flood damages in the Middle West. If Members of the Senate can remain on a plane all night in order to get back to Washington to discharge their duties, I fail to comprehend why a quorum call should be withdrawn, and why we should not proceed with the business before the Senate.

Again I wish to protest against the delay which we are encountering day after day in the conduct of business. It is the duty of Members of the Senate to be present, instead of penalizing those who remain on the job.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend from Idaho that ordinarily the Senate adjourns or takes a recess somewhere between 5 and 6 o'clock. If it had not been for the fact that we had reached the hour of 5 o'clock, I myself would have objected to withdrawing the quorum call. I am just as anxious to transact business as is any other Senator. But when we reach the hour of 5 o'clock, and it is obvious that some time will be required to obtain a quorum, I think we can expedite matters by adjourning or taking a recess.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The statement made by the distinguished majority leader is, of course, correct, unless notice has been given of a late session. I hope the Senator from Arizona will serve notice upon the Senate tomorrow, as he has done today, that the Senate may remain in session until a late hour tomorrow. Consideration of appropriation bills should be concluded by the Senate, because they all must go to conference, and the conferences may require some time. Most of the appropriation bills are already about a month late. So I hope the distinguished Senator from Arizona will serve notice tomorrow that the Senate may remain in session until a late hour unless we conclude action on the appropriation bill. After the Senator has served such notice, I shall certainly object to any withdrawal of a quorum call.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not believe that Senators are entirely to blame for not being present this evening after 5 o'clock, because there was some thought that there would not be a vote on the bill today. Some Senators thought that because a number of amendments were going over business would not be transacted at a late hour. However, I serve notice now that the Senate may remain in session until at least 7 o'clock tomorrow evening. If it appears tomorrow that we may be in session at a later hour, I shall serve notice again. I ask Senators to be present until at least 7 o'clock, if necessary, to complete consideration of the bill tomorrow.

A NEW WAY OF HANDLING THE BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star of today carries a story entitled "Senators Seek Another Way To Handle Budget—Committee Begins Study of Third Such Plan in Recent Years."

The story reads, in part, as follows:

A better method of handling the Government's growing annual budget may be recommended to Congress today by the Senate Expenditures Committee.

Chairman McCLELLAN called the committee into closed session this morning to consider a bill to improve the facilities of the House and Senate for delving into the details which make up the billions of dollars in the annual appropriation bills.

The committee is understood to have made some headway at a preliminary meeting last week and is expected to take final action on a new budget procedure bill today.

One of several plans under consideration would set up a joint committee on the budget, similar to the joint committee the two Houses have maintained for many years to study taxes.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SENATORS SEEK ANOTHER WAY TO HANDLE BUDGET—COMMITTEE BEGINS STUDY OF THIRD SUCH PLAN IN RECENT YEARS

(By J. A. O'Leary)

A better method of handling the Government's growing annual budget may be recommended to Congress today by the Senate Expenditures Committee.

Chairman McCLELLAN called the committee into closed session this morning to consider a bill to improve the facilities of the House and Senate for delving into the details which make up the billions of dollars in the annual appropriation bills.

The committee is understood to have made some headway at a preliminary meeting last week and is expected to take final action on a new budget procedure bill today.

One of several plans under consideration would set up a joint committee on the budget, similar to the joint committee the two Houses have maintained for many years to study taxes.

TWO EARLIER PLANS FAILED

Congress in recent years has tried two new plans for promoting economy and bringing about more orderly handling of appropriation bills, but both were discarded after trial runs. The McClellan committee, which recently held hearings on a wide range of congressional reforms, hopes to come up with a more lasting solution.

The first experiment was the budget ceiling clause in the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946. It directed both Houses to agree at the start of each session on a top-limit for the budget as a whole. This ceiling was to be established before the detailed appropriations for each department were considered. It was to bear some relation to the Government's expected income.

For 2 years an effort was made to carry out the ceiling law, but with little success. The two Houses wrangled over the height of the ceiling. Finally it fell into disuse.

ONE-PACKAGE IDEA ABANDONED

The second experiment was the one-package money bill of last year, which was abandoned this year. Chairman CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee and Chairman BYRD of the Joint Committee on Non-Essential Expenditures believe the one-package plan was a success.

It was scrapped, however, when administration leaders joined with Republicans in the House to override the Appropriations Committee at the start of the 1951 session.

This made it necessary for the House and Senate to return this year to the old system of bringing out a dozen separate departmental bills, and Congress is far behind its normal schedule in disposing of them. Although the appropriation bills are supposed to be laws by July 1, not a single 1952 supply bill has been completed. It probably will be late in August before the money bills are all on President Truman's desk.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the last statement to which I have referred is:

One of several plans under consideration would set up a joint committee on the budget, similar to the joint committee the two Houses have maintained for many years to study taxes.

I am quite satisfied that that refers to Senate bill 913, entitled "A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States."

The bill reads in part as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the Joint Committee) and to be composed of 10 members as follows:

"(1) Five members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, three from the majority party and two from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and"—

It goes on with the details of the so-called plan, which is an amendment to section 138 (a), which is a rule of both Houses, under which we are now operating.

It is my understanding that the reason why this particular bill was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, is found in the fact that it is provided, in section 102 (1) (g), subdivision (2), that:

Such committee shall have the duty of—

* * * * *

(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

With that I have no quarrel. That is the job of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. But, inasmuch as the bill would amend sections 138 (a), if Senate bill 913 is the one referred to in the article, it very definitely would amend a rule. For that reason, in my humble opinion, the bill at least should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration before it comes to the Senate, if it should be reported at all to the Senate. My feeling is that the Committee on Rules and Administration has complete jurisdiction of such proposal.

I wish to state to the distinguished presiding officer and Members of the Senate that 4 years ago, and continuously since then the junior Senator from Nebraska, working with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], submitted a concurrent resolution which contains almost exactly what is contained in the bill, except that it takes members from four committees of the Senate and the House, instead of from two committees of the Senate and the House; that is, not only from the Committees on Appropriations, but from the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House.

I am not quarreling on the ground of any pride of authorship. As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I wish to state that the membership of the committee has spent a great deal of time in studying the kind of committee which we desire to set up in both Houses, which would be a legislative committee similar in purpose to the Bureau of the Budget of the executive arm of the Government, to keep us informed at all times, day in and day out, with reference to governmental expenditures and receipts. That is the purpose of the bill and of the concurrent resolution.

I feel that inasmuch as all the concurrent resolutions on this subject which have been offered in the past, as well as the bills on the subject which have been introduced, have in former years been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, this particular bill, which has been stated will be brought up—and I take it reference is made to S. 913—should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for further study. That is the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter.

The committee had done a considerable amount of work, long before this bill was ever introduced, on a proposition which to my mind is identical with the one contained in S. 913, with the exception that the concurrent resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska in years gone by and again this year provides for a committee to consist of members of four legislative committees, instead of members from two committees.

I make that statement with the deepest respect for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I feel that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should make the studies. That is the job of the committee. However, after the studies have been made I feel the proposed legislation should be referred to the commit-

tee which has jurisdiction, namely, the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that committee should report a bill or bills, if any, for the consideration of the Senate.

Once again, Mr. President, I claim no pride of authorship. That is not what is involved at all. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I believe it is my job to call the matter to the attention of the Members of the Senate. While we have no objection to the studies being made—and I say they should be made by the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments—before a bill is reported to the Senate it should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Whatever legislation is recommended ought to come from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I thank the distinguished majority leader for giving me an opportunity to bring the subject to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 913 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It is the bill which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the 'joint committee') and to be composed of 10 members as follows:

"(1) Five Members who are members of the Commitee on Appropriations of the Senate, three from the majority party and two from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Five Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, three from the majority party and two from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than 2 weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however,* That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) A majority of the Members of each House who are members of the joint committee shall together constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a lesser number, as determined by the joint committee, may constitute a subcommittee and be authorized to conduct hearings and make investigations. Any member of a subcommittee so designated shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of any hearing or investigation, but the concurrence of a majority of the members of such subcommittee shall be necessary before any report or findings may be submitted to the joint committee.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, during and after the preparation thereof; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; and (C) to consider all available information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, essential programs, and changing economic conditions, and, on the basis thereof, report to said committees findings relating to revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or in relation to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of section 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, employ and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee, and all such employees shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties to which they may be assigned: *Provided, however,* That the services of any such employee may be terminated by the concurrence of a majority of the members of the joint committee. No person shall be employed by the joint committee until a thorough investigation as to loyalty and security shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a favorable report on said investigation submitted to the chairman or vice chairman.

"(h) The joint committee shall assign members of its staff (1) to assist the staff of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending in the House of Representatives, and (2) to assist the staff of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending in the Senate. At other times the staff of the joint committee shall serve the joint committee directly.

"(i) Employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the books, documents, papers, reports, preliminary and other estimates of budget requirements, or other records of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia: *Provided, however,* That such employees shall not be permitted access to books, documents, papers, reports, estimates, records, or any other thing containing information classified for security purposes unless specifically authorized by the joint committee to receive such types of classified information.

"(j) It shall be the duty of each agency of the Government to supply to the joint committee any copies of any budgetary request submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, which the joint committee or any subcommittee thereof may request, either for regular or supplemental appropriations required for each fiscal year, with the detailed justifications in support thereof. Members of the staff of the joint committee are authorized to attend hearings of the Bureau of the Budget at which representatives of agencies justify their budgetary requests.

"(k) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(l) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department,

commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptrolled General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(m) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

Mr. WHERRY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 38. A similar concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, is now before the Committee on Rules and Administration. I ask that the entire text of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD, including the section at the end which has been stricken. It is the Byrd provision with reference to a one-package appropriation bill. It was stricken because the Byrd bill had passed in both Houses. I should like to have the entire concurrent resolution printed in the RECORD. It shows not only the recommendations made by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which were reported on three different occasions by the committee, but also the Byrd provisions.

There being no objection, Senate Concurrent Resolution 38 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby established a committee to prepare the legislative budget (hereinafter referred to as the 'committee'), to be composed of five members of the Senate Committee on Finance and five members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and five members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and five members of the House Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and not more than three members of each of said committees shall be members of the majority party. A vacancy in the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. At the beginning of each Congress the committee shall meet at the call of the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations and shall select its own chairman and vice chairman, except that the first meeting shall be called in July [1949] *1950*. A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum and the the powers confered upon them by this section may be exercised by a majority vote.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare and report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives at the beginning of each regular session of Congress a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall be based upon the studies and investigations of the committee, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditures in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by the committee. In addition to setting the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year, including a reserve for deficiencies, the committee may also recommend that public revenues or the public debt be increased or decreased, as the case may be; and such recommendations shall be reported to Congress and referred to its appropriate committees by February 15. [After the legislative budget shall have been reported, all bills authorizing appropriations reported by legislative committees shall be referred to the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, which shall render a report within 15 days to Congress showing the estimated cost of such legislation and the effect of that cost on the legislative budget.] *All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned with the expenditure of any funds required to meet the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years. Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews shall, when practicable, be included within the accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported. It shall be the responsibility of the committee to study such reports and report to the Congress as soon as possible thereafter the effect of that cost on the legislative budget.*

"(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act as such times and places, to employ such experts and such clerical and other assistants and to fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisible. At least one-third of any staff so employed shall be nominated and appointed by, and assigned to assist the minority party.

"(d) The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to pay the expenses of the committee, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

["SEC. 2. Commencing with the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, all appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the 'Consolidated General Appropriation Act of ——' (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted, but the aggregate total to be appropriated for expenditure in such year, including any amount reserved for deficiencies, shall approximate the maximum total recommended by the legislative budget committee. As used in this paragraph the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

["(a) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

["(b) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

["(1) the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

["(2) estimates of the amounts to be transferred between such appropriations;

["(3) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from each appropriation referred to in clause (1);

["(4) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from the balances of prior appropriations;

["(5) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (3) and (4); and

["(6) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of such fiscal year from the appropriations referred to in clause (1).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during such fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report, on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

["(c) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, for each wholly owned Government corporation or other agency of the Government which is authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering such receipts into the Treasury of the United States and which uses a checking account maintained with the Treasurer of the United States for that purpose (A) the estimated expenditures (other than retirement of borrowing) to be made out of such checking account for the fiscal year, (B) the estimated receipts (other than borrowing) to be deposited in such checking account for such fiscal year, and (C) the difference between (A) and (B).

["(d) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to ap-

propriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

["(e) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conforms with this rule.

"(f) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon."]

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Alton Adolor Lessard, of Maine to be United States attorney for the district of Maine; and

Frank B. Potter, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas.

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Richard C. O'Connell, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—DR. MARTHA M. ELIOT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Martha M. Eliot, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, Dr. Martha Eliot, although born in Massachusetts, has been a citizen of my State of Connecticut for 30 years, dating back to the time when she joined the faculty of the School of Medicine of Yale University. By coincidence it was the year in which I graduated from Yale University.

She is one of the most remarkable women of our time. She is one of the foremost pediatricians of the Nation and of the world.

Dr. Eliot was graduated from Radcliffe College and later received her M. D. degree from Johns Hopkins Medical School. While she was a member of the pediatric department, Yale University School of Medicine, she also joined the Children's Bureau staff, in order to undertake a detailed community study of the prevention and control of rickets in children. The study was carried forward in New Haven. Seven years later other and further studies of rickets and its relation to the growth of bone and the quantity and form of vitamin D were carried out in Puerto Rico, New Haven, and Detroit.

In 1934 Dr. Eliot began her association with the Children's Bureau as Director of the Bureau of Child Hygiene, to develop a broad program of maternal and child health. She wrote one of the early revisions of Infant Care, the best selling Government booklet, which has now passed the 24,000,000 mark.

From the time Dr. Eliot became a public servant in the Children's Bureau to this day, all through the depression years, the war period, and the postwar era of rehabilitation and reconstruction, she has carried forward unceasingly her great work in behalf of the children of our country and of the world.

During the depression years, she was active in drawing public attention to the fact that the lean years of unemployment were having an increasingly severe effect on the health and nutrition and general well-being of children.

Later on, when war came, Dr. Eliot went to England to observe how Britain was adapting its child-health and welfare services to the war shortages. As an official observer of the civil-defense mission during and after the blitz, she wrote with unique authority on the welfare of mothers and children.

Mr. President, I remember when I visited wartime England in 1942 the surprise with which I heard from Lord Woolton, who was responsible for the rationing program in England, that, despite shortages and rationing, the British people had learned how greatly to improve the diet of their children, so that their teeth were better, and the children were taller and healthier. That was the kind of work in which Dr. Eliot was cooperating and to which she was giving herself during the war years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a biographical statement of some of the high lights in the life of this remarkable woman.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT: MARTHA M. ELIOT, M. D.

Dr. Martha M. Eliot's association with the United States Children's Bureau began in 1924, when she became a consultant. In 1934, she was appointed Assistant Chief and in 1941 became Associate Chief, in which capacity she remained until her resignation in 1949. She was in charge of the health and medical services of the Bureau which include the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs under the Social Security Act. During the war period she directed the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care program under which care was provided for more than 1,500,000 servicemen's wives and infants.

A graduate of Radcliffe College, Dr. Eliot had her medical training at Johns Hopkins University. She served then as house officer at the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital in Boston, and later was in residence at the St. Louis Children's Hospital and the New Haven Hospital, in the Department of Pediatrics.

From 1921 to 1935 Dr. Eliot was on the staff of the Pediatric Department of Yale University School of Medicine. Her activities during this period included investigations into the prevention of rickets. She is the author and co-author of various papers on the control and prevention of rickets, child nutrition, and maternal and child health.

During 1935–36, she studied maternal and child health activities in Europe. This study was made in connection with the work being done in this country, following passage of the Social Security Act, which made Federal funds available to assist the States in developing health services for mothers and children.

In 1936, Dr. Eliot was a member of a group of experts appointed by the Health Organization of the League of Nations in Geneva for a study of nutrition in infants and adolescents. The previous year she represented the Children's Bureau at a meeting in Geneva of the Child Welfare Committee of the League of Nation's Advisory Commission for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People.

In June 1946, Dr. Eliot served as vice chairman of the United States delegation to the International Health Conference of the United Nations. This conference drafted the constitution for the World Health Organization. She had previously served on health committees of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

In May 1947, as special technical consultant to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations, Dr. Eliot visited a number of European countries to study the needs and make recommendations to the fund in planning its relief and rehabilitation program. Her itinerary included France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Yugoslavia Greece, Italy, and Switzerland. She was chairman of the United States delegation to the Health Congress of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in Torquay, England, the first week in June.

During World War II Dr. Eliot was involved in many activities relating to children. She was a member of the United States Civil Defense Commission to Great Britain and was responsible for the planning in this country for evacuation of children in the event of bombing.

In 1949, Dr. Eliot resigned from the Children's Bureau to become Assistant Director General of the World Health Organization, with headquarters in Geneva. In this position she has carried general responsibility for WHO's operations in the broad field of public health, including malaria, tuberculosis, and venereal disease control; maternal and child health; nutrition; and environmental sanitation.

She has supervised WHO's international exchange of public health fellows in its demonstration projects, and the assignment of expert consultants to member nations, working through the regional offices around the world. Broadly speaking, she has been responsible for development of program in WHO.

Dr. Eliot is a fellow of the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Public Health Association.

HONORS AND RECOGNITION

Fall 1948: Recipient of Lasker award for administrative achievements in the organization and operation of the emergency maternity and infant care program (a wartime Government program providing medical and hospital care, by physicians in private practice, for wives and infants of servicemen in four lowest pay grades).

Summer 1948: Appointed by the President as one of three official delegates representing the United States at the first World Health Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland.

Spring 1948: Awarded degree, doctor of humane letters, University of Rochester (N. Y.).

Winter 1948: Recipient of Parent's magazine award for outstanding service to children.

Fall 1947: Installed as president of American Public Health Association—first woman elected to this office.

1949–50: President of National Conference of Social Work.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, with the confirmation today of Dr. Eliot's nomination, she will become the fourth distinguished woman to head the Children's Bureau. With two of her great predecessors, Dr. Grace Abbott and Miss Katharine Lenroot, I have had the good fortune to work and to be well acquainted.

The Bureau was created in 1912 to "investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life among all classes of our people." In the 39 years of its existence it has made many important and far-reaching contributions to the welfare of children, not only in our own country but all over the world.

If infant mortality were as high today as it was in the early days of the Children's Bureau, we would be losing nearly 250,000 more babies this year than are now likely to die.

Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] pointed out on the floor of the Senate that our population is now increasing, because of the excess of births over deaths, at the rate of 6,000 a day. Were it not for the advances of the kind I am indicating, which have been so largely sponsored and fostered by the Children's Bureau, today the rate of increase would be closer to 5,000. I submit that is a very substantial difference and a very great contribution.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if maternal mortality were as high today as it was in those early years, we would be losing some 19,000 mothers a year, as against a probable 3,000—more than six times as many.

Mr. President, in the early days of the Children's Bureau it was a common sight to see very young children at work in sweatshops, in the beet fields, and even in mines. Today we have a good Federal child-labor law and many good State laws which set a basic minimum age of 16 for the employment of youngsters either in factories or during school hours.

The Bureau pioneered in the first Federal grant-in-aid program for social welfare, the Sheppard-Towner Act. It provided grants for helping the States develop their maternal and child-health services. This act was the forerunner of our great system of social-security services for children, enacted in 1935.

The biggest maternity-care program ever undertaken in this country, the emergency maternity and infant care program for the wives and children of servicemen, was a responsibility placed on the Children's Bureau by the Congress. This was one of the great morale builders for the men in the armed services during World War II, and it succeeded in providing care for 1,200,000 wives and close to a quarter of a million sick infants of servicemen.

It is impossible to calculate the help and comfort the Children's Bureau has brought to generations of mothers in our Nation through its bulletins on prenatal and infant care, and young children.

I have just referred to the booklet Infant Care, written by Dr. Eliot. It is interesting to note that this remarkable booklet has been translated into eight languages.

Deeply concerned over the problems of transient, unemployed, and homeless youth during the great depression, the Children's Bureau, through its studies of this problem, laid the groundwork for the constructive work done for youth during the thirties through the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Again, during the depression, the Children's Bureau was the only agency of the Federal Government which attempted to measure the impact of the depression on unemployed families. Its studies in this field contributed greatly to the Federal program of public assistance which later developed under the Social Security Act.

Mr. President, in these few minutes, it is manifest that I can touch on only a very few of the ways in which the Children's Bureau has served as spokesman for the children and as—perhaps this is not too strong a phrase to use—the conscience of the American people in conserving and enhancing the well-being of its people.

Much of its great contribution must be attributed to the quality of leadership it has had in the three women who have directed its work up to the present. Each of these three women has been motivated by a deep belief that every child should have his fair chance to develop to his fullest capabilities.

These women would be the first to disclaim any monopoly of credit for the tremendous gains in assuring a fair chance for more children, but we in the Congress who have an opportunity to witness and observe closely the operation of the agencies of our Government cannot fail to recognize their great leadership in the achievement of these gains.

We in the Senate now have the privilege, in confirming the nomination of Dr. Eliot, of showing our confidence in her ability to carry forward the work of the Children's Bureau on behalf of the Nation's children and our faith in her devotion to the high trust we are reposing in her.

We Americans still have much to do for our children. Too many of our babies are dying. Too many of our children are beyond the reach of good medical care. Too many of our orphans, neglected and delinquent children, fail to receive the expert help our child-welfare workers know how to give them. Too many of us parents are still ignorant of many of the most elementary things about child growth and development.

I look to Dr. Eliot to give all of us inspired and sustained leadership in bringing greater protection and health to our Nation's children and young people.

I congratulate President Truman on this gratifying appointment of one of the most distinguished citizens of Connecticut and, indeed, of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two pages, headed "Children's Bureau," from the 1950 annual report of the Federal Security Agency. These are the two introductory pages of the 16-page summary of the remarkable achievements of the Bureau during the last year, under the leadership of the famous and distinguished Miss Katharine Lenroot.

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

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

The year 1950 was a significant point in history for children in the United States.

Our child population reached an all-time high in 1949.

No earlier year in our history witnessed such mobilization of citizen concern for children, focused this time on the White House Conference on Children and Youth, called by the President of the United States and scheduled to meet in Washington in December 1950.

The Eighty-first Congress had before it more measures of direct benefit to children than any previous Congress. Though few of these measures had become law by the close of the fiscal year, their number and variety of approach to children's problems testified to the desire of many citizens for greater help from their Federal Government in advancing the well-being of children.

Many developments during the year showed the tenacity and soundness of the American tradition of using private associations, as well as Government, in the solution of children's problems. Relationships between public and private agencies in many instances were examined, in some improved.

Never before was it as safe for mothers to have babies. Never before have children had as great likelihood of surviving the physical hazards of birth and of contagious diseases during their growing years. With the conquest of these diseases now within sight, the problems of emotional and mental growth and development stand out as the most pervasive challenge of our time, in the broad field of child well-being.

In our developing social services for children there is increasing awareness that such services too long have had to wait until serious damage was done a child; that more ways must be found to reach children in their own homes before they are emotionally hurt.

An understanding of the processes of normal growth and development, it is seen, is basic to all professions dealing with children, both children who are sick and those who are well. With this has come the realization that our specialists can no longer work effectively in isolation; that each has something to contribute to all others.

Never have so many questions about the way children grow, and what they need to be buoyantly healthy, been laid on the doorsteps of our physical, social, and psychological researchers, for answer.

Public health and welfare services reached more children in various ways, but in no sense did they keep pace with the great increase in numbers, especially of very young children. Nor was there any indication that private services expanded proportionately.

To be worth anything, services for children have to be manned by competent people, and it takes years to train physicians, nurses, social workers, nutritionists, dentists, psychologists, and psychiatrists. Today's failure to keep pace with children's needs can be chalked up, at least in part, to failures of years past to build a greater and better corps of professional workers. Throughout the country, colleges and universities are doing all they can to multiply the numbers and increase the skills of people who work with children. Yet the demand for these workers is still far in excess of the supply.

Shortly after the close of the fiscal year, the President signed the 1950 amendments

to the Social Security Act, which should mean a better chance for good health and care for tens of thousands of children.

These amendments authorized Congress to increase annual grants for State and local maternal and child health services from $11,000,000 to $15,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951 and to $16,500,000 in 1952 and thereafter; for services for crippled children, from $7,500,000 to $12,000,000 in 1951 and to $15,000,000 in 1952 and thereafter; for child welfare services, from $3,500,000 to $10,000,000 in 1951 and thereafter. To implement the new law, Congress appropriated, for the remainder of the fiscal year 1951, $8,250,000 in addition to the total of $22,000,000 authorized under the old law.

Enactment of H. R. 6000 (Public Law 734) reaffirms the basic principle of the original Social Security Act about which a Senate report said in 1935: "The heart of any program for social security must be the child. All parts of the Socity Security Act are in a very real sense measures for the security of children." This act recognizes that if children are to have the chance to grow as happy, healthy individuals, they need not only family economic security; they must have the informed and sympathetic help, too, of doctors, nurses, social workers, and other skilled people when they need it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Martha M. Eliot, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 25, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 24, 1951:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

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

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

James J. Callaway	Elaine A. Schwinge
Seymour Levine	Ernest D. Carlson
Francis T. Flood	William M. Lordi
William P. Galen	James F. Alexander
Gerald W. Labiner	Sherman N. Kieffer
Ernest C. Siegfried	Charles S. McCammon
Nicholas L. Petrakis	Robert A. Mayer
Robert Schwartz	Rodrique A. Gravelle
John S. Shuttleworth	Sidney J. Curran
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr.	Eugene J. VanScott
Page H. Seekford	Charles J. Cherre
John D. Talbert	Vincent J. DePaulo

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

David C. Miller	Margaret S. Spies
Allan B. Carter	Leonard A. Lewis
Frank L. Weaver, Jr.	Cameron L. Self
Clayton R. Haberman	Donald W. Tharp
Warren H. Proudfoot	Bernard G. Keizer
David J. Crosby	Gordon F. Wise
Melvin R. Davis	

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

Harold Lyons

IN THE NAVY

The following-named line officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Leslie A. Kniskern	Selden B. Spangler
Bernard E. Manseau	Joseph N. Wenger
Logan McKee	
George A. Holderness, Jr.	

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 24, 1951:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Martha M. Eliot, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 24, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou infinite and eternal God, whose divine presence and power hallow all our days, grant that in these strange and arduous times we may appropriate Thy revealing and sustaining grace.

We know that of ourselves we can do nothing. We penitently confess that again and again we are smitten with a sense of how insignificant and fragile our individual and corporate life is in contrast with the vastness of the universe and the greatness of the tasks which confront us.

We beseech Thee that when the days appear irrevocably dark and the problems and struggles of life are so very difficult, we may accept them as a challenge to increase the ardor of our efforts and to mobilize our faith in the abiding reality and the inexhaustible strength of the moral and spiritual resources.

God forbid that we should ever invalidate the splendor of these resources and the revelations of Thy truth and ways of righteousness by surrendering to our fears and forebodings and allowing our trust in Thee to be eclipsed by feelings of doubt and despair.

Hear us in the name of Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 315. An act to liberalize the service-pension laws relating to veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the Boxer Rebellion, and their dependents;

H. R. 385. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.;

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Sonja Lohmann and her minor son;

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Karl Chimani and Ada Chimani;

H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Bela Abeles and Maria Abeles;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of Bror Rainer Heikel;

H. R. 1072. An act to amend the existing law to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies of United States Government life insurance;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gizella Kezdy-Reich;

H. R. 1104. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Sageros;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Lum Ying;

H. R. 1200. An act to correct an error in section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947, "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States";

H. R. 1201. An act to amend section 4 of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary-ration basis;

H. R. 1233. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vasilia Parselles;

H. R. 1443. An act for the relief of Paul Matelli;

H. R. 1691. An act for the relief of Sylvio Latino;

H. R. 1834. An act for the relief of Florence Grace Pond Whitehill;

H. R. 1899. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution";

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Sanae Iida;

H. R. 2064. An act for the relief of Dr. Ihor Sevcenko;

H. R 2170. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Maria Lummer Valentine;

H. R. 2180. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence E. Homann and her son, John A. Villas;

H. R. 2204. An act for the relief of Lamar Calloway;

H. R. 2299. An act for the relief of Biagio Poidimani;

H. R. 2406. An act for the relief of B. H. Manley;

H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margit Helena Falk Raboff;

H. R. 2455. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maryanna Boppel;

H. R. 2995. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder;

H. R. 3002. An act for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co.;

H. R. 3018. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in certain lands in Klamath County, Oreg., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3193. An act to establish a rate of pension for aid and attendance under part III of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended;

H. R. 3217. An act for the relief of the Peerless Casualty Co., and of Charles E. Nelson and Irwin I. Main;

H. R. 3455. An act to amend section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, relating to parole of Federal prisoners;

H. R. 3549. An act to modify eligibility requirements for payment of pension to certain widows of veterans of the Civil War, Indian Wars, and Spanish American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Katharina Metz;

H. R. 3708. An act for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner;

H. R. 3950. An act for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty;

H. R. 4000. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level premium term insurance for successive 5-year periods;

H. R. 4165. An act for the relief of A. D. Woods; and

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to provide that an aircraft carrier shall be named the *Forrestal*.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 629. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of William J. Drinkwine;

H. R. 2192. An act to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930;

H. R. 2736. An act to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3911. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged; and

H. R. 4106. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" by adding a new section thereto known as section 1732b to permit the photographic reproduction of business records and the introduction of the same in evidence.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 76. An act for the relief of Herbert H. Heller;

S. 83. An act for the relief of First Lt. James E. Willcox;

S. 100. An act to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens;

S. 121. An act for the relief of Tryntje Bierema;

S. 269. An act for the relief of Nicholas Papaeconomou;

S. 302. An act to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act;

S. 367. An act for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Teruko Okuaki;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Rosita Anita Navarro and Ramona Alicia Navarro;

S. 509. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; U. S. C. 718d), as amended;

S. 537. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 810. An act for the relief of Howard I. Smith;

S. 880. An act for the relief of Ann Lamplugh;

S. 950. An act to amend the act authorizing the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of such tribes under such act, and for other purposes;

S. 1028. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lou Wong Shong Ngon;

S. 1133. An act for the relief of Sophie Strauss;

S. 1146. An act to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations;

S. 1166. An act to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto;

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Davis Min Lee;

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1349. An act to establish a Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1365. An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation;

S. 1390. An act to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations;

S. 1403. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property at Shumaker, Ark.;

S. 1474. An act for the relief of E. C. Browder and Charles Keylon;

S. 1562. An act for the relief of Harvey Marden; and

S. 1704. An act to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1717) entitled "An act to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. IVES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. THOMAS submitted a conference report and statement on 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.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4740, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] had 2 hours and 17 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] had 1 hour and 37 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will yield some time now? I am not ready to put a speaker on at this time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, we are in this position: We have no requests whatever for time on this side.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman give me some additional time, then?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know what might happen later in the day.

As long as we are now speaking about time for speeches, may I suggest that hereafter when these mimeographed Republican speeches that emanate from the same mimeograph machine are sent to the Press Gallery the Members' names be spelled correctly. I cannot comprehend a Member's office sending a speech to the Press Gallery with the Member's name incorrectly spelled. If the gentleman would like to see one of them, I shall be glad to show it to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the gentleman comes from Brooklyn, too.

Mr. ROONEY. No, this gentleman comes from Ohio. His name is A-y-e-r-s, according to the press release. I understand the correct spelling of his name is A-y-r-e-s.

Mr. AYRES. May I say to the gentleman that I do not have a mimeograph machine in my office. I typed that speech up in my office. That name is quite often misspelled. The people that made the mimeographed copies for me made the error. If there is any doubt in the gentleman's mind, I should like him to pay a visit to my office. I would enjoy seeing him.

Mr. ROONEY. No, I accept the gentleman's explanation and will drop in for a social visit as soon as I have time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska desire to yield time?

Mr. STEFAN. I understand I have an hour and 37 minutes and the gentleman from New York has 2 hours and 17 minutes. I would like the gentleman from New York to yield some time until I have an opportunity to view the program here as to speakers. If the gentleman has no speakers to put on in this general debate, would the gentleman yield me additional time?

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot do that at this time, I must say to the gentleman

from Nebraska. I do not know what the situation will be later in the day. If the gentleman from Nebraska is going to find himself short of time, when we get to that point I shall be glad to consider his request. We should not have any difficulty in that regard.

This bill in previous years never took more than a couple of hours to debate, but this year the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] wanted 8 hours for general debate. The Rules Committee decided upon 6 hours. I do not know what we are going to do with all this time.

Mr. STEFAN. We have plenty of speakers on this side, who could perhaps consume 8 hours on this very important bill, but I think in fairness the gentleman from New York should yield some time at this time in order that I can prepare my program.

Mr. ROONEY. Perhaps we can do so later.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman from New York yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska now?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not see any necessity for it. The gentleman's side has an hour and 37 minutes remaining as matters now stand. We do not have a speaker available at the moment. We would be glad to consider yielding your side part of our time later on in the day.

Mr. STEFAN. I have no speaker available at this time. I will have in a few minutes. Can the gentleman put somebody on?

Mr. ROONEY. How much time does the gentleman ask us to yield in addition to the time he already has?

Mr. STEFAN. Can the gentleman give us a half hour or an hour? The gentleman has 2 hours and 17 minutes. Give me 30 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. I will give the gentleman 20 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from New York indicates that he has no speakers.

The CHAIRMAN. If somebody does not yield time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand the parliamentary situation, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman from New York has yielded me an additional 20 minutes; is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes. As a matter of fact, since the gentleman from Nebraska whom I greatly admire makes the request, we will make it the 30 minutes he originally requested.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield 30 minutes of his time to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield 30 minutes at this point to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Does that require the gentleman from Nebraska to remain standing during the course of the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The Chair does not understand it that way. This is general debate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a most important responsibility of the Voice of America is to bring hope and encouragement to the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain. The Voice is apparently failing to meet that responsibility.

I want to read to the House a number of comments on Voice of America broadcasts to Poland. These comments have been collected from letters and other messages by Polish writers and newspapermen. The material has been brought out of that unhappy country, in large measure, by recent refugees.

Among other things, the comments indicate that the Voice of America is still intent on protecting and defending the State Department for the Yalta, Potsdam, and other betrayals of freedom we have suffered. Because the Voice is concentrating on covering up past blunders by the United States Government, the Voice appears, in the words of one of these informants, "afraid or incapable even of strongly challenging the constant flow of anti-American Soviet propaganda."

Let me read some of these comments from Poles now or recently living in Poland. The comments are theirs, not mine:

COMMENT A

Voice of America broadcasts are mostly uninteresting, not sufficiently topical, too full of detailed news and comments about American internal affairs and events incomprehensible to Poles who cannot follow daily developments in the United States of America.

COMMENT B

News and comments on international affairs are usually presented from a wrong angle and often in a way which is irritating and even offensive to the Poles. The Voice of America broadcasters do not appear to understand Polish mentality and susceptibilities.

For instance: Tone and gist of such broadcasts is so increasingly favorable to Germany and the Germans that they create the impression that the United States Government intentionally wishes to provoke the Poles, who have suffered more than any other nation from German aggression, devastation, extermination, brutality, and racialism, by exaggerated praise of German achievements and qualities.

On the other hand, news about Germany which would greatly interest the Poles—such as the possibilities and progress of rearmament in the three western zones of occupation in Germany against Communist aggression—are never mentioned.

COMMENT C

Too favorable comments and almost loving tone are broadcast on Tito's Yugoslavia and lavish praise about Tito's regime and its achievements. This exaggerated praise for a purely Communist government, imposed upon the people of Yugoslavia by a ruthless dictatorship, coming from the allegedly democratic United States of America, arouses logical doubts in Poland concerning American foreign policy. The Poles wonder if the United States Government is aware of what is really going on in Yugoslavia, or if the United States Government is becoming ideologically pro-Communist.

COMMENT D

Voice of America comments on Polish internal affairs and the Communist activities of the present regime are most superficial, belated and show ignorance of actual government trends in the Soviet-imposed task of sovietization.

The broadcasts entirely ignore and never counter the constant bitter attacks against the U. S. A. in books, in official Communist papers, leaflets, broadcasts, and press and other means of anti-American propaganda shrewdly and incessantly being spread in Poland under Moscow's orders.

Poles are coming to believe that the United States Government is still afraid of offending the Soviets and their imposed Polish Communist puppet government or that it lacks arguments to refute Communist accusations.

COMMENT E

Probably the weakest part of Voice of America broadcasts is its so-called humorous auditions, playlets, and witticisms. Their satire is of poor quality, low and childish. Their tone is such that it gives the Poles the impression that Americans regard them as half-wits and morons.

I have certainly seen evidence to substantiate that one, Mr. Chairman.

COMMENT F

Broadcasts about the activities of Americans of Polish descent (the so-called American Polonia) do not interest the Poles in Poland sufficiently to warrant accounts of events and ceremonies. On the other hand, they complain about the total absence of news about the fate and activities of the refugee Poles, of the Polish refugee press, of the Polish people now spread all over the world as refugees.

The Voice of America never mentions Polish professors or books written by Poles abroad. It has never given any news about the fate or whereabouts of Polish soldiers of General Anders and other formations of the Polish Allied Army which fought so gallantly shoulder to shoulder with the Western Powers in World War II. The fate and whereabouts of these people and their families naturally greatly interests the Poles in Poland.

COMMENT G

When one considers that special legislation has been passed by the United States Congress to enable additional immigration to the United States of Polish displaced persons and of 18,000 soldiers of the Polish Army and their families, that many thousands of these Poles have been received as immigrants in Latin-American countries and in Canada, it appears surprising, to say the least, that no mention of these facts should be made by the Voice of America—the official American organ of American propaganda.

The Polish people conclude that the United States Government, still composed of New Dealers, supporters of the shameful Yalta and Potsdam deals on Poland, are anxious to avoid mentioning any facts which are even remotely connected with the existence of the Polish legal government and the Polish Army which fought in the invasion of Europe and in Italy after having sacrificed these allies and their native country for opportunistic reasons and agreed to Soviet domination over Poland.

It seems incredible that the Poles should hear of favorable American immigration laws for Polish soldiers through Radio Madrid and not directly from the United States of America.

I should say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that I am informed that the Voice of America has dealt with the soldiers of the Polish Army and the Polish displaced persons admitted to the United States. It would appear, however, that the Voice's statements cannot have been very frequent or strong, inasmuch as they do not seem to have made much impression.

COMMENT H

Generally speaking, practically all reports on Voice of America programs issuing from Poland express the opinion that they are uninteresting, drab, bureaucratic in tone, unconvincing.

They give the impression that they are prepared and spoken by clerks who do their job perfunctorily without any intelligent understanding of the human element or of Polish susceptibilities.

Please note the following, Mr. Chairman:

COMMENT I

Western radio broadcasts beamed to Poland are rated by the Poles as follows:

1. Radio Madrid is considered the best of all. It is interesting, topical, nonpartisan, informative, and is therefore widely listened to and acted upon, being regarded as a trustworthy anti-Communist directive.

2. The broadcasts of the British Broadcasting Corp. are regarded as next best.

3. In most recent reports the Liberty broadcasts of the National Committee for a Free Europe (N. Y.) are rated as somewhat improved. They are classed as third best after the two above-mentioned ones.

4. The Voice of America broadcasts come last. Very few of us here (in Poland) consider it worth while to lose time and run personal risks listening to the Voice of America program (June 1951).

I close Mr. Chairman with the following verbal message from reliable Polish leaders and press men which to me is particularly interesting. It was brought out of Poland by a refugee who managed to flee from that country in June 1951. I quote:

How can we learn the truth about American foreign policy? The United States is fighting the Soviet-led Chinese Reds in Korea. But local Communist propaganda tells us that Americans are not victorious and the proof advanced is that they cannot follow up their small temporary military advantages and have never dared bomb Manchurian bases. We are being told by Moscow-sponsored broadcasts that peace will soon be concluded on China Red terms and that Korea will be liberated together with Formosa from American imperialism. Also that the glorious Allied Chinese Peoples Democracy will replace the traitor Chiang Kai-shek in the U. N.

Here it is again, Mr. Chairman. That proposed solution we have heard so often in recent months, attributed to Nehru and Attlee and often said to have the off-the-record, behind the scenes acquiescence of our own State Department.

I hope devoutly, Mr. Chairman, that this is propaganda and not fact. This would be a sorry ending to a war which has already cost us between $7,000,000,000 and $8,000,000,000 and perhaps 350,000 casualties.

But to return to the quotation:

This Soviet information is never refuted by the Voice of America. Are we to accept the Communist version?

We hear a lot from western broadcasts about Western European rearmament and General Eisenhower. The United States is openly rearming Europe in case of a third world war against the Soviets.

At the same time the Voice of America is full of praise for Tito's regime in Yugoslavia which is no less Communist and ruthlessly dictatorial than Soviet communism.

When are your Americans sincere? Are they sincere when they are anti-Soviet and anti-Communist or when they appear afraid to press their advantages in Korea and praise Tito communism?

The Voice of America does not clarify these problems. On the contrary, by its superficiality on all subjects and by avoiding to discuss vital ones, it only deepens our doubts. It does not ring true. The number of its Polish listeners has therefore been steadily decreasing. Tell your Americans that they are wasting their time trying to sell the American democratic way of life to us who are suffering under totalitarian communism imposed upon us at Yalta.

We have bought democracy long ago. What we want to know from the United States of America is if and when they will do something definite to help us throw off this yoke. Their pro-German sympathies, so evident in their Voice of America broadcasts, make us fear that, even if they do ultimately roll back the Soviets to their legal prewar boundaries of Russia proper, they may then approve of and participate in Poland's Prussianization as they approved of and participated at Yalta and Potsdam in our sovietization. Their verbal attacks on Soviet expansion and communism cannot inspire our confidence, as long as the United States Government upholds the Yalta agreements and as long as it appears afraid or incapable even of strongly challenging the constant flow of anti-American Soviet propaganda.

These extraordinary comments, Mr. Chairman, speak for themselves.

During the Eighty-first Congress, a Senate committee, following conferences with the heads of state and leaders of government in 16 countries and dependencies, "found ample evidence that our Voice of America, our State Department, and American foreign policy have not been successful in meeting the Communist propaganda."

The hearings on this bill indicate that the State Department over the years has been "beseiged from field offices around the world with suggestions, demands, and requests to correct the programing of the Voice of America."

Criticism has been directed at program content. It has been directed at methods. It has been directed at personnel.

Some of the radio scripts which I have personally seen have been absolutely worthless. Some of them, in my opinion, have been actually harmful.

In his speech of April 9, 1951, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] referred to "specific instances of grossly improper management, where the taxpayers' dollars were thrown down the drain pipe by the people in charge of this program."

Other instances of failure to cooperate with the Congress appear in the hearings on this bill.

Within the funds made available by the Congress, the agency has made it possible for State Department personnel to make no less than 354 speeches in 29 States in a period of 18 months. It has also found it possible to pay some $500,000 to the Gallup poll and other commercial firms to evaluate the work it has been trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the objectives of the Voice of America. Their attainment, in my judgment, is of tremendous importance under present conditions.

I am opposed, however, to spending hundreds of millions of dollars for a Voice of America whose work to date I heard characterized in Europe by high authority only a month ago as "pitiful."

Surely it should be possible to marshal the enormous advertising skill in this country and to apply it through skillful and trustworthy personnel, by methods which will assure results that are vital not only to America but to the entire Western World.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, for several years we have been told how Russia refuses to let American magazines and moving-picture films be distributed in Russia. We have been told that the same is true as far as iron-curtain countries are concerned. We know they jam and do everything to stop our radio programs. It is general knowledge that any dissemination of information to the people of Russia and iron-curtain countries is not permitted in any way.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter along those lines. I do not know whether or not all House Members receive an information bulletin from the Embassy of the U. S. S. R. at 2112 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, or not. Our office has received a copy twice monthly for several years. I did not ask for it or buy it. Anyone can obtain it at the subscription rate of $2.40 per year, $2 for 10 months, 10 or more copies to one address $1 per subscription, sample copy free. Checks payable to the Information Bulletin of the Embassy of the U. S. S. R. It also states, "Material herein may be quoted or reproduced with or without credit."

This information was taken exactly as it appears on the inside of the front cover. If it is published twice monthly at the U. S. S. R. Embassy in Washington, they must have a large modern press. If it is published outside the Russian Embassy, and by a publishing concern in the United States, the owner or owners must be rather funny Americans.

Inasmuch as H. R. 4740, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, is before the House I feel it is in order to call your attention to the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin which is one of Russia's known ways of disseminating information in the United States. This appropriation bill calls for an expenditure of $85,000,000 for information. This is under title one of the bill, and is the subcommittee amount for international information now before the House. It

was reduced by the committee to that amount by $30,000,000 in the budget estimate.

Remember, the eighty-five million is only a part of the total for the Department of State. A great deal of the eighty-five million is for the Voice of America. I believe in advertising, but even with the committee reduction eighty-five million is still quite an advertising expense.

The Bureau of the Budget report for fiscal year 1951–52 on page 772 states under international information that radio programs are developed, produced, and transmitted from 38 transmitters in the United States and from overseas relay stations. It calls for daily broadcasts in the 1951 Campaign of Truth by furnishing radio receivers free to individuals in certain foreign countries.

From the U. S. S. R. Bulletin I want to read you how the Russians broadcast their viewpoint to Americans, to Communists, and sympathizers, to anyone in the United States who will listen. On owning a short-wave radio, to those in the back of their bulletin, possibly published in the United States and certainly sent out from the Russian Embassy here, they show, Moscow Radio broadcasts in English. I will read exactly from the magazine:

MOSCOW RADIO BROADCASTS IN ENGLISH

Radio programs in English are broadcast daily and Sunday from Moscow to the United States on the following schedule:

All time used is eastern standard.

Daily evening programs of news, political commentary, and side lights on Soviet life are broadcast from 6:20 p. m. to 10:58 p. m. on the following bands: 15.23, 11.88, 11.82, 9.67, 7.29, and 7.24 megacycles.

All programs begin with the news and a review of the press. These are followed by comment on Soviet or international subjects.

The following special features are included in the evening programs:

Mondays: Programs for farmers.

Tuesdays: Programs for youth.

Wednesdays: Scientific and cultural programs.

Thursdays: Programs in Russian for American Slavs.

Friday: Literary and musical programs entitled "In the Republics of the Land of the Soviets."

Saturdays: Economic reviews, weekly sports reviews, replies to letters from listeners.

Sundays: Concerts.

Will Russia let our Embassy in Moscow mail out such a magazine and information to Russians? She will not. Will she let our radio programs be broadcast to her own people and satellite nations? She will not.

I know under our Constitution we have, or are supposed to have, free speech and press. Here is one place I am willing to bypass the Constitution until this present situation is over. We may not be able to stop the publication and mailing of this pamphlet, but we can jam Russia's radio program.

KARL STEFAN, a member of the committee and who broadcasted for our Government to Czechoslovakia and the Philippines during the Japanese occupation, tells me that a Washington taxi driver turned on his radio and called Mr. STEFAN's attention to one of these Russian broadcasts. Mr. STEFAN informs me that any ham radio operator can jam this program of Russia's to the United States. They can jam it for little or nothing.

Why not jam it by the ham operators, the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of State, and everyone else who can do it? It should be done regardless of the Constitution. Why not fight communism fire with fire?

Why should this Government let Russia broadcast to American youths on Tuesdays? The Thursday's programs in Russian for American Slavs should certainly be jammed. Why not jam the whole works—Constitution notwithstanding?

If KARL STEFAN tells me any ham operator can jam this program at no cost, why not get it done? I believe the gentleman from Nebraska knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that Congress refuse to pass the State Department appropriation bill until the State Department makes an honest, sincere, and courageous attempt to free Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis, Jr.; and until they adopt a policy which will command respect abroad of America and American citizens.

I also hereby request the House Foreign Affairs Committee, whom I deeply respect, to cease for a moment in their debate of how many billions of dollars they shall give away and consider the resolutions before them on the Oatis case which attempt to restore the respect that is due American citizenry on foreign soil.

In the case of businessman Robert Vogeler, who spent 17 months in the prisons of Hungary, and Consul General Angus Ward, captive of Red China for 13 months, there is monumental evidence to the fact that the State Department will do nothing until it is forced by Congress or by public opinion.

A country's standing among the nations of the world is not measured by the gold in its vaults nor by the size of its armies, but it is measured by the respect accorded its citizens by other nations. The respect of the world is one of the greatest heritages that a nation can bestow upon its citizens.

We all remember the story of Paul who, when arrested, declared "I am a Roman born," and was accorded the respect, the rights, that citizens of the greatest country of that time received no matter where they wandered.

Americans have died on a thousand battlefields to establish and maintain that pride and the meaning of "I am an American." That sacred torch has been held high by men of all parties. Jefferson saw to it that the sacred right of citizenship in the United States was respected even by the Barbary pirates on the shores of Tripoli. Madison even allowed this Capitol to burn rather than allow the name of an American citizen to be insulted and trampled in the dust. To Jackson, the fact of being an American meant more than life itself. It is a great line of great Americans who have seen to it that the rights of an American citizen be respected in every corner, in every country, on every sea of this old world—Lincoln and McKinley; Teddy Roosevelt, who said "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead!" and Perdicaris was released alive; Cleveland and Wilson; Hoover and Franklin Delano Roosevelt—they had many different economic and political views but they all held sacred the right of the American citizen and the protection that was due each citizen.

So, too, we have had a great list of Secretaries of State who down through history have stood as citadels of protention in maintaining the rights of the American citizens abroad. There have been Monroe and Calhoun, Webster and Hay; Olney and Root; Bryan, Lansing, and Hughes; Kellogg and Stimson; Hull and Byrnes.

Something has happened in America in the last few years. Perhaps it is because of the philosophy of "America last" seems to be dominating the thinking of too many. Why anyone would take pride in belonging to that group of "America-lasters" is more than I can understand.

Today it would seem that America rewards our enemies and forgets our friends. We give special trade concessions to help those nations that are unfriendly to us, such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Today we are buying Czechoslovakian goods to the extent of more than $30,000,000 a year. We are giving them this trade to the detriment of our American business and labor. We are charging the Czechs just half the regular tariff rate, which is also to the detriment of American labor. Our markets are flooded, for example, with that blue glassware from Czechoslovakia, but we gave them good American gold in return for it. We are also giving England billions of dollars while they in turn ship supplies to Red China to kill American soldiers.

Why should any country respect the rights and lives of our American citizenry today? Out of this kind of dealings with foreign countries can only come disrespect. Out of this disrespect, this lack of decisive and firm action, can only come eventual war.

How far can we let foreign countries go in imprisoning and torturing our citizens? Do we let them get by with one, or two, or five? If so, why not 20, 50, or 100? Our American philosophy has been that every man is endowed with the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" and that any one life is just as important as any other in these United States.

If we cannot or will not command respect for American citizenry in Czechoslovakia, then let us bring our American citizens back to America and quit sending American gold and aid to Czechoslovakia. If we do not, soon the situation will arise which will make war inevitable. We are all opposed to war but we also know that a weak, vacillating, cowardly policy, ignoring the dignity of being an American, will bring war quicker than any other course.

As to Korea, in January of 1950 our Secretary of State said in effect that we

would not defend the rights of our friends, the South Koreans. Some 140,000 American casualties attest to the results of such a statement.

Bill Oatis was an honest, respected, loyal American from my home State. Oatis belonged to that great group of American newspapermen who must always be kept free. His only crime was that of being an honorable American citizen doing his job of reporting the news fairly and honestly. Now he is a felon, convicted by a kangaroo court run by hooligans. Czechoslovakia is insulting the American flag and American citizenry. Yet it flies the same U. N. flag that floats so freely here in these United States.

When we think of the great men who have sat in this distinguished Hall, does not such an incident make your face burn with shame. At least let us quit giving American gold to finance that kangaroo court in Czechoslovakia. Let us have enough pride and guts to deserve the 175 years of heritage that great Americans have so fearlessly given to us.

We all know that the only hope that we have to restore that respect is through some action of Congress and through American public opinion. Therefore, I am appealing today to you in your consideration of the State Department appropriations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to force some action. I am still for a strong, highly respected America as against the philosophy of the "America-laster."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I compliment my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] for so ably presenting the case of another Hoosier who now is imprisoned behind the walls of a Czechoslovakian prison.

The need for a hard-hitting Voice of America that will declare to the world that our country believes in freedom has been brought home most forcibly by recent events to the people of the district in Indiana that I have the honor to represent. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, and the right to a fair trial were put to test in the case of William Oatis, a news correspondent, now imprisoned in Czechoslovakia.

I have been advised that when the officials of the Voice of America appear before the House Appropriations Committee they usually present grandiose figures on the size of the audience that supposedly is listening to the Voice around the world. When members of the Appropriations Committee try to pin these figures down and discover what basis they have in fact, the Voice people speak only vaguely of the difficulties of finding out exactly how many people are listening.

There is available a report dated March 26, 1951, to the Department of State in Washington from Donald R. Mann, its Public Affairs Officer in Habana. In this report Mr. Mann discusses the results of a radio survey in Cuba by the Associacion de Anunciantes de Cuba—Cuban Advertisers' Association. Here is an excerpt from Mr. Mann's report:

> In the national survey covering the Voice of America, 26,136 homes were visited during Voice of America program hours, of which 23,483 possessed radios, and 9,720 of these were turned on. The time of rating for the Voice of America hours was 40, which means that 300,000 of the estimated 750,000 sets in Cuba were turned on. Twenty-two persons were found listening to the Voice of America, which gave the programs an average rating of 0.093. This covers the entire 3 hours of programs, both English and Spanish. The average rating of 0.093 when projected against the number of sets results in a total of 697 listeners during the 3 hours. * * *
>
> The 0.093 average rating for the Voice of America for the 3 hours of programs compares this way with the three principal networks during the same listening period: CMI with an average rating of 16.8; RHC, 11.5; and Union Radio, 5.0.

I want to repeat what this radio survey showed out of 26,136 homes that were visited throughout Cuba, 22 persons were found to be listening to the Voice of America. This results in an average rating of nine one-hundredths of 1 percent compared to ratings as high as 16.8 percent for the three principal networks during the same listening period.

Mr. Mann also reported:

> CMOX, the Habana English language station, known as the Cuban-American Radio, which rebroadcasts the Voice of America news in English and also uses Voice's recordings, had no listeners, according to the survey.

Mr. Mann's report speaks for itself. The Voice of America is not reaching the the people of the world. The United States is falling down on psychological weapons, which should be one of our mainstays. I repeat, most Members of this House agree on the urgent need for a hard-hitting Voice that will bring the story of freedom and democracy to the other peoples of the world. Day by day, the evidence is mounting that the Voice of America, as now managed and operated, is about as hard-hitting as a creampuff. Improvements certainly are necessary.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Has the gentleman ever visited the Voice of America in New York and witnessed a Voice of America broadcast?

Mr. BEAMER. I am sorry to say I have visited it on only two occasions to see demonstrations of the Voice of America. Then I realized it was propaganda trying to sell us on the Voice, rather than selling the principles for which this country stands.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I have visited the Voice of America and have heard some of the programs. I fortunately understood some of the languages that were being beamed. I must say that the Voice of America had an effective program being beamed to the various countries where they could be reached. Of course, we know that they cannot reach all of the world with the appropriations we are giving them, but they are doing a very good job with the amount of money they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

THE GREENWOOD PLAN

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, last summer, Chauncey W. Lever, manager of the Greenwood (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce, read of an address by a prominent American urging that a Marshall plan of ideas be created so that the United States could more effectively present its side in the cold war. The address had stated that America was losing the cold war by not successfully combating the lies of communism.

In a telegram to the speaker, Lever suggested that each chamber of commerce in the United States set up a local committee which would gather ideas from citizens of the community on how to pierce the iron curtain and promote world freedom and peace, screen the ideas, and send the best to a centralized idea agency that would pass the ideas on to the Voice of America or any medium used to combat communistic ideology.

The suggestion stirred the imagination of the press and radio of the Nation and became known as the Greenwood plan. Although urged by every quarter of the Nation to conduct a national program, the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce was not equipped to do so. However, a committee known as the Greenwood Plan Committee, composed of persons of varied occupations and interests, was appointed to gather ideas from citizens of Greenwood County and to begin a long-range program to further acquaint local citizens with the philosophy of communism, its lies and its deceits. A varied program has been carried out and is still in progress in Greenwood County.

When the Crusade for Freedom began its campaign last fall it was realized that the aims of the crusade were similar to those of the Greenwood plan. Three members of the Greenwood Plan Committee went to New York and offered the Greenwood plan to Gen. Lucius D. Clay, national chairman of the Crusade for Freedom, suggesting that he use the plan in any manner he believed feasible in the work of the Crusade for Freedom. General Clay and his associates received the idea with enthusiasm and resolved that the Greenwood plan retain its own identity while affiliated with, and sponsored by, the Crusade for Freedom.

The national headquarters of the Greenwood plan were appropriately set up in Greenwood, S. C. Chauncey Lever, the originator of the Greenwood plan, was given a leave of absence from the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce to serve as executive director, and is assisted by David W. Cole, head of the department of history of Lander College.

On June 25 of 1951 a national campaign was launched by sending each chamber of commerce in the United States, Hawaii, and Alaska an invitation

to join in the battle against world communism. An attractive mailing piece outlined the aims of the Greenwood plan and told how the individual community could begin a program to obtain ideas from its citizens on how to pierce the iron curtain and promote world freedom and peace. To those chambers of commerce that indicated a desire to join in the Greenwood plan a kit was forwarded which gave detailed information on how to put the program in operation. So far, over 300 communities, representing every State, Alaska, and Hawaii, have joined the Greenwood plan.

The ideas that are accumulated by local Greenwood plan committees will be screened and the best will be forwarded to the State Crusade for Freedom Committee. The State Crusade Committee, after screening ideas, will send the best to Radio Free Europe to be used in its slugging attack upon communism as it exists behind the iron curtain. A secondary feature of the Greenwood plan, but equally important, is the intensive study of communism that is recommended, a study which will no doubt be followed by a rededication of the American people to the American way of life—a system which allows every freedom for which mankind has ever struggled as opposed to communism, which offers slavery and death.

The beauty of the Greenwood plan is that it gives every American the opportunity to fight communism personally by allowing him to contribute his idea on how it might be defeated. Each American who contributes his idea is assured that it will be given careful consideration and will be put to constructive use. One of the slogans of the Greenwood plan program is "Your idea may be the one that gives hope to some imprisoned person behind the iron curtain." Thus, ideas gathered through the Greenwood plan and used by Radio Free Europe will show the peoples captured by communism that America is dedicated to the defeat of their captors.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, today one of the most pressing questions in the mind of every American is: How long is the present world-wide tension between the free world and the Kremlin going to last? Of course, no one can give a definite answer. However, many of us are beginning to face realities enough to realize that it may last for a long time. It is at least foolish to proceed on any other basis.

To win in this mortal struggle for survival, we must not continue to wage just defensive efforts. We must take the offensive in waging peace. We must attack the job with the same vigor, determination, and challenge with which we have so successfully waged military offensives.

To wage the peace intelligently and successfully, we must carefully analyze the danger that threatens us. The Soviet Union has been and is now carrying on a completely new kind of war against the non-Communist world. In this new and to us strange type of attack, we must clearly understand that from the Kremlin point of view and objective, the military is just one of four major fronts. The four fronts are military, economic, political, and psychological. While the Kremlin wages unremitting war against the free world along these four fronts, if we survive, we must effectively wage the peace along these same four fronts.

This over-all and seemingly evenly balanced attack on the free world by the Kremlin is the compelling reason why we must give adequate attention to each of these four equally important fronts. Should we win on one front and lose on the other three, we will still be losing our essential objective. If we continue to exist as a free people, we must win on all four of these fronts. Therefore, it is just common sense that we take the offensive equally effective on all four fronts. To single out one of these fronts and destroy its effectiveness is just about equal to inviting failure and disaster to our over-all purposes.

The United States information program is the backbone of the free world's psychological offensive. Then, the Voice of America which is the voice of freedom must be adequately supported. We must effectively take the offensive in the struggle for the minds of men.

On the psychological front, the Soviet Union spends billions to breed strife, suspicion, and distrust among men everywhere. They buy and pay for the full time of thousands of people to do nothing but create and magnify discord and division. They turn the employer against the employee, and the middle class against the peasant. They magnify minor political and economic differences into major discord. Their main working capital is insecurity. A major investment is in the manufacture of hate. They use the poverty and discord which they work so carefully to produce to make alluring their own false pretenses of helping to bring peace and plenty to the masses.

In such a conflict, each of the four fronts is of vital importance. Each must be adequately supported. Each must be carefully and effectively used. We must wage a balanced offensive on a complete front. The proposed appropriation of $85,000,000 carried in H. R. 4740 for the Voice of America is of more importance than the rather meager sum in the over-all figure would indicate. During the next fiscal year, we will spend sixty-five to seventy billion dollars in our efforts to remain a free nation in a free world. Then eighty-five million becomes a very modest effort on so vital a weapon in our offensive survival. I will support an amendment to increase the appropriation. I earnestly urge all my colleagues to support such an amendment. Let us wage a balanced offensive for a free world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, as a result of our bungling foreign policy for the past 5 years we have suffered more than 160,000 casualties in Korea and that is just the beginning. For the past 5 years the people of America have been waiting for this day. They have been waiting for the appropriation bill to come up for the Department of State. This is the division of our Government that has made such a shameful botch—Korea, Yalta, Potsdam, and the United Nations. At this fateful day I am ashamed of my party leaders, to whom the people of America are looking, that at this tragic and fateful hour they have made a compromise with the majority leaders to call up this bill when there would be no quorum calls so that the people of America might know what is going on.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I made no such compromise with either side.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am not referring to the members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason I am going to make a point of order, and insist on it, that a quorum is not present so that the American people will be represented here when this great discussion is going on on something that concerns the future of America and the future of every young man and woman in this country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to see the gentleman is here today.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I want to say if the gentleman will look at my roll calls in the last 9 years I have answered just as many roll calls as has the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Let us compare the records in the more interesting last 3 weeks or 3 months or the last year. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows very well that there is a primary election in Pennsylvania today. It is perfectly all right with me, I have no objection to what the gentleman is doing, but I will say that the gentleman is one of the few Members of this House who is not entitled to make the statement he did just now. I am confident that my attendance record in the 7½ years I have been here will compare very favorably with the gentleman from Wisconsin's 9 years. I suggest the gentleman insert the details in the RECORD.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am not embarrassing any Member. I have never as a Member of Congress asked special consideration in considering legislation when I could or could not be here. If the Pennsylvania delegation could not be here the bill could have been delayed a day or two. And I repeat again that over the 9-year period I have been in Congress I have answered more roll calls than has the gentleman from New York and I feel that his attempted reflection is entirely uncalled for. I insist on my point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee divided.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the Chair count the Members on the minority side who have remained seated during this teller vote, or must they rise and pass through the middle aisle?

The CHAIRMAN. After the tellers report, the Chair will count all Members in the Chamber.

The tellers reported that there were—ayes 0, noes 73.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eleven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss what I regard as one of the most amazing performances to date by the State Department's so-called Department of Public Affairs, which operates such programs as the Voice of America, United States Information Service, and so forth.

Perhaps some of you will recall that last December a Mr. Norman Cousins was sent to Asia by the Department of State on what professed to be a lecture tour, paid for and financed by funds out of the United States Treasury. According to the expense account turned in by Mr. Cousins after his return, he lived at the expense of the Department of State from December 31, 1950 through March 16, 1951, and was compensated for 75 days at the rate of a $500 per month salary. His over-all charge was $4,550.

On May 11 of this year, I addressed a letter to Mr. Edward W. Barrett, the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, making inquiry about the purpose of Mr. Cousins' trip, and the purpose of the State Department in sending him abroad. The letter must have occasioned some surprise because I did not get a reply until May 28—2½ weeks later. I will put Mr. Barrett's letter in the RECORD:

MAY 28, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: I refer further to your letter of May 11, in which you inquire concerning the recent trip of Mr. Norman Cousins to Southeast Asia, and request data relative to other projects of similar nature which have been or are being financed by the Government.

As you know, the Department conducts an international educational exchange program, pursuant to authority contained in the Smith-Mundt Act, the Fulbright Act and the Finnish War Debt Act, under which American professors, research scholars, teachers, students, and leaders and specialists in various fields of endeavor are sent abroad and persons in these categories are brought to the United States on grants-in-aid awarded by the Department, the over-all purpose being to promote American understanding and friendship among the peoples of other countries. The Department is, of course, constantly endeavoring to discover means by which the fullest possible realization of this objective can be achieved.

In furtherance of this aim, officers of the bureau concerned with South Asian affairs in the Department felt that in view of his prominence in the America world of letters, Mr. Cousins would be the type of person who might be well suited to undertake a project of lecturing on the American way of life before foreign audiences, especially in certain areas where the United States is too little understood. It was believed that, as a well-informed, successful private citizen, he could articulate the United States position in world affairs, and could command a sympathetic reaction to our point of view from influential groups which have been critical of our policies. The Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs and I approved of the choice of Mr. Cousins and officers in the Office of Educational Exchange concurred. He was, accordingly, awarded a grant-in-aid for the purpose of lecturing on various aspects of American life at United States Information Centers and before other interested groups in Ceylon, India, and Pakistan. He likewise visited Japan, Hongkong, and Singapore, although these points were not included in his lecture assignment. In India, Mr. Cousins delivered lectures in Madras, Calcutta, New Delhi, and Bombay. In Pakistan, he addressed groups in Dacca, Lahore, and Karachi.

Reports describing the results of his visit and clippings from local newspapers submitted by our missions have been extremely gratifying, and, judging by them, I believe it may be said that Mr. Cousins accomplished a great deal toward refuting many popular misconceptions which are held abroad about the United States. The Department believes his lecture tour succeeded in increasing among the people of the countries he visited a respect for and understanding of the people of this country and of the problems we face.

Inasmuch as a final voucher has not as yet been submitted by Mr. Cousins for payment, I am unable at this time to tell you the exact cost of his lecture tour. However, he was authorized all necessary transportation, a compensation at the rate of $500 a month, and a per diem in accordance with standardized Government travel regulations, the stipulation being that the assignment was to be for a period not to exceed 75 days.

Although Mr. Cousins was the first to participate in this type of general lecturer project, in view of the widespread interest his lecture tour evoked, the Department is now contemplating the possibility of arranging other assignments of similar nature which might profitably be undertaken.

If there is further information concerning this matter which I can furnish you, I hope that you will not hesitate writing me again.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

I do not know why it took Mr. Barrett 17 days to answer my letter, because the information in his reply was negligible, to say the least. So, on June 1, I wrote him another letter, asking for more information. The response to my second inquiry arrived 26 days later, on June 27, and I might as well tell you that my secretary had prodded them by telephone on an average of twice a week in the intervening 26 days.

At this point in my remarks I want to insert the full text of Mr. Barrett's second letter:

JUNE 27, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: As requested in your letter of June 1, I am sending you under separate cover copies of reports from several of our American Foreign Service posts and clippings from local newspapers overseas relating to the recent lecture tour of Mr. Norman Cousins. I would appreciate it if you would have these papers returned for the Department's files after you have had an opportunity to read them.

I believe you will find that the salient points of the speeches which Mr. Cousins gave in India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, are fairly well covered in the press reports which I am sending you. Since Mr. Cousins spoke to a large extent from notes and outlines, full texts are not available. You will note that these clippings are from newspapers of a wide variety politically. On balance, and read in the light of the reports from our Foreign Service establishments, they indicate especially Mr. Cousins' effectiveness in combating the Communist attack upon the United States as a nation of warmongers.

I am enclosing a report which covers items of expense for which Mr. Cousins has submitted statements to the Department. These claims are, of course, subject to review by the Department's Office of Budget and Finance, and it is not known at present whether they will be allowed in every case in the amounts indicated. As soon as I receive a final report of the total cost of Mr. Cousins' trip, I shall be glad to furnish you that information.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosure: Report of expense.)

(Under separate cover: 1. From American Embassy, Colombo, Ceylon, dispatch No. 553, January 25, 1951, with enclosures. 2. From American Consulate General, Bombay, India, dispatch No. 971, April 24, 1951, with enclosures. 3. From American Consulate General, Lahore, Pakistan, dispatch, April 23, 1951, with enclosures. 4. From American Embassy, New Delhi, India, dispatch No. 2337, March 30, 1951, with enclosures. 5. From American Consulate General, Bombay, India, dispatch No. 885, April 4, 1951, with enclosures.)

On July 5 I dispatched another letter to Mr. Barrett and on July 17, 12 days later, I received a reply to my third inquiry. Once again Mr. Barrett's office had been prodded several times by telephone from my secretary. I tell the House this because I want them to understand how Mr. Barrett's office established some sort of a world's record by replying in 12 days. That is evidently what they consider high-speed performance down there.

I place Mr. Barrett's third letter in the RECORD at this point:

JULY 17, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: In your letter of July 5, you made additional inquiries regarding the recent lecture tour of Mr. Norman Cousins. You requested copies of reports from the American Foreign Service posts at Calcutta, Madras, Dacca and Karachi concerning Mr. Cousins' visit, and you inquired concerning the role of Mr. Julius Stulman in this tour.

The Department has not yet received reports from the posts in Calcutta, Dacca and Karachi covering Mr. Cousins' visit to those places.

The reports from Madras, dispatch No. 508 dated February 1, 1951, and dispatch No. 673 of March 21, 1951, together with accompanying newspaper clippings, are enclosed. You will note from the latter dispatch that the Public Affairs Officer at Madras in a letter to the editor of the Liberator took exception to a statement appearing in the January 19, 1951, issue of that newspaper

(Enclosure No. 1 to dispatch 508) which referred to Mr. Julius Stulman, Mr. Cousins' traveling companion on this trip, as a "Communist." The editor's note acknowledges that, as used in the context of the news article, the word was intended to denote "community-minded." The enclosed dispatches, together with those previously forwarded to you, constitute all of the communications from the American Foreign Service posts which are on file in the Department regarding the activities of either Mr. Cousins or Mr. Stulman—except for one item mentioned below.

With regard to Mr. Stulman's presence on Mr. Cousins' trip, I understand that he is a personal friend of Mr. Cousins and that he accompanied him at the latter's request. Mr. Stulman is head of the Stulman-Errick Lumber Co., of New York City. His purpose in visiting Southeast Asia is understood to have been an interest in exploring practical projects of technical development and organization and in discovering means of improving living standards in underdeveloped areas of the world. He paid all of his own expenses on this trip and traveled as a private citizen.

The report from Bombay which you requested is a classified report containing remarks about a private American citizen not traveling under Government auspices or at Government expense which could be embarrassing to the individual concerned and to the reporting officer. If you so desire, we would be glad to discuss this with you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

Enclosures: 1. From American consulate general, Madras, India, dispatch No. 508, February 1, 1951, with enclosures. 2. From American consulate general, Madras, India, dispatch No. 673, March 21, 1951, with enclosures.)

Meantime, on July 11, I dispatched a fourth inquiry to Mr. Barrett and I am happy to report that I got a reply to this letter in 8 days—on July 19. In fact, Mr. Barrettt sent a man up to my office to deliver it to me by hand. I will not burden the RECORD with this fourth letter.

I cite this 2-months' ordeal of trying to get answers to four letters from the State Department as an example of why the whole propaganda program which the State Department is running is a flop. It moves with the speed of molasses on a cold day in Maine. The Department of Public Affairs is so wound up in red tape, paper pushing, memowriting, and bureaucracy that it is no wonder it gets nothing done. You have heard speech after speech in this House decrying our Voice of America as a boring flop which runs far behind events and which, in no sense of the word, could be described as an alert, up-to-the-minute outfit.

Now as to this gentleman named Norman Cousins. In case you never heard of Mr. Norman Cousins, and I should be surprised if many Members of the House have, I want to tell you a few things about him.

He is 38 years old, once worked on the New York Post and then joined the Saturday Review of Literature, which is a little magazine devoted to reviewing books and phonograph records. It has some standing in the world of letters but it is more famous—if indeed it has any fame at all—for its agony columns and lovelorn personal ads. Its circulation is minute, indeed, compared to other magazines.

The Saturday Review of Literature has done its full share of lauding Communist books down through the years of Mr. Cousins' management, although the magazine has professed to be anti-Communist. I think a fair description, politically, of Mr. Cousins and his magazine would be fuzzy-minded. The magazine is typical of the confused thinking of so-called American intellectuals.

Inasmuch as the United States Government had never sent anybody abroad before on a trip of this kind, I wondered why it should pick out an obscure man like Mr. Norman Cousins for the initial experiment. I caused extensive inquiries to be made and I must tell you that the only reason I can discover for the selection of Mr. Cousins is that he happens to be a personal friend of Mr. Barrett. It seems that they used to ride to New York City together from Connecticut on the same train every morning. I suppose when we consider the limitations of this whole public affairs program and the quality of its administrators, we would be expecting too much from them to pick a sponsored speaker on any other basis. Certainly I would never expect them to pick somebody who might really represent America and who would be so prominent that his name might be recognized abroad.

I have before me Mr. Cousins' expense account, and I want to read it into the RECORD:

Per diem for the period Dec. 31, 1950, through Mar. 16, 1951	$768.00
Salary compensation for 75 days at the rate of $500 per month	1,250.00
International travel	2,301.27
Local travel	131.65
Passport	10.00
Inoculations, including plague, typhus, smallpox, cholera, tetanus, typhoid, and paratyphoid	90.00
Total	4,550.92

Now let us see what we got for our $4,550.92.

I hold in my hand what purports to be some press clippings gathered by our consular offices in southeast Asia and I want to read you a few excerpts from them.

The first one is from the Ceylon Daily News in Colombo, and is dated January 16, 1951.

It described Mr. Cousins' speech in these headlines: "Need for world federal government—fastest growing movement in United States."

The second clipping is from the Ceylon Observer, published in the same city on January 16. The headline reads: "World government desperately necessary."

Now I want to quote you a paragraph from that news story concerning the speech delivered by Mr. Cousins in Colombo. Here is what he says:

I believe that it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government in which nations could maintain their own institutions, accepting a high sovereignty in matters concerned with the security of the people. The world federal government is the fastest growing movement in the United States.

Mr. Cousins, in virtually every press clipping that I have seen, expounded on the thesis that world government is the desirable solution to everything.

For example, speaking in New Delhi, India, Mr. Cousins provokes the following headline, "Plea for world government."

The same idea is included in a report of Mr. Cousins' remarks carried in the Times of India on February 15, and in the Indian News Chronicle of February 17.

For example, the Free Press Journal on February 23 has this headline, "Formation of world government, Mr. Cousins' plea."

I do not know whether I have all the press clippings on Mr. Cousins' trip or not. I do know that I have all that the State Department would give me, and I would urge any Member who wishes to do so to look at this file and see for himself what we spent $4,550.92 for.

I think Mr. Barrett and the State Department were possibly a little bit worried when I had the audacity to inquire about Mr. Cousins' trip.

I hold in my hand something that was never intended for my eyes, and I can imagine that there are going to be a few red faces in the State Department and its Public Affairs Department when I get through reading this piece of paper. It will show you what kind of tricks and deceitful practices are engaged in when a Member of Congress makes an inquiry as to what the State Department is doing with all the money that the taxpayers are giving it.

This piece of paper that I hold in my hand is a confidential memorandum which was circulated in the State Department as a result of my letter of June 1, and by some fortunate chance or other it got included by accident in the material sent to me, at my request, by the State Department.

It is dated June 13, 1951, and is titled "Memorandum."

It is addressed to Mr. William C. Johnstone, Mr. Charles M. Hulten, Mr. Edward W. Barrett.

The memorandum states that it is from Francis J. Colligan.

It states that the subject is: Attached letter to Congressman TABER.

Each of the gentlemen has placed his initials after his name, indicating that it was read by him. That is efficiency for you.

I want to quote from this surprising piece of paper which, I repeat, was never intended for my eyes:

Attached herewith you will find a reply for Mr. Barrett's signature to Congressman TABER's letter of June 1, 1951. The Foreign Service reports and clippings which Congressman TABER requested and which are being sent under separate cover are also attached. A review of the reports and clippings prompts the following comments:

1. The reports are good. They are well done and they indicate the over-all value of Mr. Cousins' trip.

2. The clippings cover a wide range of newspapers. It is hoped that Congressman TABER will consider each individual clipping for what it is worth and in the light of the over-all effect of Mr. Cousins' activities and the evaluation of them as contained in the Foreign Service reports.

3. Some of the clippings may raise certain questions; for example, the "plugs" for world federalism and the newspaper statement to the effect that Cousins thought that democracy was being "experimented with" in China (clipping B-1, New Delhi).

Now, I want to stop at this point in the memorandum and read you some remarks made in longhand writing in the margin at point 3. Somebody using blue ink has drawn lines under the words which asserted that Cousins thought that democracy was being "experimented with in China—clipping B–1, New Delhi." A person, who apparently signs himself R. A. P. in his own handwriting, penciled these words: "Paragraph of clipping cut off. Story complete without it."

I suppose Mr. Cousins is entitled to the opinion, if it is his opinion, that Chinese Communists are engaged in "experimenting with democracy," but I do not think it is Mr. Cousins' right to so state publicly on a trip financed by the State Department of our Government. Of course, he must realize that we have people in our State Department who have regarded the Communists in China for years as mere "agrarian reformers." And perhaps I should not censure Mr. Cousins at all.

But I think that the House will agree with me that when Members of Congress ask a department of this Government for a report of how money was spent, we do not need any little bureaucrats editing the answers for us with a pair of scissors.

I might say to the members of the press that I have had photographs made of this particular piece of bureaucratic conspiracy, and they are welcome to have copies of the photographs, if they wish.

Now, to continue reading to you from this remarkable memorandum which was circulated in the Public Affairs Department and which was sent to me quite by accident. It continues:

4. The reports may raise other questions. (a) For example, Cousins' changing the lecture topics agreed on with the Department before he left. (These changes were not important.) (b) Mr. Cousins' being accompanied by Mr. Julius Stulman, as reported by Bombay. (NEA jumped the gun on this one by drafting a cable requesting courtesies, and so forth, for Mr. Stulman simply because Mr. Cousins thought Stulman's trip was important. We have a separate file on Mr. Stulman as a result of this incident, and we have called NEA's attention to the fact that they should not again take such action.)

5. Mr. and Mrs. McGhee met with Mr. Cousins in Bombay. (Mr. McGhee might be called upon by Mr. TABER to give his personal evaluation of Mr. Cousins' trip.)

These comments are prompted simply by the fact that, since we are sending these reports and clippings to Congressman TABER, he may after careful perusal of them have certain additional questions to ask. A reasonable review by him of these clippings and reports should lead to the conclusion that Cousins' trip was not a waste of money and, in fact, did much good.

Attachments:

1. Reply to Congressman TABER.
2. Clippings and reports.

OEX: IEP: FJColligan: emt.

Let us see what else this remarkable secret memorandum tells us:

A. We now discover that Mr. Cousins changed the subject of his lecture topics after he had left Washington, en route to southeast Asia.

We also note from Mr. Barrett's letter, which I read you earlier, that Mr. Cousins did not even speak from prepared texts, and therefore we must conclude that, unlike General MacArthur, the astounding Mr. Cousins was allowed to speak under official sponsorship without so much as submitting a single word to the State Department for clearance.

I hold in my hand a copy of the newspaper put out by the Democratic National Committee under the direction of William M. Boyle, Jr., national chairman of the Democratic Party. This particular issue was published immediately after President Truman had fired General MacArthur, and is devoted exclusively to Mr. Truman's lamentable mistake. The Democratic National Committee's newspaper publishes in full the White House press release which cites as an excuse for firing MacArthur that he had not cleared several of his utterances and other public statements, and it quotes a December 6, 1950, directive by President Truman as follows:

No speech, press release, or other public statement concerning foreign policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of State. * * *

Officials overseas, including military commanders and diplomatic representatives, should be ordered to exercise extreme caution in public statements, to clear all but routine statements with their departments, and to refrain from direct communication on military or foreign policy with newspapers, magazines, or other publicity media in the United States.

I would like to point out to the House that this order evidently applied only to people who had the courage to speak up against the administration, inasmuch as Mr. Norman Cousins was speaking without State Department clearance throughout southeast Asia, on a trip financed by the State Department, during the same period that this administration was getting ready to fire General MacArthur.

I do not know what Mr. Cousins and his pet world-government scheme hold for the security of the American people, but I want to tell the House that General MacArthur is worth a million Norman Cousins. Certainly if General MacArthur had been fired for his utterances, then the State Department should be severely rebuked by the President for allowing Mr. Cousins to appear as an American spokesman scot free of official clearance.

B. We also discover that the gentlemen down at the State Department were quite worried, according to this memorandum, about Mr. Cousins'—and I quote the memorandum—"plugs for world federalism."

C. We also discover that Mr. Cousins was not traveling alone. He was accompanied completely around the circuit by a Mr. Julius Stulman, who got his picture in the papers of southeast Asia along with Mr. Cousins, and who shared in some newspaper and radio interviews with Mr. Cousins.

I have learned that several of our consular officers in southeast Asia filed complaints to Washington about the presence of Mr. Stulman. Just what the real nature of these complaints was I do not know, as Mr. Barrett wrote me that the reports were classified.

It appears that Mr. Stulman paid his own expenses everywhere, but it strikes me as extremely peculiar and coincidental that he should take this trip with Mr. Cousins, who at least enjoyed a semi-official position, which of course did Mr. Stulman no harm since he shared in it.

I have tried to make some inquiry about Mr. Stulman and I find he is a very wealthy New Yorker, with interests in about 15 corporations. I also learned that he is an ardent advocate of some sort of a mysterious economic reform program. He has spent considerable of his own money, promoting what seems to be an idea that only he is interested in.

I want to be perfectly frank with the House that I have next to no information about Mr. Stulman's part in the 75-day trip which he and Mr. Cousins took. Nor do I know what the complaints about Mr. Stulman from our foreign-service officers were. However, If I were a businessman interested in the financial success of 14 or 15 corporations, and if I were looking for some business in southeast Asia, I think I would like auspices such as Mr. Stulman traveled under. On the other hand, if I were the advocate of some vague economic reform program and I could get nobody in the United States to pay any attention to me, I might want to make the trip in the hope that somebody in southeast Asia might give me some recognition.

At any rate I should say that the Public Affairs Department is incapable of conducting the programs it undertakes when it sponsors and finances a trip half way around the world for a man who does not submit a single utterance for clearance, and who is accompanied by a businessman who enjoys at least quasi-official sponsorship.

Mr. Stulman was the beneficiary of a State Department cable directing all Foreign Service personnel to extend him special "courtesies." And several official press releases from the United States Information Services at various points in southeast Asia mentioned Mr. Stulman's part in the trip. For example, the United States Information Service stationed in the United States Embassy in New Delhi had a press release on February 10 which stated:

Mr. Julius Stulman, American economist and industrialist, is accompanying Mr. Cousins in order to observe and study economic conditions in India.

In Madras, India, Mr. Stulman shared a press conference with Cousins, and it was Stanley Chartrand, the United States Information officer, who personally introduced Mr. Stulman to the press.

In conclusion concerning Mr. Stulman, it should be noted that there was considerable confusion among our various Foreign Service missions on what to do about him. In contrast to the official welcome he got in some places, a dispatch sent to the State Department from W. Clyde Dunn, American consul at Bombay, on April 4, 1951, states that one of the "limitations on effectiveness" of the Cousins trip was "the constant presence of Mr. Julius Stulman, his traveling companion."

Now to return to Mr. Cousins' role on this Marco Polo journey in reverse:

Not only did Mr. Cousins spend most of his time promoting world government, but in virtually every city he visited, he managed to take cracks at the American press. Just to cite you a couple of examples out of many, he is quoted in the January 18 issue of the Times of Ceylon as follows:

> He did not think newspapers and magazines in the United States reflected the true public opinion.

One Indian journal even expressed surprise at the contempt with which Mr. Cousins evidently regarded the American press. The publication Bharat commented on February 25 as follows:

> It was surprising to hear an outstanding American journalist asking this country not to take the American press as reflecting the public opinion there.

I am not a reader of the Saturday Review of Literature, but I am told that the most it reflects publicly is the opinion of Mr. Cousins and a coterie of nickel-and-dime intellectuals as to their views on books and phonograph records.

I am certain of one thing, however. I can guarantee the House that the American press as a whole is far more accurate and far more representative of American public opinion than Mr. Norman Cousins himself.

When Mr. Cousins praises world government and represents it as "the fastest growing movement in the United States," he not only displays a colossal ignorance, but raises doubts in my mind whether he could get a job as a cub reporter on the Daily Eugle in "Sadie's Switch, Okla."

I hold in my hand a press clipping dated July 10 of this year which announces that the monthly magazine Common Cause, published in Chicago and founded 4 years ago as the official organ of the Committee To Frame a World Constitution, has gone out of business. The story says that the highest circulation the magazine achieved was in 1948 when 4,000 copies were distributed. The news report adds that the circulation has fallen steadily since.

The story also discloses that as a result of pressure tactics by the Committee To Frame a World Constitution, 22 State legislatures adopted resolutions endorsing world government, but 14 have since rescinded the action.

The history of this committee and its publication, together with the actions of the various State legislatures in rescinding resolutions previously adopted, would seem to indicate that Mr. Cousins scarcely reflected the American public opinion accurately when he described world government as the "fastest growing movement in the United States."

In fact, it is perfectly plain from reading the clips that the Hindu newspapers sensed that Mr. Cousins did not know what he was talking about. A Bombay daily, the Hindustan, commented as follows:

> It seems in this trip Mr. Cousins is going to appear more as a political expert than a man of letters. The topics of his talks deal mainly with "democracy," "peace," "American public opinion," and so on. It is a matter of regret that Bombay will not come to know about the artistic personality of a man who has been heading for 10 years a first-rank literary magazine like the Saturday Review of Literature.

Need I note that in his letter to me, Mr. Barrett six months later was still trying to palm off Mr. Cousins' selection because of his prominence in the American world of letters? And Mr. Barrett implied that Mr. Cousins was to talk about things considerably closer to the hearts of Americans than world government.

Among the other curious performances of Mr. Cousins was his statement in Ceylon rapping the United Nations which—if I understand American policy correctly—we support 100 percent, and a statement in Madras, India, denouncing "Red witch hunts" in the United States.

According to the Times of Ceylon, published in Colombo, January 19, Mr. Cousins advised Ceylon not to join the U. N. Here is what that press clip says:

> He further said that Ceylon was not a member of the U. N. and need not be as long as the (U. N.) organization had no effective means to suppress aggression.

I am sorry that I cannot quote any more from that clipping, but unfortunately, Mr. Cousins seldom rated more than three or four paragraphs in the newspapers, and I would scarcely call his trip a success so far as publicity is concerned.

Concerning his denunciation of what he called "Red witch hunts" in America, I want to read from a clipping from the newspaper, The Indian Express, dated January 20. I quote:

> Giving his views on the Red hunt in America, Mr. Cousins said that there was a tremendous movement against this there, that even the Attorney General recently came before the American public denouncing the witch hunt. One could expect this problem to be really solved only when the problem of peace in the world was also solved.

It apparently has never occurred to Mr. Cousins that we will only have peace in the world when we get rid of communism and that we will only have security in the United States when we have driven the last Communist off the Government payroll and out of posts of influence.

I think the House is entitled to know the upshot of Mr. Cousins' trip so far as Mr. Cousins himself is concerned.

Mr. Cousins is a bright young man, and I do not expect anyone to criticize him too much for trying to make a fast dollar. Throughout his journey he was sending dispatches to the Saturday Review of Literature bearing such datelines as Tokyo, Korea, and so forth. Mr. Cousins afforded his readers his views on a wide variety of topics, including deprecating Congress for demanding the ouster of Dean Acheson, for cultivating totalitarian postures, for political headline hunting and crass exhibitionism," and for a variety of other things, including advocacy of Red witch hunts. I might add that about the nicest thing he said about Congress in one dispatch was that it had "crackpots" among its Members.

But Mr. Cousins really hit the jackpot when, under the sponsorship of the State Department, he got an interview with Nehru, the Prime Minister of India. This is the same Nehru who wants Red China admitted to the United Nations and who holds other torturous views once held by the late and lamented Jan Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia. Nehru evidently thinks that the way to get along with communism is to hold hands with the Communists in world organizations. Mr. Masaryk paid for similar beliefs with his life, and his country paid for his beliefs with its freedom.

I do not know whether Mr. Norman Cousins had a scoop or not in interviewing Nehru inasmuch as he does not seem very difficult to interview. But I think the House should know that the publishing firm of John Day Co. has just announced it is publishing Mr. Cousins' interview with Prime Minister Nehru in book form—at $2 a copy. Lest some member be tempted to rush to the nearest bookstore and buy this book, I will warn him in advance that most of the questions asked by Mr. Cousins answered themselves and were as long as the answers supplied by Mr. Nehru. So the book comes out about equal parts Cousins and Nehru.

As a Member of this House, who, like many other members, dislikes to see the taxpayers' money go down the drain, and as one who is deeply distressed over the lack of favorable world opinion about American foreign policy, I would say that Mr. Barrett and the State Department have performed a great disservice to their country in fostering this Cousins trip. It appears to me that Mr. Cousins lined his pockets at the expense of Uncle Sam, and if this $2 book has any sales at all, he promises to have further profits in addition to the free trip he has already taken.

Finally, it is my conclusion and my recommendation that the State Department and its Division of Public Affairs forget its program of dispatching representative citizens to other parts of the globe until such time as the State Department has been thoroughly cleaned out and the personnel replaced by individuals with considerable more judgment than that exercised by Mr. Barrett and Mr. Acheson. America has reached a low state indeed when it has to choose an obscure editor such as Norman Cousins to represent it in any part of the world.

I suppose in the final analysis that this Cousins case should be regarded for what it is—only another example of the complete ineptness and blundering of the bunch of bureaucrats, pinkos, and nincompoops who infest the agencies of our Government, particularly the State Department. The Cousins case is certainly an excellent example of how difficult it is for Congress to find out what is going on in the executive branch of this Government.

Mr. Cousins spent all his time promoting a world federation and belittling the United Nations. Is the State Department for or against the United Nations? It looks to me as if, following their usual practice, they were on both sides of that question and were trying to ride two horses at the same time.

I wonder how the taxpayers like that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Do I understand that this propagandist, urging a world government, was paid for out of the Voice of America funds?

Mr. TABER. That is correct; $4,552.50.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Who approved such an expenditure?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Barrett.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If Mr. Barrett has the money to throw away in that fashion, would it not be good common sense to take twenty or twenty-five million off of his authorization in this particular bill and make him a little more cautious about such procedures?

Mr. TABER. I think it would be a little more appropriate if that were done.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I must answer that question this way, and ask one. When we were getting out of Han Kiang about last Christmas time, I suppose you would like to have the fire power cut off? You stopped your fire power, and that is where the Reds are today.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman can get plenty of time to make a speech. I would have been glad to answer a question.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment.

At this time we are in this situation: We have had this so-called Voice of America putting out all sorts of things on the air, some of them absolutely flat and unable to draw the interest of people in foreign lands; some of them by people who have endeavored to stir up trouble amongst the people of the United States, like that broadcast by Raymond Gram Swing, who went after General MacArthur. We all know what Raymond Gram Swing is. Frankly, during all of the time of the first months of the Korean debacle, when we went in there, there was not one word telling the world why the United States was right in its position. Frankly, if we are going to have a Voice of America, it should support the position of the people of the United States and it should represent them.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COLMER. There is one question in connection with what the gentleman has been discussing that has concerned me as a question of policy. What I cannot understand is that these departments apparently have money to pick up any man or group of men or any group of people and send them over to Europe on one mission or another. If Members of Congress want to go over to Europe on any mission, ordinarily they have to get approval of the Congress by proper resolution and proper appropriation. I am going to give the gentleman an illustration of what I am talking about. I want to say that I have no criticism of that mission. I think it was a splendid mission. Recently a group from this body was taken over by the military or the State Department, or both, I do not know which, flown over to Europe, and they did a good job over there. More recently a group from the other body went over under the same auspices and came back. I do not say that was a bad thing, but I am talking about the policy of the departments having the right to do that.

It was brought to my attention this morning—and I want to say in all fairness this is only hearsay, that the State Department is now planning to take people, men and their wives, and others, and send them over to Europe at Government expense to show those people over there a few of the people we have over here. That may be a good thing, but why does the Department have that much leeway when we are talking about trying to save money?

Mr. TABER. I frankly do not see. Frankly, the thing that bothers me is this: General MacArthur was fired because they say he said something that did not jibe with the policy of the administration. This man goes over and he tells these people that the United Nations does not meet the situation of the world, contrary to what I understand is the policy of the United States Government; he tells them that we should join a world federation, or a world government. I do not see where a paid propagandist from the State Department should go over and advocate a program which is not the United States policy, and I do not approve of that way of doing business; I cannot get myself down to that level.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The Voice of America is asking approximately $100,000 in this bill. Can the gentleman tell the American people any tangible evidence of what the Voice of America has accomplished since it has been established?

Mr. TABER. The trouble is that they have not very often; there have been rare occasions when they did have something that was some good. But I have made it my business repeatedly and repeatedly to go over scripts of their broadcasts; I have read hundreds of them myself. The worst curse that goes with that is that everything they send me by way of a broadcast script they send likewise to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from New York tells me it is ruining his eyesight to have to read all of them. I am sorry about that; I did not want to bring that trouble on anybody.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that at the expense of my deteriorating eyesight I do not interpret the scripts I read as does the gentleman from New York; I do not reach the conclusions the gentleman reaches after reading the scripts word by word, and the gentleman has caused me to read bales of them, thousands of them. Let him point out what is wrong with some of these scripts he has on the floor right now. Let us see in what respects they are wrong, incorrect, and not proper propaganda.

Mr. TABER. I have just a few minutes; I have not any of them in my hand, but there are several up at the table.

Mr. ROONEY. Why not include one in the RECORD?

Mr. TABER. That one on MacArthur is bad.

Mr. ROONEY. Why not insert that in the RECORD and let the people know what is going on.

Mr. TABER. If I were to put all of the bad ones in the RECORD there would be no room for other things for months to come.

Mr. ROONEY. I will settle on 10 out of the many thousands if the gentleman will put 10 in the RECORD. Let the people know what is going on and see what you are talking about.

Mr. TABER. There will probably be more than 10 referred to and pointed out by speakers here this afternoon.

Mr. DONDERO. What I asked for was tangible evidence of what the Voice of America has accomplished for this country after we have spent millions of dollars in financing it. That is what I want to know.

Mr. TABER. We have not done what we should have done. If we had a set-up there which would find out what the psychology of the people they were going to broadcast to was and is, and have people in charge who are competent to do it, I believe there could be a real good come from it. It needs a first-class businessman to run it, it needs absolute loyalty, and not so many people.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the remarks just made by the gentleman from New York, I should like to read the following letter from Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett:

JULY 19, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN ROONEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: In our conversation last Friday I mentioned that Representative TABER has asked for all reports dealing with the recent lecture tour of Mr. Norman Cousins in the Near and Far East. As you know, we have learned through past experience that one of the most effective means to

counter Communist propaganda is through personal appearances by prominent Americans. Lecturing by Fulbright lecturers under P. L. 584 (Fulbright Act) and other leaders and specialists has proved increasingly effective.

As I told you, we have sent such people abroad before with emphasis on their lecturing both to specialized and to general audiences. I should clarify, however, that Mr. Cousins was the first to be sent abroad for the specific purpose of lecturing to general audiences with no emphasis on specialized groups. As a representative of an American intellectual publication and a long-time student of India, he seems to have done a good job. Loy Henderson was enthusiastic about the results.

In accordance with our conversation, I am enclosing for your information copies of letters, clippings and reports which we have sent to Mr. TABER.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD M. BARRETT.

P. S.—The business of sending lecturers abroad, plus many of our activities, appears not to be particularly new. Edward Boykin recently published an analysis of the propaganda campaign which Lincoln put on to win British support during the Civil War. After telling about Lincoln's distribution of 1,750,000 papers of pronorthern literature and sponsoring 150 pronorthern mass meetings in Great Britain, Boykin reports:

"Lincoln routed a cavalcade of American lecturers and stump speakers through Britain, men who could speak for the North at mass meetings of the British people. He summoned Henry Ward Beecher, America's most popular and powerful pulpiteer, to Washington, gave him instructions and hurried him to England.

Mr. Chairman, under the permission heretofore granted me by the House I shall insert in the RECORD at this point the copies of letters, clippings, and reports sent to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and referred to by Mr. Barrett, as well as a two-page typewritten sheet which contains material on the same subject. I do this without having read the clippings or any of this poorly photostated material. I do this with the idea that the American people are entitled to hear the State Department side of this controversy and without any personal opinion on my part one way or the other.

The material referred to follows:

RECENT LECTURE TOUR OF MR. NORMAN COUSINS TO SOUTHEAST ASIA UNDER THE DEPARTMENT'S EXCHANGE OF PERSONS PROGRAM. PUBLIC LAW 402

The Department of State conducts an international educational exchange program to authority contained in the Smith-Mundt Act, the Fulbright Act and the Finnish War Debt Act, under which American professors, research scholars, teachers, students, and leaders and specialists in various fields of endeavor are sent abroad and persons in these categories are brought to the United States on grants-in-aid awarded by the Department, the over-all purposes being to promote American understanding and friendship among the peoples of other countries. The Department is, of course, constantly endeavoring to discover means by which the fullest possible realization of this objective can be achieved.

In furtherance of this aim, officers of the bureau concerned with South Asian affairs in the Department felt that in view of his prominence in the American world of letters, Mr. Norman Cousins, editor, the Saturday Review of Literature, would be the type of person who might be well suited to undertake a project of lecturing on the American way of life before foreign audiences, especially in certain areas where the United States is too little understood. It was believed that as a well-informed, successful private citizen he could articulate the United States position in world affairs, and could commend a sympathetic reaction to our point of view from influential groups which have been critical of our policies. The Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and the Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs approved of the choice of Mr. Cousins and officers in the Office of Educational Exchange concurred. Concurrence was also obtained from the United States missions in India and Pakistan.

Mr. Cousins was accordingly awarded a Departmental grant under Public Law 402 to enable him to lecture on various aspects of American life at United States Information Centers and before other interested groups in Ceylon, India and Pakistan. In India, Mr. Cousins delivered lectures in Madras, Calcutta, New Delhi, and Bombay. In Pakistan, he addressed groups in Dacca, Lahore, and Karachi. He likewise visited Japan, Hong Kong, and Singapore, although these points were not included in his lecture assignment. Mr. Cousins' grant consisted of all necessary transportation, a salary compensation at the rate of $500 per month, and a per diem in accordance with Standardized Government Travel Regulations, the stipulation being that the assignment was to be for a period not to exceed 75 days.

Reports from our missions covering Mr. Cousins' general lectureship have generally been gratifying and indicate that it served effectively to further the objectives of the Campaign of Truth. Apparently the only factor which marred the complete success of this project was the presence on Mr. Cousins trip of a Mr. Julius Stulman, who, it is understood, is a personal friend of Mr. Cousins and accompanied him at the latter's request. Mr. Stulman, however, paid all of his own expenses and was not sponsored by the Department, although the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs requested the missions in India and Pakistan to extend to him the customary courtesies in furthering his professional contacts with local groups. Reports from Bombay and Madras indicate that Mr. Stulman's constant presence with Mr. Cousins detracted somewhat from the effectiveness of Mr. Cousins' visit.

JANUARY 25, 1951.

From: Colombo, Ceylon.
To: The Department of State, Washington.
Reference: Department's circular telegram 312, December 26, 1950.
Subject: Visit of Norman Cousins.

Mr. Norman Cousins, accompanied by Mr. Julius Stulman, arrived on schedule in Ceylon on January 14. During his 3-day stay he spoke twice in Colombo and twice in Jaffna, at the northern tip of Ceylon. In Colombo he addressed audiences at the YMCA and at the University of Ceylon. In Jaffna he spoke in Jaffna city under the auspices of the Jaffna District Community Centers and at Jaffna College.

The subjects announced in Department's telegram 312, December 26, 1950, were unfamiliar to Mr. Cousins, who had not seen the instruction. He spoke principally about the world crisis and the solution offered by the United World Federalists. One speech in Jaffna he devoted to the Connecticut experiment in education. The PAO suggested that he list the titles he intended to use in future talks, to be sent to other posts on his route. The new titles are "Where the Peace Begins," "Don't Resign From the Human Race," "The American Laboratory for Education."

Mr. Cousins made an excellent impression here as a sincere, intense person with an idealist's hope for world peace through federal union. His platform presence is friendly and conversational, and his approach to the dream of world government is honest and persuasive, though lacking in definiteness. His handling of audience questions was admirable.

The visit of so attractive a person as Mr. Cousins, representing the finest type of thoughtful, keen-witted, sensitive young American, has done much good here.

Press clippings reporting his talks are enclosed.

ANGUS TRESIDDER,
Public Affairs Officer
(For the Chargé d'Affaires, ad interim).

[From the Times of Ceylon, Colombo, Ceylon, January 15, 1951]

NORMAN COUSINS TALK TODAY

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American literary journal Saturday Review of Literature, arrived at Katunayake Airport yesterday by BOAC plane. He will deliver a lecture on Conditions of Democracy in the Modern World at the YMCA this evening.

[From the Colombo (Ceylon) Observer of January 16, 1951]

"WORLD GOVERNMENT DESPERATELY NECESSARY"

"I believe it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government in which nations could maintain their own institutions, accepting a high sovereignty in matters concerned with the security of the people," said Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, in the course of a lecture he delivered yesterday in the YMCA forum.

He said:

"Today the nations of the world are in the same position as they were as far back as the fourth century B. C. Their intention is to find a system of world government so that people can live peacefully. But instead, we have a League of Nations type of organization, where the veto, a weapon which can be used by any nation to hinder world progress, has been proposed and passed."

Mr. Cousins continued:

"We have had wars almost continually for the last 300 years. It is not possible for a Russia and an America, a Communist and a democratic state to exist at the same time.

"I believe that it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government, in which nations could maintain their own institutions, accepting a high sovereignty in matters concerned with the security of the people. The World Federal Government is the fastest growing movement in the United States. But although the proposal could come from the United States it would be no use without support from Asian countries. The future of the world depends on the partnership between Asia and the United States of America.

"LAST CHANCE

"Would Russia accept? No one knows. But this is the last chance and India, Pakistan, Ceylon and the United States could make the proposal in good faith to the world, in an honest attempt to avert war.

"Any country acting in good faith would have every reason to accept. If Russia does not accept, we should not despair. The door must be kept open at all times. There should be no spirit of defeatism or fatalism."

Before the commencement of the lecture, Mr. E. W. Kannangara introduced the speaker to the audience.

Mr. H. A. J. Hulugalle also spoke.

[From the Times of Ceylon, Colombo, Ceylon, of January 19, 1951]

CEYLON NEED NOT JOIN UNO

VADUKODDAI, Wednesday.—"We all want peace and the greatest opportunity awaits

the East to lead the world out of disorder into peace" said Mr. Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review, addressing a packed audience of teachers and students at Jaffna College. The Reverend S. K. Bunker, principal, Jaffna College, presided.

What the UNO had tried to do was to cope with aggressive elements rather than suppress them early and prevent war.

He then described the great atrocities perpetrated in Korean battlefields and the feeling of disillusionment prevalent among the Koreans. He asserted that there was yet hope that the UNO might work in the direction of a world federation recognizing the sovereignty of suffering humanity and create conditions suitable to peace.

He further said that Ceylon was not a member of the UNO and need not be as long as the organization had no effective means to suppress aggression.

ANOTHER LECTURE

JAFFNA, Thursday.—Mr. Norman Cousins delivered a public address at the Jaffna Central College Hall on citizens and education in America.

Mudaliyar C. Thiagarajah, president of the Jaffna District Community Centers Union, presided.

[From the Times of Ceylon, Colombo, Ceylon, of January 19, 1951]

RHYMES OF THE TIMES—WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

"The world federal government is the fastest growing movement in the United States. I believe it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government" (Mr. Norman Cousins in Ceylon).

The world's contracting into a billiard ball,
America's in the middle of Ceylon;
A world federal movement will save us all.

Southeast Asia is in the Mall,
And wicked, gay Paree at the Golden Faun;
The world's contracting into a billiard ball.

The Colombo diplomat is Mayfair's jewel,
America's darling, Miss Anna Wong;
A world federal movement will save us all.

The English hunt gave us our annual kraal,
And Carol Reed made the quiet place a kampong;
The world's contracting into a billiard ball.

So, Mr. Cousins, God speed towards your goal,
Send us some federated 'taters, tractors, corn;
A world federal movement will save us all.

Send us federated Grable for Beira Ball,
Marx brothers to play my role, when I am gone;
The world's contracting into a billiard ball;
A world federation movement will save us all.

T.

[From the Times of Ceylon, Colombo, Ceylon, of January 18, 1951]

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IS FOR PEACE, SAYS NORMAN COUSINS

"I do not know how close we are to another war. I do not know how much time we have to avert another war. But I know we are not doing enough to avert war", said Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, during a public lecture at King George's Hall yesterday evening.

Sir Ivor Jennings, Vice-Chancellor, University of Ceylon, presided.

Mr. Cousins, speaking on public opinion in the United States, as reflected in their peace movements, said that few voices seemed to be raised for peace, and many for war. He did not think newspapers and magazines in the United States reflected the true public opinion. Their main aim was to convince Russia, and they meant business. But, he believed, the American Government sincerely wanted peace.

Mr. Cousins said there was a growing movement in the United States which said that world law was the only way of attaining peace. The people of the United States believe the crisis that faced the world was a human crisis, not a national one.

[From the Colombo (Ceylon) Daily News of January 16, 1951]

NEED FOR WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT STRESSED—"FASTEST GROWING MOVEMENT IN UNITED STATES"

"Today the nations of the world are in the same position as they were as far back as the fourth century, B. C. Their intention is to find a system of world government so that people can live peacefully. But instead, we have a League of Nations type of organization where the vote, a weapon which can be used by any nation to hinder world progress, has been proposed and passed."

This view was expressed by Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, in a lecture yesterday in the Y. M. C. A. forum in which he advocated the forming of a world federal government.

"The League of Nations could have prevented war by stopping Japan in 1932, and again by checking the Germans on the Rhine in 1934. Two giant powers with a vacuum existing between can only mean that each will be trying to prevent the vacuum from being filled by the other.

"We have had wars almost continually for the last 300 years. It is not possible for a Russia and an America, a Communist and a democratic state to exist at the same time."

DESPERATELY NECESSARY

"I believe that it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government, in which nations could maintain their own institutions, accepting a high sovereignty in matters concerned with the security of the people. The world federal government is the fastest growing movement in the United States. But although the proposal could come from the United States it would be of no use without support from Asian countries. The future of the world depends on the partnership between Asia and the United States of America.

"Would Russia accept? No one knows. But this is the last chance and India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and the United States could make the proposal in good faith to the world, in an honest attempt to avert war.

"DOOR MUST BE KEPT OPEN

"Any country acting in good faith would have every reason to accept. If Russia does not accept, we should not despair. The door must be kept open at all times. There should be no spirit of defeatism or fatalism.

"Some say that this talk of world government is being visionary. But what have practical men brought on but three practical wars."

Mr. Cousins pointed out that he was not speaking for the majority of the American people. "The majority," he said, "had not yet accepted. In my State a 4 months discussion campaign on the subject ended with a signed petition being submitted to the President of the United States, requesting him to take the initiative to bring about world peace."

"I believe," he added, "that the peoples of India, Pakistan, and Ceylon can join this movement. There is a starvation of moral leadership. If there is a volcanic eruption of moral force somewhere in the world, then moral peace will prevail."

Before the commencement of the lecture, Mr. E. W. Kannangara introduced the speakers to the audience and observed that "at a time when war is threatened and the democratic way of life is challenged, we are fortunate to have Mr. Norman Cousins to speak."

Mr. H. A. J. Hulugalle also spoke.

APRIL 24, 1951.

From: AMCONSUL, Bombay, India.
To: The Department of State, Washington.
Reference: Bombay's Dispatch No. 885 dated April 4, 1951.
Subject: Norman Cousins' interview with Pandit Nehru.

The Sunday edition of the Bharat Jyoti, for April 22, devoted the enclosed two pages of space to the tape-recorded interview of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru accomplished by Norman Cousins during the last few days he was in India. The fact that a major Bombay Sunday paper would devote this much space to the interview is additional evidence of the impact that Norman Cousins had locally. This Consulate General would again like to report its satisfaction with the visit of this particular American leader specialist.

PRESCOTT CHILDS,
American Consul General.

(Enclosure: Clipping, Bharat Jyoti, April 22, 1951.)

[From the Bharat Jyoti, of April 22, 1951]

A WORLD FREE FROM FEAR—NEHRU DISPELS UNITED STATES SUSPICIONS: TALK WITH NORMAN COUSINS—OUTSPOKEN ANSWERS TO CRITICAL QUESTIONS ON INDIA—MANY FALLACIES ARE EXPOSED: VALUES THAT INDIA PRIZES

(Mr. Norman Cousins was sent out to India by the United States Government to speak to us about the purposes and policies which motivated America. The American people are concerned because they feel that India is gradually drifting away from their bloc. The present-day world tension has created a complex of fear. Fear has driven them into imagining that there can be no other right policy than one they follow. It therefore leads them to the conclusion that those who are not with them are against them. India's foreign policy has therefore come under an angry criticism and irritation. India prefers to consider her own national interests first, which demand that a temper of peace is necessary before we can apply ourselves to the problems which the world faces. India feels that we must also realize that means are as important as the ends. Evil cannot be met by evil. Unfortunately, however, India's independent policy is considered by many in the United States, according to Mr. Cousins, as deliberately leading toward totalitarianism of the left or preparations for a full partnership with united Communist Asia. Such an estimate of our approach has upset the otherwise friendly feelings between the two countries. In the heat, words fly and ignorant charges are made against much that India stands for. Even Mr. Norman Cousins did not escape from its gloomy touch. Though he pleads for better understanding and seeks to understand the Indian point of view from Prime Minister Nehru in this long interview, he refers to petty things which, according to him, indicated the hostility of the Indian public to the United States. He cites the playing up of race stories from the United States in our newspapers. He does not realize that Asia sees in race riots the evidence of double standards which the west still continues to believe in. This interview is a recorded conversation between Mr. Nehru and Mr. Cousins. It is perhaps one of the finest expositions of the mind of the Prime Minister and throws light on many things. Mr. Cousins, however, remains unconvinced. He makes an eloquent plea in his summing up to the American people as follows: "It is important that we consider carefully Mr. Nehru's responses, for a wise

American policy with respect to India may help to save what remains of Asia and to a large extent may help to save the peace of the world itself. I believe I am justified in saying that there could be no more tragic mistake for America than to write off India as a Soviet satellite. My own guess is that the Nehru government is actually much further from the extreme left than the people themselves, or at least from the small section of the people that is politically conscious and articulate. If America, with full sense of India's importance and with human values at the core of our foreign policy, proposes a working partnership with India, the results quite conceivably might be one of the turning points of history.")

SO THE WORLD MAY KNOW

"Mr. COUSINS. I have been increasingly disturbed in the past few weeks at what seemed to be a growing misunderstanding between India and the United States. Reading the press of India and also reading clippings from newspapers in the United States, which people back home have sent along to me, I have become deeply concerned that these two people who have so much to offer each other and, indeed, upon whom the burden of world peace rests, should today be drifting apart. How do you account for this growing misunderstanding which, in many instances, seems actually to approach hostility.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. You have been here now some weeks or months. I should like to think of your own experiences here. Have you in your individual capacity experienced—shall I say—any hostility toward you yourself or toward Americans as individuals?

"Mr. COUSINS. Here in India I have had one of the richest experiences in my life. I feel, and I say it in all sincerity, that I have been made to feel as much at home by the Indian people as I am back in the United States. Yet"—

Yes; it is this "yet" that is at the bottom of all the misunderstanding between India and America. The interview that the editor of the Saturday Review of Literature had with the Prime Minister of India is conditioned by this "yet." The interview is reproduced here as it has been recorded. We offer no apology for its inordinate length, as the subject discussed by the two distinguished persons is of extreme importance and the world must know what we in India stand for. Here is the text:

"Mr. COUSINS. I wonder whether you would care to define for Americans the basis of Indian and American understanding and friendship today.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, I don't know that it is possible to define anything precisely in the modern world. The most one can do is to grope about and try to see a way toward any kind of objective that one aims at. Basically, I feel that it is of essential importance for India and the United States to understand and then possibly appreciate each other's outlook with a view to as large a measure of cooperation as possible. Having said that, I begin to think what our more ultimate objectives involving a large part of Asia today and possibly the rest of the world. But for the moment I am speaking about India.

"We are—well, in search of our soul. We are groping and trying some kind of adjustment—integration, if you like—of our national life, our international as well as individual lives.

"Having passed through these periods of transition and very rapid change, we have to find some equilibrium. Normally this would have been difficult enough; but in the present state of affairs, after all that occurred since the war in India—the partition, independence, and so on—all this has shaken us up a good deal. And so we are trying to search to find out what our objectives are. Some of us may have some vague notions; others try to look at things objectively without any fixed ideas so far as possible. So when any—shall I say slogans or fixed concepts—are put, we use them in a measure, but we are rather suspicious, too, because slogans are apt to petrify a man's thinking.

"Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Prime Minister, exactly what slogans and fixed concepts do you have in mind?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Every slogan, every word, almost, that is used by the Socialist, the Communist, the capitalist. People hardly think nowadays. They throw words at each other. They talk about democracy, but when we sit down and think about democracy all kinds of aspects of it appear which do not necessarily come up in the average man's mind. An Englishman may think of democracy in terms of his system; an American in terms of his system. Russia talks about the people's democracy, which is completely different. They use the same word. People talk about equality. Equality has a certain meaning in people's minds—in Western Europe, in America—a certain meaning which is very largely political. And certainly something aiming at economic equality.

"Mr. COUSINS. For purposes of this discussion, Mr. Prime Minister, how would you define democracy in order to give it a universal meaning—something that people everywhere could understand and respond to?"

THE DEMOCRATIC WAY OF LIFE

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Now, I told you just now that definitions are very difficult, and I do not presume to define anything, because to define anything that is big is to limit it.

"Nevertheless, if I may vaguely suggest something, I would say that democracy is not only political, not only economic, but something of the mind, as everything is ultimately something of the mind. It involves equality of opportunity to all people, as far as possible, in the political and economic domain. It involves the freedom of the individual to grow and to make the best of his capacities and ability. It involves a certain tolerance of others and even of others' opinions when they differ from yours. It involves a certain contemplative tendency and a certain inquisitive search for truth—and for, let us say, the right thing.

"That is, it is a dynamic, not a static, thing, and as it changes it may be that its domain will become wider and wider. Ultimately, it is a mental approach applied to our political and economic problems.

"Mr. COUSINS. In terms of the basic equalities inherent in democracy that you mention, Mr. Prime Minister—not only political equality but social equality and economic equality—would you agree that political equality is the means through which people may achieve the other equalities? For if we lack political equality then we lack the main tools by which we can secure for ourselves the other rights. Take, for example, the right of protest, which is at the heart of political democracy. I am sure you would agree that if the right of protest is destroyed no country can really call itself a democracy. Nor can any people expect to have other forms of equality—economic or social—unless they maintain this right of protest.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Yes, political freedom or political equality is the very basis on which you build up other equalities. At the same time political equality may cease to have meaning if there is gross economic inequality. Where, let us say, people are starving the vote does not count. They are thinking in terms of the next meal and not of the vote. But leaving that out for the moment, political equality is the basis for other equalities.

"Mr. COUSINS. Would you say, Mr. Prime Minister, that it would then also follow that the state must submit itself regularly to the approval of the people? Because unless a people have the chance to pass upon the merits of a certain government political equality will be meaningless.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. I agree again. Although I accept that principle completely, in practice the people can be preyed upon so much by propaganda by rousing their passions in this or that direction that you may get some entirely wrong decisions and wrong policies. But you must take this risk. It is far better to take this risk than the other risk.

"Mr. COUSINS. I suppose one thing that democracy, as you have defined it, does do is to protect the individual against dangerous error by government. It is true that in the course of sustaining free institutions many mistakes will be made, just as there will be many abuses—abuses which at times, I suppose, will complicate the operation of a democracy. And yet if the mistakes and the abuses become too large, the people can use their ultimate power to protect themselves and, as we say in America, to turn the rascals out. What other hope is there that, despite the abuses and the confusions, the people can keep decisions in their own hands, which means that the individual must be protected in his right to change the state?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. The individual has to be protected. Also the social organism has to be protected against the predatory individual. You take steps against the gangster or the antisocial individual. So the process of protection is twofold. And it is just possible—in fact not only possible but it has taken place innumerable times—that a group may gain power and may manage for some time, at least, to preserve that power not merely by the physical means of guns but by deluding the public by propaganda or by other processes.

"Mr. COUSINS. In which case you might then also say that the people themselves have failed rather than democracy itself?

"Wouldn't you agree that democracy is actually a chance—a chance for the individual, a chance to develop his own potentialities, a chance to grow, a chance to advance the human procession, perhaps, even, a chance to justify his own place in self-government?

"Price Minister NEHRU. There is an old saying, isn't there, that the people get the government they deserve? And the kind of democracy they deserve? Democracy requires obviously a higher standard among far more people than other forms of government. If they do not reach their standard it may be that their democratic apparatus may fail.

"Mr. COUSINS. A moment ago you discussed the relationship of men to the state. From what you said I gather that you believe deeply that the state is made for man and not man for the state. The individual, of course, does have obligations and responsibilities to society at large, but the state basically is created to advance the welfare of the individual?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Undoubtedly. The individual is uppermost in my mind; but in a social organism an individual cannot be separated from the rest. The rights of the individual must be balanced by the obligations of the individual to the social organism. Without obligations there can be no real rights.

"Mr. COUSINS. Well, suppose we begin then by defining—I apologize again for getting into definitions—suppose we begin by defining what the principal obligations of the state are to the individual. After that suppose we go on to the obligations of the individual toward society as a whole.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. This business of definition rather embarrasses me, because I am not a professor or a philosopher or even a very effective politician. I have dabbled in various things and given a great deal of thought to matters, because they interest me. A state's obligations to the individual or the individual's obligations to the state must necessarily have varied during different periods of history. The original state was a very, very simple state in which, practically speaking, all that the state had to do was to protect the individual from a foreign enemy or another tribe. Then, from that develops the concept of what might be called, without being offensive, a police state. A state preserves law and order, protects its citizens from foreign enemies, and takes taxes to carry on its business. For the rest, it was left to the individual or the group. The present idea of the state has grown far beyond that. A state is supposed to do much more. Every state—I am not talking about any particular brand of state—every state is trying to do ever so much more for the individual than has ever been attempted previously.

"So the state becomes more and more of a socially functioning organism—for the good of society or the individual, as you like. And the more it becomes that, the more benefits it confers on the individual, the more, in a sense, the individual has obligations to that state. So the two things, the rights and the obligations, march together.

"If the state and individual are properly integrated and organized, there is no conflict. Otherwise, if one side goes ahead of the other, there is a lack of balance.

"Mr. COUSINS. Within that general framework what would you say an individual has the right to expect of a state—not only as a matter of protection against a foreign power, but in his direct dealings with the state itself? How would you illustrate the socially functioning organism you just mentioned?"

EXPERIMENTAL, NOT DOGMATIC

"Prime Minister NEHRU. The state, apart from protecting the individual from foreign enemies or internal disorders, has the duty to undertake to provide him with opportunities of progress, of education, health, sanitation—generally, everything that would give him the opportunity to fit himself for such work as he is capable of doing. And, you see, the state, as everything else today, has grown more and more centralized. The deep problem of today, to put it in this way, is this: you cannot escape centralized authority, whether it is of the state, whether it is of the big corporation, whether it is of the trade union, or whether it is of any group. They all go on being centralized authorities. Now all centralization is a slight encroachment on the freedom of the individual. We want to preserve the freedom of the individual, and at the same time we cannot escape centralization in modern society. How to balance the two?

"Mr. COUSINS. Would it be fair to ask you to answer your own question? What is the answer to the conflict between centralization and individual freedom?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, I should say that we cannot do without a large measure of centralization. But we should try to limit that as far as possible, keeping the minimum of centralization and as far as possible decentralize the rest.

"Mr. COUSINS. Would you at this point, Mr. Prime Minister, care to discuss your own program for India today, in the light of these objectives?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. I would hardly discuss that program in any detail but the general idea is that we—the state, that is—try to function in a way, first of all, to provide for the primary needs of our people or, at any rate, to make such arrangements that people can get those primary needs. Then there are the important secondary needs. Now, the economic organization would have to be rather a flexible one, so that we can vary by experience. It is inevitable that in India, where private resources are not great, any project must be a state project. Our river valley schemes must be state schemes. No one else can do them. And any other really big project can either be a state project or jointly owned by the state and private enterprise with a measure of state control, leaving a large field for a private enterprise. Thus we get what I would call a public sector of our economy and a private sector and maybe a sector where the two overlap, with part state control and largely a private sector managing under state control. So we have these three branches of our economy. There need not be any rigid lines between them, and we can see which functions better and more successfully and allow them to develop. Our approach is experimental and not dogmatic."

LAND REFORM IS FIRST ON LIST

"Mr. COUSINS. You said a moment ago, Mr. Prime Minister, that as a state increases its centralization in certain sections of the nation's economy it becomes all the more important to safeguard and increase the rights of the individual. Would you care to discuss India's position on that matter today—what India is doing today to safeguard and enlarge the rights of the people at a time when it is imperative for India to develop projects requiring centralization?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. So far as political rights are concerned I suppose that our constitution has gone as far as any constitution can go toward safeguarding the political rights of the individual. So far as economic questions are concerned it is a question of a state interfering to protect, rather than keeping away, because in rather undeveloped economies there is a tendency to certain groups of vested interests to override the interests of the large groups by whatever methods they have. Now we are very largely speaking, an agricultural agrarian country. And one of our first programs is land reform; that is, to change the old big landlord system here—rather semifeudal landlord system—in favor here and there of cooperative farms, which we wish to encourage. That removes one out-of-date system—the big landlord system—which came in the way of our growth. The change-over has been complicated because we have done it by constitutional means and by giving compensation, which is a heavy burden. Nevertheless, that is clearing the way for other reforms—plans for industrial growth, agricultural growth—in many ways collaborating the two as far as possible and thus bringing about some kind of a balance between industry and agriculture today. There are far too many people on the land. We have to draw some of them into industry—big industry or small industry or both.

"Mr. COUSINS. In connection with India's projected industrial development, is there anything that you believe the United States might be able to contribute to India's need today or in the near future?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. It is obvious that a highly industrialized and technically efficient nation like the United States can give the greatest help to any underdeveloped country like India. After all, industrialization is limited, as it must be by various factors. There is the factor of the resources we can apply to it, which ultimately means, let us say, annual savings to be put into future growth. It also depends on the technical personnel that we can train. Perhaps that is an even more important factor. And so our progress is bound to be regulated by the resources at our disposal. If we have greater resources—technical, financial, or other—our progress will be faster. That we realize. At the same time, that real progress cannot be superimposed—it has to grow in the country, carrying the people with it. It is not teaching somebody at the top or just putting up a machine. We must grow up to it. While we want to grow fast, we want that progress to be solid and not just showy and superficial.

"The United States can help us in terms of capital goods and technical personnel. After all, in the nineteenth century a good deal of the development of both North and South America took place with help from Europe. That process to some extent can be applied to Asia now. That type of help can come which will develop Asia and which will enable her to solve her own problems.

"Mr. COUSINS. This brings up a question we discussed at the outset of our meeting today, Mr. Prime Minister. I refer to American-Indian relations. I have been increasingly disturbed in the past few weeks at what seemed to be a growing misunderstanding between India and the United States. Reading the press of India and also reading clippings from newspapers in the United States, which people back home have sent along to me, I have become deeply concerned that these two people, who have so much to offer each other and, indeed, upon whom the burden of world peace rests, should today be drifting apart. How do you account for this growing misunderstanding, which in many instances seems actually to approach hostility?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. You have been here now some weeks or month. There are many Americans who have visited India during the last few months and have met all kinds of people—members of government, our officials, our people in the fields and factories, peasants, and the rest. I should like to think of your own experiences here. Have you in your individual capacity experienced—shall I say—any hostility toward you yourself or toward Americans as individuals?"

THE AMERICAN IS DISTURBED

"Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Prime Minister, here in India I have had one of the richest experiences in my life. I feel, and I say it in all sincerity, that I have been made to feel as much at home by the Indian people as I am back in the United States. Nowhere in the world outside America have I known such warm friendship. Yet at the same time I have observed, especially during the question period following my talks, in the comments that came at me from the audiences, and in reading some of the newspapers, I have observed misunderstanding about the United States that can result in hostility. I know this—that if I were a citizen of India and read the newspapers here and if my impressions of the United States were derived mainly from those newspapers I am afraid I would have a rather distorted idea of the United States. I know that I might then be increasingly vulnerable if someone came at me with propaganda against the United States, I might feel that what he said would be correct, because I would have been conditioned in that direction. So I would say, based upon my experience, Mr. Prime Minister, that while I have nothing but the warmest feeling for the Indian people who have offered their hand in friendship wherever I have gone, I am, as an American, disturbed at what I have read in the press and what I have heard about America and the American people as a whole.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. I asked you that rather personal question because I wanted you to appreciate a certain difference between what might be called personal reactions and reactions in regard to some vague impersonal policy.

"Mr. COUSINS. Yes.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Now, look at our history vis-à-vis England. For 150 years or

more there was a great deal of hostility, as was natural, against the British occupation of India. To some extent that was transferred to the Englishmen or the English officers here, too. But—not too much. Now, after this change in India to independence, you have no doubt found that there is very little hostility—practically none—to England and certainly none to any individual Englishman.

"Mr. COUSINS. That is reassuring, especially since I have felt at times here in India as though Americans were being held accountable for all the colonial and imperialistic abuses of the English during the period of their rule. Is it wrong to say that America may have replaced Great Britain as a villain in the eyes of some Indians, at least? Is that a fair statement?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, I don't think so. Not in that sense, because the Englishman came in contact as an officer with the masses of our people. America is something distant about which our newspaper readers may read and talk. It does not sink to the level of the large masses. But what I was pointing out was this: That one must differentiate between what might be called the basic feeling of difference in outlook or policy, which for the moment may be expressed strongly but which does not represent any basic hostility. So far as India is concerned I do not think we are very good at long-continued or sustained hostility."

OUTLOOK AND APPROACH

"Apart from that (for at least 30 years or more we have been conditioned by Mahatma Gandhi. He was continuously telling us that we were fighting against British imperialism, but that we must treat the Englishman as our brother. Well, we did not learn this lesson very well, perhaps, but it did affect our minds and ways of thinking. Anyway, the whole point is this—that I do not think there is any basic hostility against America, or, for that matter, against any country here in India. Certain things, certain policies, which may not be clear or which may not fit into our policy, may create criticism—which is a completely different thing.

"Now our policy, I should like you to remember, our present general world policy is the natural outgrowth of all our thinking during the last 30 years or more. If you took the trouble to read the resolution our National Congress passed—25 years ago, 30 years ago—you would find a certain way of thinking which we repeated again and again. So that it was quite natural for us to carry that on—varying it, of course, adapting it to changing conditions in the world. Then came our independence. Again, the reaction of a newly independent country is not to get entangled; to keep going itself; to protect its own interest in terms of its larger friendship in the world. So that we had all this background. Not that we are ignorant of world conditions; we are friendly observers of them. Then again, there is this aspect of it; if you dislike a thing or disapprove of it, how are you to meet that particular contingency now? We have felt all along that the right approach must be as far as possible an approach of friendliness even to the other wrong approach. Not appeasement. We make distinction between the two. One must not appease evil, but we have to convert evil as far as possible. Therefore we have to be firm and yet courteous and friendly. The evildoer may not be converted, but remember there are vast numbers of people who are not evil but are conditioned by the evildoer.

"Mr. COUSINS. I cannot, of course, speak for the American Government and I certainly cannot presume to speak for the American people. But I would guess that the American people would thoroughly agree with you in what you have said about appeasement. In our own relations with the rest of the world today we do feel that we are confronted with a matter of principle which it is difficult to put aside or ignore. We believe these principles are related not only to American security but to the security of free people of the world today, for the two are interdependent. We cannot advance common security for the world's peoples through a policy of appeasement. Would you agree?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. I agree with you entirely when you say that there should be no appeasement of evil. Having said that, it depends how you deal with evil. It depends also what is evil and what is not and to what degree a thing is evil. Very few things are 100 percent evil—just as very few things are 100 percent good—and if condemning something which is mixed good and evil you condemn the whole thing you might get slightly entangled in condemning the good, too.

"Mr. COUSINS. But what happens when you are threatened by the whole thing?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well when you are threatened by the whole thing you resist that threat, but you try to distinguish nevertheless, because otherwise you confuse people's minds and make them think that you are against the good, too.

"Mr. COUSINS. So far as the need to distinguish between the whole thing and its parts is concerned I believe that we in America do try to make distinctions. We do make a distinction I think, for example, between the Russian people and the Russian Government. I don't think there is any hostility in the United States toward the Russian people. We regard the Russian people as human beings who are entitled to the same fair share of the good things of life as we want for ourselves. But some peoples in the world today are harnessed by their governments to purposes which threatens the peace. Under these circumstances would you agree that even if we do make distinctions the threat to world peace can continue? How are we to deal with this threat—again, without uncertainty or appeasement?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, that is a big question that you have raised. I should have said that the basic threat today in the world was fear. And fear is the most dangerous companion for any individual or for any country to possess. Fear clogs the mind, and fear leads often to impassioned action. As you have said, we must not give in to evil, but we must also remember that evil is not surmounted by wrong methods which themselves produce more evil. Therefore, the method becomes very important. It may sound—well, shall I say—like preaching a sermon. I have felt more and more that the basic lesson that Gandhi taught was right, and that was that means should never be subordinate to ends. I know that these sayings cannot easily be translated into life. A politician or statesman cannot function like a prophet, whether it is in a democracy or any other type of government. He has to limit himself to people's understanding of him and people's appreciation of what he says, otherwise he cannot function at all. Nevertheless, this basic idea seems to be most important: that the right means should be employed and firmness should be allied always to a spirit of friendliness and conciliation, not of appeasement. I do make a distinction

"Mr. COUSINS. What, then, is a policy that could represent firmness without appeasement? What can we do to keep from spreading in the world that very doctrine—that the end justifies the means?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, negatively speaking, the first thing to do is to follow means which can be justified. And not to adopt the same argument that in order to meet evil one can adopt any means to meet that evil. Then one stands on a stronger moral foundation and can meet that evil much more effectively. For the rest, it is a question of balance all the time—that in the context of things one at least does not do the wrong thing. Then, again, one thing is always possible—it is that one can be firm, shall I say, courteous, when need for firmness is not shown by violent language, which really, especially when countries are dealing with each other inflames popular passions so much that it becomes impossible to think calmly and dispassionately. Violent language inflames the minds of others—not only of the evil people but even of the good people, even of the good people on the other side. There is a wall created which absolutely prohibits understanding.

"Mr. COUSINS. As you observe the development of the United Nations, Mr. Prime Minister, do you believe that it does offer the means of creating an atmosphere of reason and checking the spread of such doctrines in the world—the doctrine, in particular, that the end justifies the means? In asking that, I suppose I am also asking how we can check and combat aggressive totalitarianism. Isn't this the primary job of the United Nations?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. The United Nations was formed with an objective defined in its charter. Its structure was both defined and proclaimed by its founders. It is essentially an instrument for peace. If that structure is changed and if it becomes an instrument for war then it does not function as United Nations but as something else which may really not be necessary; but it is a different functioning and different structure. The whole idea of the United Nations, in the minds of President Roosevelt and others, was that people in countries of different ways should come together around the table, that, in fact, every country in the world should come there and hammer out solutions instead of fighting on the battlefields. Now, if that structure is changed and a good part of the world is not there, then a very different situation is created; that other part of the world doesn't participate in that hammering out and it has to be dealt with by other means. The United Nations at the present moment is the only organization which can deal with such problems. But it does seem that its effectiveness is growing less. Its basic, I should say its spiritual, effectiveness is growing less because it is working in a field which is rather foreign in its conception.

"Mr. COUSINS. Yet isn't it possible that the existing structure of the United Nations is such as to make it difficult for all the nation of the world to sit around the same table? If one nation can set aside the will of the others through the veto, for example, then there is not much inducement to sit around a table for the purpose of coping with fairly fundamental problems. Then too, so long as there are no obligations that are compulsory and binding, which could make it possible for the United Nations to implement and enforce its decisions, there is every tendency for nations which feel insecure to strengthen themselves through armament programs or military alliances."

UNITED NATIONS AND POWERS

"This in turn makes it difficult for one bloc to see the other bloc attempt to build up its position. Much attention has been paid to the refusal of the west to admit China. Yet Russia has consistently opposed the admission of Ceylon, which is certainly a representative government.

"Russia takes the view, no doubt, that to admit Ceylon would add strength to the opposing side. For perhaps some of the same reasons and a great many others the West feels justified in opposing the entry of China. Isn't there some way of resolving the problem by making the United Nations stronger than any possible combination

within it? In such a United Nations, built upon clearly defined rights and obligations, might we not have the basis for the universal design you seek?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Doesn't that mean a change in the basic conception and structure of the United Nations, leading up to a United Nations which presents, by and large, countries of one way of thinking?

"Mr. COUSINS. The original conception of the United Nations, of course, is still the ideal. That is to say, an organization which can make the world safe for its differences. Any United Nations which would attempt to steamroller differences out of existence would—inevitably, I believe—result in war. But if, on the other hand, Mr. Prime Minister, the United Nations could be given adequate power, protecting the world against the violator rather than attempting to cope with aggression after aggression occurred, then we may be able to raise the United Nations to a plane where world peace does seem within sight. I suppose the big question for such a strengthened United Nations is not which nations are to be left out but how to get all the nations in the world to come in.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Surely the United Nations cannot claim two things at the same time. One is to ignore a country within its counsels and at the same time try to impose its will on that country which has been ignored. The two are contradictory. The United Nations, by keeping out some countries, whether China or Ceylon (both, I think, are equally wrong), in a sense denies itself the moral right to deal with that country. For that country it is a simple reply that 'you do not recognize us for this purpose; therefore, we have nothing to do with you.' The United Nations puts itself in a wrong position thereby. If you cannot deal with a country within the form of the United Nations, then the only alternative is to deal with it outside ultimately by force of arms."

WHAT HOPE FOR THE WORLD?

"When you talk about blocs, it is rather difficult to define what a bloc is. Any military alliance is a very close bloc. Any two or three or four countries joining together is a bloc—whether for military or other reasons. So either on the one side you must put an end to any association of two countries for any purpose—other than maybe cultural—or some kind of alliances will take place ultimately. Such things have to be met by an improvement of the world situation; because much of this is due to fear—whether fear of oppression, fear of other countries spreading out and attacking the interests and privileges of their neighbors. The basic way to move is to create conditions of lessened fear. Having done that, you can then build up that type of United Nations you have suggested.

"Mr. COUSINS. Yes, all over the world, Mr. Prime Minister, wherever I have gone I have found the fear of which you speak. I have found it in individuals everywhere. In some places that fear resulted in futility, in others defeatism, in others desperation or acute anxiety. Would you agree that the place to start is by eliminating today the cause of fear? What better way to do that than by working inside the United Nations itself to give it the required strength within the required time? What other hope for the world is there?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. That is true. But, again, I repeat that if the United Nations itself in the minds of large numbers of people does not represent the world as a whole it becomes a part of the world and the other part is out of it. That part of it then is not subject to its jurisdiction, and you can only bring it in or deal with it by the policemen's methods—which countries resent. So that instead of assuring peace you are gradually drifting to greater conflicts.

"Mr. COUSINS. I do get your point, Mr. Prime Minister; I was merely anxious to find out from you whether you believe that a proper starting point might perhaps be in the form of a call for a revision conference in the United Nations under articles 108 and 109 of the Charter. Such a revision conference might represent something of a fresh start inside the United Nations, trying to finish the job begun at San Francisco—enormously difficult though that may be. It would bring together—before it is too late—the nations of the world in order to find out to what extent it is now possible to define the basic principles on which workable universal world organization must rest. Assuming that weakness tends to create crisis, how can such weakness as may now exist in the United Nations be eliminated?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. You are referring to a possible revision of the United Nations Charter?

"Mr. COUSINS. Yes, sir.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, perhaps that may be desirable and it may help. Personally, I do not find anything wrong about the United Nations Charter itself. There may be minor procedural matters. It is a very fine charter. The objectives are fine, but still, if a revision is required, certainly we should consider it to make the United Nations more of a universal body. That would no doubt help."

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

To: Department of State.
From: Bombay 885, April 4, 1951.
Reference: Voluntary.
Subject: Leader specialist program, Mr. Norman Cousins.

This consulate general has the honor to report on the successful visit of Mr. Norman Cousins to Bombay during the period February 22 through February 28. By the time Mr. Cousins reached the end of his rapid itinerary he was of course a sick man, having contracted amoebic dysentery in Calcutta. Although this consulate general had made long-range advance plans involving a reasonably heavy schedule for Mr. Cousins, the Embassy in Delhi warned this office 1 day in advance that Mr. Cousins should be handled carefully and should be given as much opportunity to rest as possible. With that warning this office had serious doubts about the possible success of the week, but Mr. Cousins' firm determination to carry through his commitments his physical condition did not seriously interfere with the successful completion of his mission in this area.

Mr. Cousins' public appearances included a press conference on Thursday, February 22, attended by approximately 30 representatives of the major papers in the city, and later on the same day a speech on the subject of "American Public Opinion and Peace" for the Bombay branch of the Indian Council of World Affairs. Approximately 60 members of that organization attended the lecture which was given in the Board room of Bombay House, headquarters of Tatas. On Friday, the 23d, under the sponsorship of the Progressive Group, Mr. Cousins talked to an audience of approximately 300 on the subject of where the peace begins. A speech scheduled in Poona on Saturday the 24th was canceled on the basis of Mr. Cousins' health. On Monday, February 26, Mr. Cousins spoke to 150 people at a meeting arranged by the newly formed Democratic Research Service with his topic "Who Speaks for Peace." On Monday afternoon Mr. Cousins also made a brief appearance in the office of the United States Information Service and spoke to assembled staff members. February the 27th involved two speeches for Mr. Cousins—one at noon for 200 Rotary Club members with his topic, "Don't Resign From the Human Race," the other later that day was a question and answer period concerned with literary subjects arranged by P. E. N. for approximately 70 members and friends.

This catalog of public appearances clearly indicates a deliberate move on the part of this office inasmuch as local organizations were approached to sponsor Mr. Cousins' appearances. The consulate general made no attempt to hide the fact that Mr. Cousins was visiting Bombay under the auspices of the United States Government but it was thought wise to arrange for a recognized local association to actually sponsor his public appearances.

Members of the press attended all of the public lectures and the reporting was in most instances adequate. Typical press reports on the several features are forwarded as enclosures for this dispatch. Few editorial comments appeared pertaining to Mr. Cousins' visit but three are attached as enclosures for this dispatch. A note in Bharat, Congress-owned daily, February 24, inspired by comments made by Mr. Cousins at his Indian Council of World Affairs speech, an editorial in the frequently anti-American Free Press Bulletin, February 28, criticizing Mr. Cousins for his lack of understanding of the basis of India's neutrality, and a favorable brief note in the Bombay Chronicle dated March 1 congratulating Mr. Cousins for his tactfulness in recognizing and commenting on the feeling of frustration found during his visit in India. As usual the party line, Blitz, provided the one false note in reporting American activity in the area. In the issue of March 3 that publication used a brief reference Mr. Cousins had made to the geographic spread of communism as a jumping-off point for additional castigation of the United States. In relation to the extent of Mr. Cousins' activity during the time he was in Bombay it is only surprising that Blitz failed to devote more attention to his visit.

In all his public appearances Mr. Cousins was impressive and although he is not a brilliant orator his texts were more than satisfactory and were delivered with a sincere conviction which impressed his audiences. In each instance Mr. Cousins emerged as a brilliant performer when it came to the question-and-answer period. It was the general consensus of most people who heard him that that portion of each lecture period was by far the most impressive. The questions at one or another session ranged the full gamut of local current thinking about the United States in international relations. Some of the questions recurring more than once were: Why does the United States support reactionary regimes such as Chiang? Why has the United States refused Nehru's mediation? Mr. Cousins' personal views on One World Government? The explanation for the United States refusal to accept China as a U. N. member? Why not leave the Koreans to solve their own problems? And an explanation of the differences in the definitions of peace.

The most hard-hitting speech made by Mr. Cousins during the week he was in Bombay was that for the Democratic Research Service. Before Mr. Cousins' arrival the Democratic Research Service had cleared with him asking that he prepare a special speech aimed at an exposé of the phony Soviet peace campaign. Mr. Cousins used it as an opportunity to describe the state of thinking in the United States in the early part of the 1930's and then the progressive disillusionment of America with the international attitude of the Soviet. He also pointed a parallel that he has seen in India today, the current state of confused thinking which he has found similar to that in our own country during the 1930's. The full text of this particular speech was transcribed by tape recorder and is available to the Department if the Department is interested in

seeing it. During the question period immediately after that speech the first question was concerned with Mr. Cousins' appearance at the Waldorf-Astoria Peace Meeting in 1947. Mr. Cousins explained at considerable length in an off-the-record fashion the full story behind his invitation from the Peace Committee and the exact sequence of events at the actual meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria. It was one of the most interesting answers given by Mr. Cousins during the whole time he was in the city of Bombay.

An additional interesting press reaction appeared in the Bombay Gujerati daily, Hindustan, a reasonably influential local language newspaper with a circulation of 15,000 copies. In the February 23 issue in a three-column story on Norman Cousins in the literary section of the editorial page, the editor made the following statement:

"Following the visit of the British Council's drama group, the arrival of an author from across the Atlantic will find welcome from all interested in literature. It seems, in this trip Mr. Cousins is going to appear more as a political expert than a man of letters. The topics of his talks deal mainly with democracy, peace, American public opinion, and so on. It is a matter of regret that Bombay will not come to know about the artistic personality of a man who has been editing for 10 years a first-rank literary magazine like the Saturday Review of Literature. If a public talk on some literary subject can still be arranged, it would be worth while. Either at Mr. Cousins' meeting with P. E. N. members or at another suitable occasion, it is necessary to arrange a talk that will throw light upon him as an author and give some idea of contemporary trends in American literature. We hope the USIS will think about this."

One of the staff members in the Gujerati translation section of the office caught the article the morning it appeared and without reference to Mr. Norman Cousins the cultural affairs officer wrote immediately to the editor. The text of the answer is given in full:

"Your article concerning Mr. Norman Cousins has been called to our attention and we would like to report that we completely sympathize with your point of view. In relation to that point of view we deliberately saved one evening of Mr. Cousins' crowded schedule for an opportunity for the members of P. E. N. to meet him. We assume and we early promised Madam Wadia that Mr. Cousins would talk informally at that meeting about the American literary scene and will then be only too glad to answer questions pertinent to the literary field.

"As you are aware most of Mr. Cousins' appearances are concerned with the subject of peace. In relation to the situation of the world in 1951 and in relation to Mr. Cousins' personal convictions this consistent concern should not be a surprise to you or your readers. Mr. Cousins' whole literary life has been concerned with literature as a living force and with, in 1951 forces in the world threatening life itself, it should not be a surprise to you that much of Mr. Cousins' thinking and talking time is concerned with the * * *. Unfortunately the editor did not choose to publish the answer, but fortunately Mr. Cousins heartily approved of the text and requested a copy for his personal files inasmuch as he regarded it as a clear-cut explanation of the philosophy of his trip.

Mr. Cousins was satisfied with the press conference, which was an extremely lively one in relation to Bombay standards, much as it was off the record, which surprisingly enough reporters did appreciate. The press conference was remarkably free from the needling variety of questions visiting Americans frequently face, and the chief explanation seems to be the sincerity of Mr. Cousins in talking to individuals and groups. He gained the respect of many of the reporters immediately, and held that respect throughout the conference, which lasted for 1 hour and a half. During the week Mr. Cousins was also interviewed for an All India Radio broadcast. The interview was accomplished by Mr. Frank Moraes, the editor of the Times, of India, and the majority of the questions were, of course, literary, inasmuch as All India Radio keeps clear of political commentary.

A fine statement by Mr. Cousins was made during his brief appearance at the United States information center. He told a story concerning his visit to a refugee camp in Delhi during which he encountered a reasonably active Communist propagandist. He used that story as typical of the propaganda campaign being fought in India and finished with a statement which has been repeated to USIS employees throughout India.

"Within a week I shall be leaving India, and you will be here to fight out the battle. It will be easy enough for me back in the United States to talk about the problems and to get American support, because that is easy enough to do at a distance. I do not know whether I will get it, but at least I can talk about it. But you will be here on the firing line, and so I would say to you that in all the world today I can't think of a group of people who have a greater cause to which to dedicate and consecrate themselves than you have, because a lot more is a stake than merely the preservation of this nation or that nation. What is at stake is the preservation of human value. We have got a very tough fight on our hands. But I think it is a fight in which we actually have and can bring greater force to bear than the other side can bring to bear on the problem. I think we have the greater force because I think we have history itself on our side. I do not think that we can do more than fight the good fight. I don't think indeed we can do less than that. But I do think, however, that to do less than that would be treason to the human race."

Based on instructions from Delhi this Consulate General kept Mr. Cousins' social engagements to an absolute minimum. Before word reached this office of the state of his health several social functions had been arranged. Mr. Cousins insisted on carrying through with those functions although he possibly should not have. On Thursday, the 22nd of February, Mr. Minco Masani, the Chairman of the Indian Council of World Affairs, Bombay branch, gave a dinner party involving numerous local personalities Mr. Masani was anxious to have Mr. Cousins meet. On Friday the 23d, the Consul General and Mrs. Childs entertained at a formal buffet supper for Mr. Cousins. That dinner party coincided with the one evening that Mr. and Mrs. George McGhee were in the city on their way to the Colombo Conference and they were of course added to the dinner list. It gave Mr. Cousins an opportunity to give first-hand impressions to Mr. McGhee of his full Indian experience. On Sunday evening, the 25th, the Cultural Affairs Officer, in the absence of the Public Affairs Officer, entertained 50 press people at a reception in Mr. Cousins' honor. The balance of the schedule was kept in the clear and except for small scale luncheon and dinner engagements and numerous private interviews Mr. Cousins was able to obtain some rest during the period he was in the city of Bombay. The best evidence that the Bombay experience was not as disastrous as it could have been is the fact that Mr. Cousins regained four of the seventeen pounds he had lost earlier in India.

In public meetings and in private contacts Mr. Cousins demonstrated to virtually everybody his ability as a thinker and his genuine talents as a person. Few Americans who have visited in this area have made as much of an impression as Mr. Cousins did during the week that he was in the city. The only limitations on the effectiveness of his visit were that of the condition of his health which did prevent him from following the energetic 24-hour-a-day schedule he usually follows and the constant presence of Mr. Julius Stulman, his traveling companion. Mr. Stulman is the subject of a separate despatch.

This Consulate General would like to go on record that the Government-sponsored visit by Mr. Cousins was completely successful and would also like to recommend similar visits arranged by the Government for people as well qualified as Cousins is. Local organizations welcome American speakers and if those speakers are of the caliber of Mr. Cousins the effectiveness of the USIE program will be extended. Additional enclosures to this despatch consist of 4 pictures taken at the press conference and 3 pictures taken during Mr. Cousins' quick visit to the USIS office.

W. CLYDE DUNN,
American Consul.

(Enclosures: 1. Clipping, Free Press Journal, February 23, 1951. 2. Clipping, Times of India, February 23, 1951. 3. Clipping, Bombay Chronicle, February 23, 1951. 4. Clipping, Bharat, February 23, 1951. 5 Clipping, Free Press Journal, February 24, 1951. 6. Clipping, Times of India, February 28, 1951. 7. Clipping, Free Press Journal, February 28, 1951. 8. Clipping, National Standard, February 28, 1951. 9. Clipping, Bombay Chronicle, February 28, 1951. 10. Clipping, Free Press Bulletin, February 28, 1951. 11. Clipping, Bombay Chronicle, March 1, 1951. 12. Clipping, Blitz, March 3, 1951. 13, Photographs, 4 pp.)

[From the Bombay Free Press Journal of February 23, 1951]

FORMATION OF WORLD GOVERNMENT, MR. COUSINS' PLEA

BOMBAY, Thursday.—The need for the formation of a world government functioning under world laws to be evolved by a world body was emphasized by Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, published in the United States, at a press conference here today.

The world government, he said, would enforce peace on all its member nations with a control on common security of individuals and the people.

Mr. Cousins, who is on a lecture tour of India, further stated that the United States had committed a mistake in accepting the right of veto for the Big Five in the Security Council. He regretted that America had followed the policy of isolationism in the past.

The American journalist was emphatically of opinion that a world war was not inevitable, but added: "I will not subscribe, under any circumstances, to a peace which will cost the moral values."

Referring to the preservation of peace, Mr. Cousins said that only a working partnership between India and America for peace would help the world in maintaining it.

Later, addressing a meeting of the Indian Council of World Affairs at the Bombay House this evening, Mr. Cousins observed that the American press did not necessarily reflect the public opinion in the country. He was speaking on Public Opinion in the United States of America and the Peace.

UNITED STATES NEWS

He said he was disturbed to see news from the United States treated in the Indian press as though it actually represented the real opinion of the American people. American news reaching Indian newspapers had to be understood with a proper background to evaluate it in proper perspective, he said.

There were many things in common between the two countries, and the press in

both countries which had tremendous responsibilities should work toward bringing about better understanding between the peoples of America and India, Mr. Cousins pleaded.

While asserting that "bad news from America was not the real news," he said that he saw signs of rift between the people of both countries, and this rift would be exploited to create "real rift between us." Mr. Cousins said that he found very little of American literature in the libraries and educational institutions in India, and he thought that more and more American publications should be read by Indians.

He admitted that "shady magazines," which were sold in India in large numbers, had much higher circulation in the United States than the serious type of publications.

[From the Times of India, Colombo, Ceylon, of February 23, 1951]

ESTABLISHMENT OF WORLD PEACE—VALUE OF INDO-UNITED STATES AMITY

An active working partnership between India and the United States is the only effective means by which the present drift toward another global conflict, could be avoided and universal peace established, according to Mr. Norman Cousins, noted author and editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature.

Addressing a press conference in Bombay on Thursday, Mr. Cousins, who is on a United States Government-sponsored lecture tour of India, said that these two nations—one representing the east and the other the west—should join hands within the framework of the United Nations and endeavor to work for peace through principles and not through power politics.

Mr. Cousins advocated the development of the United Nations as an organization having the authority to make, enact, enforce and interpret world laws. "Otherwise the United Nations will die and with it the last best hope for achieving peace," he added.

Declaring that another war is not inevitable, the American author, however, added that he did not believe in achieving peace at any price.

KNOW EACH OTHER BETTER

Later in the evening, speaking to the members of the Bombay branch of the Indian Council of World Affairs, Mr. Cousins referred to the lack of proper understanding between the peoples of India and the United States.

He remarked that the press and public opinion polls in the United States did not truly reflect the thoughts and views of the people. News, which was considered unimportant in one country, was prominently displayed in the newspapers of the other country, while really important items of news were either treated with scant respect or ignored totally.

Referring to the great part that the two nations had to play in the coming years in shaping world opinion, Mr. Cousins said: "There is a great similarity between America and India. These two countries must work in closer cooperation in the cause of world peace."

Asked to clarify the general misunderstanding that Americans were trigger happy, Mr. Cousins said it was an injustice to the United States—indeed to the human race to say that Americans were war happy.

Mr. M. R. Masani, chairman of the council, presided.

[From Bharat of February 24, 1951]

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, is obviously a great believer in Indo-American amity. His forcible plea for a better understanding between the two nations will be widely endorsed in this country. It was surprising to hear an outstanding American journalist asking this country not to take the American press as reflecting the public opinion there. His plea to the Indian press to be more broad based in its news treatment of America is unnecessary. The Indian press barring a microscopic minority has never tampered with the weights and measures of news reporting. And toward America, it cannot be said that either the people or the press of this country are hostile in any way. As for Mr. Cousins' assertion that anybody who makes a fool of himself in America gets a front page in India, it may be said that this is the result of the dictum attributed to Northcliffe that when a dog bites a man it is not news, and when a man bites a dog it is news. After all the public are interested in the unusual and the unexpected. There can be no doubt that a working partnership between India and America would increase the chances of peace. This is exactly what Prime Minister Nehru has been attempting, and it was in this spirit that he undertook a tour of the American Continent 2 years ago. Differences of opinion and shifts in emphasis will always mark the relations between two countries; but on the fundamental allegiance to the democratic ideal there can be and ought to be no difference whatsoever between India and the United States.

[From the Free Press Journal of February 24, 1951]

OVER-ALL POWER FOR U. N.—WAY TO SAVE PEACE, SAYS MR. COUSINS

BOMBAY, Friday.—A mandate to the U. N. Organization to exercise effective control over all nations was the only way to enforce peace in the world and make aggression impossible, stated Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, here today.

Mr. Cousins, who has been deputed by the Government of the United States to make the American viewpoint known to the Indian people, was addressing a meeting under the Progressive Group at the Taj Mahal Hotel this evening.

This end could be achieved, in Mr. Cousins' opinion, through a working partnership between the people of India and the United States inside the United Nations Organization to correct the errors of the past few years and to find the basis of a revised U. N. in which it would be possible for all nations to come in without alining themselves into power blocs.

UNITED STATES INTENTIONS

The much maligned and much misunderstood Government of the United States, Mr. Cousins said, was working for peace, and it was not true that it was concerned only with war. There was a tremendous movement for peace in his country, the speaker declared.

Mr. Cousins urged that the frightful possibilities of atomic warfare should impress on the people of the world that they could no longer afford to make any mistake which would have frightful results. Looking at the pattern of culture of the twentieth century which was a pattern of destruction, the people had the right to ask, "Where are the forces in the world that speak peace, speak for man?" And yet, Mr. Cousins wailed, all over the world the people were indulging in the luxury of nationalism in the awful game of power politics.

Peace was possible even at this late day if the United Nations was strengthened so as to have powers of law and compulsory jurisdiction over nations, he declared.

[From the Times of India, Colombo, Ceylon, of February 28, 1951]

"INDIA IS HOPE OF WORLD" UNITED STATES EDITOR'S VIEW

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, told the Bombay Rotary Club on Tuesday that there was no scope for mediation of the problems facing the world today.

Mr. Cousins, who was speaking on the subject Don't Resign From the Human Race, said that India today was in a unique position, not to mediate, but to create or design a framework within which it might be possible to prevent the world "from blowing up in one last explosion."

Wherever he had been, particularly in France, Germany, Austria, and the Scandinavian countries, during the last 3 years, he had observed a feeling of fatalism—"existantialism" and "inevitabilism" were the synonyms Mr. Cousins used—a feeling of resignation from the problems facing the entire human race.

"Today in India," Mr. Cousins said, "I feel, on the basis of my very short trip that there is a summing up of almost everything I found elsewhere. But India may be the last place in the world to reflect the feeling to resign from the human race. India is the hope of the world. No nation throughout history had more to offer to humanity at large than India has today.

"India today is the hope of the world. No nation in history, indeed, had so much to offer for the building up of an enduring peace and for the defense of the basis for an enlargement of the human species. I leave India with very high hopes."

India, Mr. Cousins added, in solving her problems, could be an inspiration to the entire world. India was the laboratory of the future. India was the largest nation in the world outside the totalitarian "bloc"—a nation which could provide an answer to totalitarianism. India had the means to advance the cause of world peace, not by mediation, but by the creation of a framework within which the rights of people could be enforced.

Rotarian-President Niren N. Ghose was in the chair. Rotarian Dr. F. P. Antia proposed a vote of thanks.

[From the Free Press Journal of February 28, 1951]

"GIVE UP FALSE NEUTRALITY," UNITED STATES EDITOR'S TIP TO INDIA

BOMBAY, Tuesday—India should give up its path of mediation and false neutrality and take the lead in establishing peace and order in the world by creating an enduring framework of law within the United Nations, Mr. Norman Cousins, Editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, stated here today.

Mr. Cousins, who was addressing the Rotary Club this afternoon, declared that there was no common meeting ground between the two different groups of the world. World peace and order could be established only if a strong and fearless attitude was taken up in the United Nations. He advocated a strong approach to the problems at present facing the world.

Mr. Cousins was of the opinion that India could rightly take the lead in the U. N. as no nation had more to offer to itself, and to the world than this country.

His impression of the country, he said, was that uncertainty, defeatism, helplessness and inertia, which were the bane of European countries, were more apparent in India than anywhere else.

[From the National Standard of February 28, 1951]

INDIA ABLE TO PREVENT WORLD FROM BLOWING UP, SAYS UNITED STATES EDITOR

"India is in an unique position to create the framework within which it is possible to keep the world from blowing up," declared Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, when he addressed the Rotary Club in Bombay on Tuesday.

Mr. Cousins added that to create such a framework of world laws to provide a structure within which the rules of the game would be properly observed, the path of mediation and false neutrality should be given up and a straight and fearless attitude be taken up before the United Nations.

Mr. Cousins said, no nation has more to offer to itself and more to offer to the world at large than the people of India.

Summing up his impressions, Mr. Cousins observed that whatever problems he had found elsewhere in the world, the prevailing feeling of uncertainty, defeatism, helplessness, and inertia, were present in India in a more intense form.

FALSE NATIONAL BARRIERS

Elaborating on the subject of his speech, Don't Resign From the Human Race, Mr. Cousins said that in France, Germany, Austria, Scandinavia, and other countries, the same attitude of despair and defeatism prevailed and people were taking refuge behind false national barriers instead of facing what was happening around them in the world squarely.

Stressing the need for resolution and a strong approach to the present world crisis, Mr. Cousins observed that India today was the hope of the world. Calling for a positive approach he stated that there could be no mediation as there was no common ground between the differing groups. Either there was aggression or there was not. "If there is aggression, let us meet it fearlessly," he declared. The only way to meet aggression was by creating an enduring framework of world laws and their enforcement by the United Nations.

[From the Bombay Chronicle of February 28, 1951]

INDIA IS HOPE OF FREE WORLD, MR. COUSINS' VIEW

BOMBAY, Tuesday.—"As the largest free nation outside the totalitarian regime, India is the hope of the world," declared Mr. Norman Cousins, American journalist and author, addressing the Bombay Rotary Club Tuesday afternoon.

"India is in a unique position to design the framework within which to keep the world from blowing up in one great explosion," he added.

Mr. Cousins pointed out that India was an inspiration to the rest of the world in that she was striving to build up a stable economy and to raise the general standard of living of the masses without infringing human freedom.

The speaker said that wherever he visited there was a feeling of defeatism and fatalism discernible. All these problems in a most complicated, complex and intensified form faced India. No nation in history had to face such great difficulties in the post-independence era than India and he paid a tribute to the leadership of the country on their achievements in these trying times.

"I am leaving India in very high hopes," he concluded.

Rotarian president, N. N. Ghose, was in the chair. A vote of thanks was proposed by Dr. F. P. Antia.

[From the Free Press Journal of February 28, 1951]

FALSE NEUTRALITY

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, has been at considerable pains to tell us that our neutrality is false and our path of mediation wrong.

He would probably like us very much to join hands with the United States of America.

Obviously, our learned guest has neither understood nor probed more deeply into the reasons that have motivated India to take the stand she has consistently taken so far.

Even a casual study of India's foreign policy will show that her main desire has been to maintain peace, to promote understanding among the peoples of the world.

Inevitably, this leads to misunderstanding and heartburnings.

India has decided to risk unfriendliness.

She has been accused of siding now with the democratic bloc and again with the Communist bloc.

This only proves the contention that India has been playing fair with the peoples—not with governments.

India has been playing an unenviable role.

She can at best take comfort in the thought that she has been playing true to herself.

Polonius' advice is good as much for nations as for individuals.

India has never been neutral toward the people.

She has consistently championed their cause in the United Nations Organization.

This is a positive policy, as contrasted with the constant shifting that the United States has been indulging.

Mr. Cousins might read the Bible (St. Matthew, ch. 7):

"And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

"Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

[From the Bombay Chronice of March 1, 1951]

A MATTER OF CONFIDENCE

Mr. Norman Cousins who has just concluded a brief visit to India, managed with supreme tact to convey pleasantly to Indians that he found predominant here a sense of frustration. Mr. Cousins is not the only visitor to make this discovery though others hesitate between politely suppressing their feeling and brusquely disclosing it. It is not always that a distinguished foreigner on a flying visit trusts his own judgment sufficiently to risk hurting the feelings of his host on what might very well be a mistaken opinion. And those who remain longer, when they do not change their ideas, have several valid reasons for not speaking with candor. But it is a general impression with foreign visitors that the national spirit which one would expect to see in a country that has just gained freedom, was not very evident. One observer felt that the middle classes who should be the foremost in this kind of enthusiasm, were strangely lethargic and even indifferent. "Labor," he said, "and the peasantry can be roused to disinterested national effort when the occasion requires it; but the middle classes are different." There is a great deal which is brought into controversy by this analysis, and the middle class in India has had very little to feel pleased about.

[From Blitz of March 3, 1951]

WORDS AND DEEDS

Addressing the inaugural meeting of the Democratic Research Service (whatever that may be—but we have our own suspicions) at (your guess is right) the Indian Merchants Chamber, Bombay, Mr. Norman Cousins, American author and editor of The Saturday Review of Literature, urged Indians to judge those who claimed to work for peace not by their words but by their deeds. So we shall, Krudder! But you won't like it.

Disregarding words of Mr. Cousins and his compatriots, let us judge the American's professions of peace and democracy by some of their deeds—e. g. (1) Hiroshima. (2) Lynching. (3) Poll tax. (4) Atom-bomb manufacture. (5) Atom-bomb Russia propaganda. (6) War bases all over the world. (7) American rearmament of Fascist Japan and Nazi Germany. (8) American troops, planes, and armament in Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Turkey, Greece, etc.

Another simple test, Mr. Cousins to judge the comparative peaceful intentions of Soviet Russia and the United States of America: How many American troops today are to be found outside the frontiers of the United States of America? How many Russian troops are to be found outside the frontiers of U. S. S. R.?

We shall judge your deeds, Mr. Cousins but, suppose the verdict is "Guilty?"

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

To: Department of State (for IEP).
From: New Delhi, India, No. 2237, March 30, 1951.
Reference: Depcirtel 312, December 27, 1950.
Subject: Exchange of persons: American leader program, visit of Mr. Norman Cousins to Delhi area.

Mr. Norman Cousins arrived on February 10, 1951, from Lahore and left for Bombay on February 21. He returned to Delhi on February 28 and left again on March 3. During that time, Mr. Cousins gave seven lectures, was entertained at two teas, one dinner, one reception and at quite a large number of unscheduled social engagements. Also Mr. Cousins gave his time to all who wanted to see him and had several appointments with government officials, cabinet ministers, and one luncheon engagement, one dinner engagement, and two other appointments with the Prime Minister. He made two tape recordings with the Prime Minister, granted only on condition that they be used by NBC in the United States. He also made two recordings for All India Radio and toured some of the refugee camps.

Mr. Cousins was ill with dysentery while here, and therefore much of his tour was canceled. He also preferred a light schedule here so that he could devote more time to talking with an inverviewing Government officials.

The tour program (see enclosure 1).

RADIO BROADCASTS

His first broadcast was an interview with Harindranath Chattopadhyaya, one of India's leading poets and a pronounced Communist. The full text of approximately 30 minutes was edited down to 12 minutes. The interview was planned to be on cultural subjects, mostly writers and their works, but many "loaded" questions were asked. However, because of the policy of All India Radio, all objectionable material was deleted. The first broadcast was effective, and Mr. Cousins handled himself very well.

The other broadcast was on the Brains Trust program. Here questions are placed before a panel for discussion. The panel consisted of Mr. Jack Hughes, master of ceremonies, and from the British Information Service, New Delhi, Dr. K. G. Saiyadain, of the Ministry of Education, Dr. K. S. Krishna, director, National Physical Laboratory, Father D'Souza, Catholic priest and member of Parliament, and Mr. Norman Cousins. The questions ranged from "If science keeps advancing at its present rate, man will eventually destroy himself," to "Discuss the statement that 'Women are the better half.'"

In this second broadcast the discussion was extremely interesting, and with Mr. Cousins' sharp wit and humor, there was favorable comment among those who heard it.

He was requested to make further broadcast recordings, but found it impossible because of lack of time.

Press coverage (see enclosure 3 and press clippings.)

Enclosed are two press releases put out by USIS on Mr. Cousins' tour of the Delhi area.

Mr. Cousins' visit received extensive coverage in the majority of the Delhi area newspapers. Enclosed also is a press release of one of Mr. Cousins' interviews with Prime Minister Nehru.

POINTS OF EMPHASIS

1. Mr. Cousins stressed the point that there must be a peace with justice through a world federation, and that this federation must be supported by all nations of the world which will give the federation power to make and enforce laws.

2. He said that there must be better Indo-American relations since India has all the potentialities of becoming to the East what America is to the West. Therefore, the two countries must cooperate to create a better world.

3. He said that to achieve better relations (and he stressed this point in every speech), there would have to be a truer writing of the news. He said that if he were an Indian reading the Indian newspapers, he would have nothing to do with America because they (Indian newspapers) give front page headline coverage to American news items such as murder, rape, and statements by irresponsible nitwits, but some really important philanthropic event is hidden in the back pages in a two- or three-line article. He admitted that the same was done in some American newspapers but that the true facts could also be read in many others.

4. He expressed the opinion that after there is a working world federation, there must be a respect among all nations and all peoples for the rights of the individual and of the nations as individuals. He said that the United Nations could be such an organization if the nations of the world would drop all selfish aims and ambitions and work together for the benefit of mankind to abolish greed, want, and fear, and settle by discussion any misunderstanding that might arises.

Following every lecture, there was a question-and-answer period, and in his replies Mr. Cousins was at his best. Those questions most frequently asked were:

1. Is there discrimination against Negroes in the United States?

Yes. We have racial discrimination in the United States. But after a people have been kept in slavery for a hundred years and then are granted their freedom, it is not easy for those who have been masters to accept them as equals. You have the same problem in India with your untouchables.

In America, during the past 25 years, there have been great forward strides to abolish discrimination. However, you in your newspapers read nothing about this. You read only the bad aspects of discrimination and cannot know what forward steps have been and are being taken to do away with discrimination.

2. Why was Pakistan not considered an aggressor in Kashmir when China was branded as such in Korea?

I do not feel qualified to discuss the Kashmir question since I do not know the many intricacies involved and am not an expert on the subject. However, I hope that India and Pakistan can settle their dispute amicably between themselves.

3. Is it true that civil rights are becoming non-existent in the United States?

No. It is not true. From your newspaper accounts of the Martinsville Negroes and the Communist incidents (things which were always cited by the audience), it is no wonder that you have such ideas. However, we have been going through a bad time—a time of unrest and readjustment. We are beginning now to come out of it. India is going through such a time now, and I am sure she will come out of it.

4. Did the United States drop the atomic bomb on Japan because of racial discrimination?

No. There was no discrimination involved. I have seen the cities of Europe, and the damage done there by bombings was much worse than that done by the atomic bomb in Japan. In Europe, it was not just a few cities but many or all of the large ones. I feel that perhaps Japan should have been warned and given the opportunity to end the war before the bomb was dropped. However, if everyone could see the destruction in both Europe and Japan, as I have, I feel sure there would be no feelings whatsoever about racial prejudice unless it were against Europe.

5. Do you think the United States Congress will grant the wheat to India? What is American public opinion on this?

Yes. I think the wheat will be given to India. However, we are damned if we do and damned if we don't. It is the same all over the world.

If we give someone something, they damn us for giving it because we are showing our superiority as the "haves" over the "have nots." Also, if we don't give it, we are damned because we have it and won't give it. However, since it is a matter of conscience and since in a thing of this sort Americans are ruled by conscience, I feel that public opinion will be in favor of the wheat grant.

EVALUATION

The embassy regards short-term visits of American lecturers of the highest priority value for both short-term and long-term objectives. This informal person-to-person exchange of prominent, mature American leaders is invaluable, by supplementing the existing official exchanges, in increasing international understanding.

Particularly in India, where there is so much social, economic and cultural change during the first years of its national life, American leaders, by first-hand contacts and frank discussions with important people and organizations, will learn how Indians think about the rest of the world.

The embassy believes that these leaders should not only be sponsored by the Department, but also by private organizations and foundations possibly subsidized for this purpose by the United States Government.

Mr. Cousins' impact in Delhi was noticeable. Audiences and private interviewers liked him and seemed to be swayed, at least for the moment. He was sincere in his approach and in his interest in the opinions of others. He met and talked with all who wanted to see him.

His speeches were extemporaneous and varried in their appeal. However, he devoted much of his time to answering questions, and at this he was very adept. He occasionally showed himself somewhat too glib but gave no real offense. His listeners were always interested, if not always satisfied by his answers.

The total observable effect of the visit has convinced the embassy that it is important to have in India many alert and liberal leaders—talking, talking, talking. They should be tireless in their patience, but quick to present effectively American principles.

SUGGESTIONS

Because Mr. Cousins was under the sponsorship of the Department of State, many of the Indians felt that his speeches and discussions were strictly propaganda. It might be possible, in the future, to get some nongovernment organizations or institutions to sponsor some of the leaders officially with unofficial departmental backing.

It is suggested that something of the personality and habits of the leader be forwarded to each post for use in the preparation of the tour program. Along with this should be sent the leader's biography to be used by the posts in the preparation of press releases and other material. Those organizations and groups to whom the leader is to speak might make use of the biography in the selection of topics for the speeches.

Whenever possible, each visiting lecturer, at least those under the Department of State's program, should visit Delhi first for briefing and the working out of an integrated and well-planned program throughout India.

Public Affairs Section:

CLARE H. TIMBERLAKE,
Counselor and Chief Public Affairs Officer,
(For the Ambassador).

(Enclosures: 1. Tour program of Mr. Cousins. 2. Clippings: (a) Times of India, February 17, 1951. (b) Times of India, February 15, 1951. (c) Indian News Chronicle, February 17, 1951. (d) Statesman, February 17, 1951. (e) Indian News Chronicle, February 20, 1951. (f) Hindustan Times, February 20, 1951. 3. Press releases.)

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE,
American Embassy, New Delhi.

(For release in the morning papers of Wednesday, March 7, 1951)

NEW DELHI, March 6, 1951.—Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, who has just completed a 2-month good-will tour of India, had several conversations with Prime Minister Nehru. During the course of the conversations they discussed the proposal now before the United States Congress providing for the shipment of wheat to India. Prime Minister Nehru authorized Mr. Cousins to release to the press the following statements from their conversations:

"Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Prime Minister, before we conclude these discussions, I wonder if I might ask you a question that has to do with Indian-American relations. Some of the newspapers I happened to have seen here in India during the past few weeks have suggested that if America sends wheat, it will do so out of purely selfish motives. Would you care to comment on that?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. You have been here for 2 months or more and no doubt you have read many of our newspapers. No doubt you have seen that a good many of them have criticized our government—sometimes vigorously, sometimes quite violently, sometimes even worse. Well, I hope you realize that we have some freedom of the press here. Secondly, that some of the newspapers are very good and some of them not so good. Anyhow, to answer your question, just do not understand any individual or newspaper saying that. We have always wated not only the general cooperation of America but particular assistance in the things we need.

"A year and a half ago, when I went to the United States, food was the basic need and I mentioned it, and I have often been surprised to hear that people were saying that they gathered the impression that we never really wanted help. It amazes me. We want all the help in the world from everyone in the world. But it is also true, and this is what Mahatma Gandhi taught us, that we must learn to stand on our own feet. Too much reliance on outside help means that you do not grow properly, that you do not strengthen yourself. That is true, but in the matter of wheat, we have wanted it; we want it badly; we are facing a very severe crisis. We don't shout about it quite so much perhaps as we might; it is unbecoming to shout. But the fact is that our need is very great. We welcome the suggestions made in America—in the Congress there—that a large quantity of wheat will be coming, and we shall look forward to it."

Mr. Cousins' visit to India was made under the auspices of the United States State Department Cultural Exchange Program. His lecture tour took him to Madras, Calcutta, New Delhi, and Bombay, where he made numerous addresses to university, college, and civic groups on American Public Opinion, Democracy in the World Today, and many related subjects. He left New Delhi last Saturday for Bombay to enplane on his return trip to the United States. He expected to

visit Cairo, Athens and several other European cities before reaching New York City on March 15.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,
New Delhi.

(For immediate release)

MR. NORMAN COUSINS ON VISIT TO DELHI

NEW DELHI, February 10, 1951.—Mr. Norman Cousins, noted American author and editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, is visiting Delhi for a series of lectures and informal discussions with educational and civic groups. He also will meet prominent Government officials and Indian cultural leaders to discuss various aspects of bettering Indo-American relations.

From February 13 to February 16, Mr. Cousins will go to Lucknow, Kanpur, and Allahabad. In Lucknow, he will lecture at the Lucknow University. The lectures at Kanpur and Allahabad will be given under the auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs. He will also speak at the university in Allahabad.

When he returns to Delhi on Friday, February 16, he will address the Indian Council on World Affairs on the philosophy of American democracy.

Mr. Cousins will travel to Aligarh on Saturday, February 17, where he will speak at the Muslim University.

On February 19 and 20 respectively, Mr. Cousins will lecture at the University of Delhi on Public Opinion in the United States and at St. Stephen's College on Conditions of Democracy in the Modern World.

During his stay Mr. Cousins plans to see Agra and other ancient historical monuments in the Delhi area.

Well-known in world literary circles, Mr. Cousins is making a tour of India under the sponsorship of the Department of State of the United States, in the interest of cementing friendship and understanding between the peoples of India and America.

Thirty-eight-year-old Mr. Cousins graduated from the Teachers' College, University of Columbia in 1933. Though trained to be a teacher, he joined an editorial position in the New York Post and a year later he became the book critic of the magazine, Current History. Five years later he was appointed as the executive editor of the Saturday Review of Literature. Here he won fame by his outspoken and realistic writings which linked literature with current events. His feature articles broke the monotony of straight book reviews and set a new pattern of journalistic writing.

Mr. Cousins has lectured extensively on books and world affairs. He is also an author of repute. The Good Inheritance and Modern Man Is Obsolete are two of his well-known works.

A member of the board of directors of the Great Books Foundation, Mr. Cousins is also the vice president of the PEN, the international organization of authors. He is deeply interested in music and has composed over half a dozen musical scores.

Mr. Julius Stulman, an American economist and industrialist, is accompanying Mr. Cousins in order to observe and study economic conditions in India.

TOUR PROGRAM

1. February 12, 1951, 5 p. m.: Tea at Ambassador's. (Present were Government officials and leading newspaper and magazine editors.) Mr. Cousins made a short speech on Public Opinion in India and in the United States.

2. February 14, 1951: Lectures at Mahanand Mission Harijan College at Ghaziabad, and at Central Institute of Education on Foreign Policy of United States of America.

3. February 16, 1951, 6 p. m.: Lecture before Indian Council of World Affairs at Constitution Club, New Delhi, on Philosophy of American Democracy. (Note clipping from Times of India of February 17, 1951. The last paragraph misquotes Cousins altogether. It has made Mr. Cousins responsible for what was really the text of Mr. Ayyanger's speech during the 50-minute rebuttal period following Mr. Cousins' 40-minute speech.)

4. February 17, 1951: Motored to Aligarh where he met and talked with the vice chancelor of Muslim University, Dr. Zakir Hussain. He also visited the Yogi school in Aligarh where he gave a short unscheduled lecture.

5. February 19, 1951, 5 p. m.: Lecture at the University of Delhi, Convocation Hall, on Public Opinion in India and in the United States. The attendance here was very poor. Because of the death of a minister, classes had been dismissed in the morning. This office was not notified nor was the university willing to reschedule the speech.

6. February 19, 1951, 7:30 p. m.: Cocktail party at William C. Bourne's (information officer and attaché) residence to meet the representatives of the local press.

7. February 20, 1951, 9:35 a. m.: Lecture at St. Stephen's College, Assembly Hall, Delhi, on Condition of Democracy in the Modern World.

8. February 20, 1951, 7:30 p. m.: Dinner at St. Stephen's College students' dining hall, followed by an informal discussion period in the students' lounge with 20 of the leading students.

[From the Hindustan Times of February 20, 1951]

INDIAN CONGRESS FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM

Dr. Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review of Literature, will lead a discussion on the world movement for cultural freedom. Constitution Club, 5 p. m.

[From the Times of India of February 15, 1951]

INCREASED POWER FOR UNITED NATIONS—UNITED STATES JOURNALIST'S VIEW

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, of New York, said in an interview in New Delhi on Wednesday that the "United States and India could save the peace by coming together in a working partnership inside the United Nations."

Such partnership, he said, could lead the way to an enforceable system of world law through the fullest development of the United Nations. In particular, he urged that both countries, in their respective positions of leadership in east and west, should make a joint proposal to the world for an early revision conference of the United Nations aimed at a drastic strengthening of the U. N. Charter.

"The United Nations must be vested with the powers to make, enforce, and interpret world law," he said. "It must enjoy compulsory jurisdiction only in clearly defined matters related to world security."

Mr. Cousins is on a lecture tour in India and Pakistan under the cultural exchange program sponsored by the United States Government.

[From the Indian News Chronicle of February 20, 1951]

INDIA CAN HELP U. S. A. KEEP WORLD PEACE

DELHI, Monday.—That America had not been properly understood and represented and "no one really speaks for U. S." was revealed by Dr. Norman Cousins, a visiting American editor, in a lecture this evening in the Delhi University. He was speaking on American Public opinion. Dr. S. N. Sen, vice chancelor, presided.

Dr. Cousins said that several misunderstandings had cropped in India leading to distrust of Americans. He urged for a better understanding of the Americans by the people of this country. He said this was essential for world peace.

Dr. Cousins added that it was true that America had not responded to India's needs with the promptness and in a measure as was expected. But it was not due to any apathy or for any "political" consideration on the part of the Americans. It was due only to the fact that very little was known there about Indian needs and conditions in general.

He referred to the recent appeal for wheat by India. He said that no American knew as to what India's real needs were.

He however promised that when he returns to his country he would take up the matter with United States newspaper men, writers and also in the next meeting of the PEN.

PSYCHOLOGY OF PEOPLE

Dr. Sen in his presidential remarks said that to understand Indian opinion it was essential to understand the psychology of the Indian people. Indians he added were essentially for peace for their very salvation lay in peace. He hoped that the Indian Government would cooperate with the United States Government in the maintenance of an "honorable peace."

[From the Statesman of February 17, 1951]

CONDITIONS FOR DEMOCRACY—UNITED STATES EDITOR'S ADDRESS

Addressing a meeting of the Indian Council of World Affairs in New Delhi on Friday, Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the United States magazine, the Saturday Review of Literature, said that if the democratic way of life was to be maintained and enlarged, it must form part of a world structure.

Speaking on the Conditions for Democracy, he said that the world had become a geographic unit. To make it fit for human habitation, there was need for both an overall economic integration and adoption of measures to safeguard the individual's rights against the State. This could be achieved only if the threat of aggression was removed and for this a world organization with powers to enact and enforce international law was essential.

He suggested that a revisionary conference of the U. N. be called and provision made for a world federal government with powers to prevent aggression. It was not worth while, he pointed out, to have peace at the cost of justice.

As leaders of the East and the West, India and the United States of America had a great responsibility in mobilizing public opinion and working in partnership for the achievement of world conditions in which democracy could spread.

[From the Times of India of February 17, 1951]

PLEA FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT—ERADICATION OF RACIAL BARRIERS URGED

The Indian people would support the ideal of a World Federal Government only if the participating white nations shed all colonialism and removed all barriers—social, political, economic, and geographic—against all colored peoples, said Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, deputy speaker of Parliament, in New Delhi on Friday.

He was presiding over an Indian Council of World Affairs meeting, addressed by Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, New York, who emphasized the need for Indo-American cooperation for a revision of the United Nations Charter to provide for a World Federal Government.

Mr. Cousins said that unless the world discovered a design for itself as a whole the strains and stresses on democracy in each individual country would continue to increase.

Only by solving the world problems in a democratic manner and by treating the world as a single unit could the problems of individual democracies be solved, he said. "The world has become too small for provincialism," he emphasized.

What mattered was not the mere superstructure of a world government, but the character of the law on which it was to be based. Such a system, he said, should not rely merely on western conception of democracy, which, he said, had condoned the oppression of colonial people, as in South Africa and the barring of the entry of colored people into countries such as Australia and Canada. Even the western economic system involved the concentration of wealth in a few hands, a system that could not work in eastern countries, where the pressure of population was high. He wanted the western system of political and economic democracy to be developed to suit eastern conditions. Such an experiment was already being tried in the East, particularly in China.

[From the Indian News Chronicle of February 17, 1951]

NATIONS URGED TO STRIVE FOR WORLD PEACE—COUSINS APPEALS FOR INDO-UNITED STATES COOPERATION

NEW DELHI, Friday.—A fervent appeal to the people of the world to come together and dissolve their differences and help the cause of peace was made this evening by Dr. Norman Cousins, a visiting American editor. He was speaking on "Conditions of Democracy in United States of America and Other Countries" at the Constitution Club under the auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs. Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar presided.

Dr. Cousins said that it was time that the people of the world realized how tragic another war would be. If they failed to prevent it, then in his view they had no right to call themselves civilized and democratic. The only manner in which they could help bring about peace in the world was, he said, that all nations strengthen the hands of the U. N. He made a special appeal to India for cooperation as the leader of the eastern countries. He thought that if the United States and India could work together for the cause of peace then much could be achieved both in and outside the U. N.

He added that if the majority of the member nations of the U. N. wanted peace then they could call for the holding of a revision conference by a two-thirds majority in the U. N. The decisions of such a revision conference, he said, would not be subject to veto. In this manner a headway could be made toward forming a world federal government, which could both enact and enforce laws for the maintenance of world peace.

DESIGN FOR DEMOCRACY

In the course of his lecture, Dr. Cousins said that there were three basic provisions for the functioning of a democratic government in any country—existence of a design for democracy both in that country and in the world at large economic integration on a large scale with the rest of the world (this he termed as substance for world peace); and some unity of concept in the relations between the state and the individual, meaning thereby freedom of individual's body and mind.

He said here that in Japan the first prerequisite for a democratic set-up had been somewhat realized. The present-day Japan, he said, was a much more industralized country, a healthier place to live in—the death rate having fallen from 27.7 to 11.4 percent—and was economically fast progressing. But he added that unless the general atmosphere in the world did not change, nothing much could be accomplished by individual nations in completing their democratization.

Concluding, he told the gathering not to be misguided by exaggerated press reports and start thinking that the Americans had gone hysterical due to the pressure of the present world situation and the power of their arms.

Mr. Minoo Masani, M. P., speaking on the occasion, said that Dr. Cousins' ideas and beliefs were greatly affected by those of Mahatma Gandhi who also was opposed to war and wanted an honorable peace for the people of the world.

[From the Forum of March 11, 1951]

CREATION OF A WORLD INSTITUTE

(By Julius Stulman)

The world has struggled a long time to find its answers and it has had to grow up. Man has fought and competed for the world's goods and glory with an utter disregard of the fact that he is part of the human family and that in the ultimate end he can only create chaos, depressions, suffering, and revolutions by building individual pyramids for himself and his close associates.

What we have to learn about our free economic system and democratic order is that the individual is entitled to rise higher and higher only as he helps to broaden and widen the base below him, so that the whole structure rises together. He has to work on this principle: That his goal is not alone to erect a sharp pinnacle of personal wealth and special privilege for himself—which inherently leads to self-destruction—but to guide the building of that broader, stronger structure in whose benefits he and all the others will share.

The world is hungry today for limitless quantities of goods and is starving for the productive skills, the administrative genius, the technical know-how which the leaders of our free enterprise system can provide. Must they be swept aside by revolution? Must they be shackled by the bureaucratic rules and regulations of self-keeping politicians? Must they always be guided and goaded by legislation? I say they need not be.

Our businessmen are not demons. Most of them have excellent intentions. But a great many of them are men who fail in their thinking. They fail to see their responsibilities to their fellow men and to the very democratic, free enterprise system from which they have extracted such profit.

To correct this kind of error, we have to start by recognizing that there is purpose and plan and function in God's order for the universe and for man.

In the economic realm we have to act on the assumption that the purpose of an economic system is to call forth and organize the productive skills and powers of men, to create abundance and to see that that abundance is fairly distributed. We will not have that kind of economic system if we leave matters to blind chance. And we will not get that kind of system if we try to legislate it into being, if we try to create it through a giant Government bureaucracy. We must also warn ourselves against thinking in terms of labels, of taking words for the real thing.

A VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION

It is with thoughts like these in mind that I have proposed the creation of a world institute, a voluntary association of men dedicated to the integrated, ethical, and material development of man. That is a tall order, I know, but this is a time for tall deeds if we are to survive at all.

Cutting across the artificial boundaries of race and nationality, the world institute would, on the one hand, promote the study of the new integrated science of human behavior and the study of scientific and technical developments needed to lift world living standard. On the other hand, it would also attempt to take concrete measures, area by area, to promote educational, economic, and social development.

Here is how it would work. The world institute would be directed by outstanding men and women drawn from many lands. One of their primary responsibilities would be to determine what educational program and research studies should be made and what development projects should be undertaken in each area. They would endeavor to become a great cooperative body for the common good. Rising above the limitations of personal greed and the special interests of the nation, the class, the private corporation, they would devote their skills to planning out what needs to be done to raise the level of life—and how to do it.

Specifically, perhaps the first projects of the institute, in addition to its educational program, would involve the establishment of enterprises and local institutes in underdeveloped regions in Asia or Latin America.

[From the Bombay Chronicle of February 27, 1951]

IN A CHINA SHOP

(By Taurus)

I walked into a room in the Taj Mahal Hotel one day last week. As I was some 10 minutes late for a press conference, I walked in as quietly as I could, little realizing that I had interrupted a veritable barrage of words by walking right across the line of fire. Wayne Hartwell who was seated farthest from the door, murmured that I must have met Mr. Stulman already. As I sat down in a chair next to Wayne, I looked around for the man and missed him because I was looking in the wrong place. Then I knew.

"* * * that is the point," said a soft voice which seemed to have been at it like the ticking of a clock eternally and untiringly. "I see everywhere around me in India so much possibilties: In the sun, in the air, in the sea, and even in the earth at our feet. And the people are so intelligent. Yet there is so much frustration around.

"It is simple and all things are simple, if you will only understand them. Take an ordinary typewriter. If, when I am typing at it, my man walks in and sees me doing my work and watches me and I ask him, 'Can you do this?' sure, he will answer, 'Yes, I can.' And being intelligent, thinking to himself, 'What Sahib can do, I, too, can do; why not,' he will set himself down to bang away at the keys. And the machine will break down and he will not know what just must be done to set it right. And he will feel quite puzzled. If he were just plain stupid, he would not suffer like this. He will say, 'I can't do this by myself,' and he will sit down to see the machine broken down into bits and to understand everything about it until he has got it all in.

"I am not blaming him. Why I would do the same thing myself. So would all intelligent persons. Wouldn't you do that yourself, Wayne?"

From Wayne, who was looking at the ceiling in a slightly befuddled state, came the discret affirmation, "Sure, that's just what I would do."

"Sure, you would," continued the gentle purr, as though Wayne had not spoken at all. "Why, so would all of us. So do Indians. I don't blame them. Would you blame them? Why, no. No one can blame them. And there we are all stuck, like a precocious child which, after he tried to imitate the grown-ups, develops all kinds of fixations and ends up at the psychiatrists. How must we get out of this? What must we do to escape from this vicious circle?"

I looked furtively at my watch. Mr. Stulman had covered a great deal of ground and done it all single-voiced, except for Wayne's gallant support unnecessarily rendered at one brief second. And he seemed good for

another day. I had another appointment. Dimly I cursed myself for coming and shook myself to catch up with that voice which raced endlessly through solar boxes, molasses utilization, a huge Heath Robinson pipe across the island of Bombay which would filter the seawater of all its valuable minerals and pour out the water at the other end.

It was all more than I could take in at one sitting and more than any man should give out at one, either. But Mr. Stulman's million-dollar ideas were inexhaustible. At one point, the soft voice alarmed us by saying that it had not yet begun.

Then with one superhuman effort, we all staggered out. Fearful, says the Gita, is the dharma of another. Certainly, Mr. Stulman had established the principle.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have been told just recently, this morning, in fact, that the Voice of America is now putting on considerable emphasis on the article that appears in the morning paper, that the American boys going to Europe were going to fight under one flag and that the American flag, with the Stars and Stripes, would not be in evidence. I wonder what effect that would have on the mothers and fathers of American boys in this country when they have to send their sons to Europe to fight under a flag other than their own. I understand the Voice of America is featuring that very thing.

Mr. ROONEY. Is General Eisenhower proposing that? I have not seen the article to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I saw it in the paper, and it makes my heart sick.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman the newspaper article to which he refers?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I have.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that a proposal of General Eisenhower?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not know. I understand the Voice of America is putting it in No. 1 headlines today.

Mr. ROONEY. Would it make any difference to the gentleman whether it was proposed by General Eisenhower?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; it would. If my son goes over there, I want him to fight under the Stars and Stripes and not under some foreign flag. I will say that to the gentleman without any hesitation.

Mr. ROONEY. At first blush I might be inclined to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] gave quite a dissertation on the need for bringing advertising men into the Voice of America program. He implied that this program would be much better if it had an advertising man in a key position.

Apparently the gentleman from Ohio does not know that the present general manager of the program, Mr. Thurman L. Barnard, is a top-flight advertising man who, in the past, has handled most of the advertising for the Ford Motor Co. and for the Procter & Gamble Co. He also had psychological-warfare experience during the last war. Mr. Barnard, incidentally, took a salary cut of about 80 percent in order to do this important work.

Incidentally, Mr. Barnard and other top-flight advertising men claim that the amount of money spent on evaluation of the Voice of America program is not too excessive. They point out that it has been proposed to spend only about 3 percent of the total budget of this program for evaluation and that major networks of this country and major radio advertisers spend at least as high a proportion on audience surveys, market research, and other evaluation techniques.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to a veteran of the Korean war, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I am disqualified from making any remarks on Voice of America broadcasting.

In Italy I was called to the front to broadcast when bullets failed, just before the Battle of the Bulge. General Clark sent word that he wanted live German prisoners. I was called on, and with the grace of God, by broadcasting to the enemy we got a few, and with some information gleaned thereby checked a break-through around Christmas time.

I have also made a broadcast on the Voice of America to Poland. I have been there; studied there, and I ask you to study my broadcast. I think it will do a job.

My wife, who was in Warsaw when the bombs fell in 1939 and in Vienna in 1945 when American bombs fell, has also made a Voice of America broadcast. They are available for your inspection.

I was in Korea and it seems to me in discussing the Voice of America that we have started out on the wrong foot. Perhaps the Voice of America talks too much about America, as though this one-hundred - and - seventy - five-some-odd-year-old country can tell people with thousands of years of history and culture what they should do. To that extent I say perhaps we are a little egotistical.

We learned much in Korea. We are not fighting a third-class enemy, as some would have you believe.

The enemy has shown us cards in spades. We found enough field artillery pieces buried in a river bed, cosmolened, to supply a whole infantry division. We discovered four caves filled with enough demolition to load 67 army trucks. In some caves, cattle was stored. The enemy slept in civilian homes by day and marched by night.

Their propaganda is vicious. They really hate. You have to match them, else you are going to lose.

Granting everything you say about the Voice of America, that it is in a coffin corner, does that mean that the Voice of America is not opposed to tyranny and that you are going to let it down?

Did you do that to General Walker when he was in a coffin corner on the Pusan perimeter and we went from Kaesong to Taejon to Taegu? When we came out of Hungnam, did you throw in the towel? Not Congress.

Sure, some did. One wonders whether they spoke like fighting Americans or were in Stalin's boat, unwittingly.

When I got back from Korea, my reaction to them was, "Unfavorable." Now, today, they and their followers seem to say, "Go to the Yalu." We need a little consistency.

The Voice of America is cut down to $85,000,000. There should not be a one of us that wants it cut more. Do you know what six leading American corporations spent in advertising in 1950? Eighty-nine million dollars, or $4,000,000 more than you are asking the Voice of America to spend.

And what is the income of these six corporations? What is the income of the United States?

The corporations sell products and good will. All we sell is the Bible, the flag, and the Constitution, and what each means. That is America. Our Bible says, "Be kind"; our flag, "Be loyal"; our Constitution, "Be fair." Can you put a price on America? I dare you to.

I say if you tamper with the Voice of America, instead of studying it and giving it help, you will defeat the purpose for which we dedicate our lives, and that is freedom for all the world.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was greatly impressed by what the distinguished gentleman said in regard to the use of foreign-language broadcasts. In a recent visit to Formosa I was informed by the leaders of the Nationalist troops that they would be delighted if they could be permitted to send those Chinese troops, those loyalist, United Nations Chinese troops to Korea. Those leaders said if they did not carry a single gun they could be most effective by broadcasting to those Chinese Red troops. I want to know if the gentleman does not think we could make effective use of these Chinese allies of ours in the very way he has indicated.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. That is going into foreign affairs. The Voice of America, I dare say, implements foreign affairs. I answer that this way.

If we have patience, perhaps the justification in not going across the Yalu will become evident. The military has set a precedent by limiting its operations to Korea, and not allowing Chinese Nationalist troops to go there.

You are now putting the State Department in position to demand that all diplomatic discussions be limited to Korea.

That means that you are not going to sell out Formosa with its Chinese troops, and you are not going to discuss the admittance of Red China to the United Nations.

If you bring Chiang Kai-shek's troops into Korea, you are going to compromise the strong stand you now have, the ace in the sleeve. If you do not ask Chiang for help, the Reds cannot justifiably bring in any extraneous problem for solution in Korea.

In that sense, I think Marshall and Acheson are right. Perhaps America

will yet acclaim their brilliant direction of Korean hostilities and negotiations.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, as long as I have been a Member of this body, which has been quite a number of years, I have always tried to have decent respect for the opinions of others. That brings me to an answer, an answer from a State Department official himself, as to what that official thinks of the Voice of America, for which we are asked today to appropriate $100,000,000 for its continuation.

I do not think anybody wants to cut off the Voice of America immediately, but we do question its methods, its material, and its subjects for broadcasting to the nations of the world the message of this country, in order to influence people abroad to be friends of our country and not our enemies.

I am going to read to the House a report on the very question before us; a report from our Minister to Rome, Italy, a report which he made to the State Department expressing his opinion of the Voice of America broadcasts at least to Italy. It is rather revealing, and comes in sharp contrast to what I have just heard on the floor of the House from the gentleman who just preceded me.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY Has the gentleman mentioned whose report it is?

Mr. DONDERO. I will mention the Minister's name.

Mr. ROONEY. Fine.

Mr. DONDERO. What do the Italian people think of the pamphlet material of the United States Information Service? Here is the answer, in the words of an official of the State Department itself, Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., who is our Minister to Rome: "The average Italian is tired of looking at well-fed and well-clothed Americans." And what does Mr. Thompson prescribe? "Material that is more directly anti-Communist."

Mr. ROONEY. Is this not the same matter that was discussed in detail here on the floor of the House some time ago? Is this not the matter where valid, proper, constructive criticism was used within the Voice of America for the purpose of improving it?

Mr. DONDERO. This report was made this year.

Mr. Chairman, I would rather not yield at this point, as I would like to preserve the continuity of my remarks.

Mr. Thompson's comments are contained in an official report to the State Department in Washington, dated March 7, 1951. He said:

> We have received the two pamphlets, Meet Some Americans and A Community in Action. It is our belief that both these pamphlets are too broad in treatment for use in Italy.
>
> The pamphlet, Meet Some Americans, is much too scattered in subject matter and not specific enough in its approach to the Italian scene. It would have been more useful if the various types or groups were treated separately, by occupation, for example; we then might have been able to adapt or treat the material more directly in terms of Italian life and problems. Each story should be complete with a beginning and an end. The present pamphlet is too much a collection of photographs of American faces.
>
> With regard to the second pamphlet, A Community in Action, this same objection is immediately apparent. Again the approach was too broad; the pamphlet would have been more effective if examples of community action through a democratic approach were illustrated. To be of use to us, however, these examples should have some meaning and application to Italian life and communities. An American community that solved its own housing problem would be one possibility. Community methods of handling adult education or safety are others that might be applicable. In any event, any pamphlet prepared about life in America should be very specific in its treatment of subject matter and should have some applicability in Italy.
>
> Italian criticism has been directed against some aspects of our media program to the effect that the average Italian is tired of looking at well-fed and well-clothed Americans. He feels that he knows all about American prosperity and American good living.
>
> In connection with our future program, we are in need of pamphlets or pamphlet material that is more directly anti-Communist. In our attempt to reach the Italian worker, we must tell him of forced labor conditions in the U. S. S. R. and its satellites. We must be able to convince him of the dire consequences to him personally of a Communist take-over in Italy. To do this, we need great quantities of material (in most instances it need only be research or preliminary texts and photographs) telling of the effect of communism on the life, labor conditions, purchasing power, diet, clothing, etc., of workingmen in the U. S. S. R. and its satellites.
>
> At this time, the main concern of the average Italian worker is economic security, for which he believes he would be willing to trade much of his civil liberties and freedom. We must convince him that the coming of communism to Italy would not provide him with this economic security nor better his lot. It would only force him to work longer hours at less pay and under labor conditions immeasurably worse than his present ones.
>
> While a continuing propaganda effort should be made to educate the Italian worker to value all civil rights, freedom of opportunity to select his job and other similiar rights that affect his economics are the ones to emphasize in the immediate propaganda period ahead.

I want to emphasize that the report I have just read was written by an official of the State Department itself, a man who would be presumed to have a friendly attitude toward another activity of his own department. Yet, Mr. Thompson's opinion of the pamphlet material is that it should be made directly anti-Communist. This criticism goes, I believe, to the heart of the deficiencies of the Voice of America and related activities. The officials of the Voice have no real conception of the enemy they are fighting, and they are therefore completely helpless in mounting the weapons that are required to fight that enemy.

The best way to be anti-Communist is to understand communism—something that has never occurred to officials in the Voice of America. The best way to put the Voice of America on its feet would be to put it in the hands of persons who know the score when it comes to communism. If the present Voice management persists in staying in power, the least it can do is read 5 or 10 out of the hundreds of available books on communism.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], I shall here insert, under the permission heretofore granted me by the House, what are alleged to be typical broadcasts on the subject Life Behind the Curtain.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

LIFE BEHIND THE CURTAIN NO. 23

REPORTS FROM: RUMANIA, U. S. S. R., BULGARIA, HUNGARY, ALBANIA, POLAND, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AND SOVIET ZONE OF AUSTRIA

(EDITORS NOTE.—Sources for each item are given in the margins.)

FEPS—Free European Press Service.

FBIS—Foreign Broadcast Information Service.

NYT—New York Times.

CDN—Chicago Daily News.

ANNOUNCER. We present now a special feature based on reports reaching the United States from the Soviet Union and its satellites—a brief glimpse at the lives of the men and women under communism. Today, you will hear reports from Rumania, the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet zone of Austria.

NARRATOR. Bucharest, Rumania. The Communist government's capital police force has instituted controls for checking on the identity and activities of all citizens in Bucharest which are reported to be even more extreme that the old "police report" methods of the Nazi period. A police decree was recently published requiring all owners of property, housing superintendants, managers of business houses, and sublessors to report within three hours anyone moving into their premises without a police identity card. Punishment for failure to report violators is 1 to 6 months' imprisonment and a fine of five-to-20,000 leis. This fine amounts to 1 to 4 months' pay for the average Rumanian industrial worker.

Moscow, U. S. S. R. Observers in Moscow report that the Communists are having difficutly in getting Soviet youth to respond to their campaign of "peace through belligerency." At a recent Youth-for-Peace rally in Moscow, they said, the young people participated lustily in the singing of love songs and Russian folk songs. But their response to a song about the "instigators of a new war" was noticeably unenthusiastic. Although the song was led by a Communist Youth leader and the words of the propaganda tune were held up before the audience on a large banner, they reported, few of the Moscow young people joined in the singing. Most ignored the music and fell to talking among themselves.

Kharkov, Soviet Ukraine: Life as a professor in a Soviet university is not easy, according to a professor who formerly taught at the University of Kharkov. Former Soviet Prof. Yuri Sherekh, now a voluntary exile in Sweden, told a lecture audience the other day that under the Bolshevik regime scientists and academicians must exercise constant vigilance to assure that they are serving the party's interests. As a result no academician would read a paper or deliver a lecture which did not succeed at some point in unmasking deviationists, however abstract the subject or however farfetched the connection. A psychologist speaking of the mechanism of aperception is expected to warn his listeners against the crimes and errors of the spiritualists, Professor Sherekh said. An engineer speak-

ing on industrial construction must thunder denunciations against someone who has done a faulty construction job somewhere sometime in the past. Creative scholarship and scientific research are retarded, he said, because professors and scientists are having to look for scapegoats to satisfy the party's constant demand for Socialist vigilance.

Sofia, Bulgaria: The Bulgarian radio's broadcast of August 28 announcing slogans of gratitude for what it described as the Soviet Union's fraternal aid and selfless daily assistance to Bulgaria is reported to have left most Bulgarians cold. Neutral economic observers in Sofia report that the decision of the Kremlin-controlled Communist puppet government to tie Bulgaria's economy to the needs of the Soviet Union has transformed the satellite nation into little more than a colony for Soviet exploitation. As an example, they said, the Soviet Union has forced the Bulgarians to export the bulk of their commodities such as tobacco and rose oil to the U. S. S. R. at cut rates and then has resold them on the world market at a low profit, virtually eliminating Bulgarian competition. On the other hand it has flooded Bulgarian markets with surplus Soviet goods of inferior quality which the subservient Bulgarian puppet regime has made no effort to prevent. Meanwhile, they said, Bulgaria's ambitious postwar plan for the industrialization and electrification of large areas of the country has been scuttled by the Soviet Union's failure to support the idea. As an evidence of this they pointed to the drastic restrictions which have been imposed on the use of electric power due to the failure of the Soviet Union to send promised power generators and spare parts. Slogans about the Soviet big brother being the sun and air of Bulgaria and Bulgaria's guaranty of independence cannot lessen the clear and present reality that Bulgarians are underpaid, underclothed, underfed, and economically demoralized largely because of Soviet exploitation, they said.

Budapest, Hungary: Newspapermen in the capital cities of Moscow's satellites report that one of the most sensitive parts of the Cominform's machinery for spreading the "big lie" is the Editorial Office for Foreign News. A branch of this office, they report, operates in each of the Communist capitals and exercises a rigid control on all news printed by the captive press. Newsmen familiar with the operations of the EOFN report that these offices receive direct releases from Moscow for distribution to the satellite press, complete with translations of significant articles from the Soviet press. Translations of items from the western press are also provided, but these may only be used after they have already appeared in the Soviet press. No other foreign items are permitted to be printed. The EOFN exercises a rigid scrutiny of the national press to see that this rule is observed.

Valona, Albania: The Soviet Union's high-handed trade tactics with one satellite country are not working out very well. According to reports from Valona on the Adriatic Sea, Russian ships are putting in frequently at Valona and taking on cargoes of crude oil, copper, chrome, timber, leather, meats, cheese, and industrial herbs. The loading is being done at night by troops of Albania's Communist army, and civilians are not allowed near the dock area. This is reportedly due to the widespread unrest caused by the Soviet Union's one-way handling of its present trade agreement with its smallest satellite. Under the terms of a long-standing agreement the Soviet Union had promised to provide Albania with extensive textile machinery, a sugar refinery, an oil refinery, and other equipment, including sufficient oil piping to connect Valona with the oil fields in the Kossovo area. Thus far, it is reported, it has only delivered the oil pipes, which are now being used to drain Albania's oil for transshipment to Russia.

Lublin, Poland: Mention of the Polish National Liberation Committee's famous manifesto issued on the date of the wartime committee's founding on July 22, 1944, was conspicuously absent from the speeches which marked the Communist sixth anniversary celebration at Lublin recently. Loyal Poles recalled that the Soviet-sponsored committee, formed while the European conflict was still going on, promised to promote friendship between Poland and Great Britain and the United States. It also promised to preserve civil liberties "especially freedom of the press, associations, gatherings, professional organizations, and freedom of religion." And it assured that private ownership would be preserved in all walks of life. Polish observers pointed out that the signers of the manifesto are now as obsolete as the manifesto's provisions. Of the 13 who signed it 6 years ago, only 2—Radkiewicz, minister of public security, and Skrzeszewski, minister of education—remain in high posts. The others have died, fallen into obscurity, or been placed in minor positions by their Communist bosses.

Prague, Czechoslovakia: Communist music-maker Jaroslaw Barwick has completed a cantata based on the Moscow slogan "Hands off Korea." Orchestras and choirs throughout Czechoslovakia have been ordered to learn the cantata and report back to Prague the date of the first performance.

Soviet sector, Vienna, Austria: Austrian officials are worried about attempts by Soviet officers to exert pressure on Austrian law courts. Chancellor Leopold Figl recently submitted evidence of 214 instances covering 25 out of 26 courts in the Soviet occupation zone in which Soviet officers had phoned Austrian judges instructing them on sentences which should be handed down and demanding acquittals for Communists and stiffened sentences for anti-Communists.

ANNOUNCER. You have just heard another in our series of on-the-spot reports of life as it is lived in the countries under communism. Tune in regularly on this same meter band for our frequent reports on life behind the curtain.

Mr. ROONEY. This broadcast shows how difficult life behind the iron curtain is and how unpopular Communists are. It is a typical broadcast, I have been given to understand, on this subject, having emanated from the Voice of America under date of September 1, 1950.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It is my understanding that in the last election in Italy, while they did not gain as many votes in their official body, yet the Communists carried by a larger vote than they did in the preceding election.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say this to the gentleman with regard to the Voice of America in Italy. I have been in Italy a half a dozen times in the last 7 years. I have spoken to the highest American officials, to the highest Italian officials. I have spoken to the man in the street. I have spoken to the clergy. It was practically unanimously agreed, all along, since the election troubles with the Communists started in 1946, that the Voice of America contributed heavily to the success of the anti-Communists.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have been briefed with groups a number of times regarding the unrest in the countries behind the iron curtain. What can the gentleman tell us, if anything, regarding the activity of the Voice of America in stirring up and amplifying that unrest?

Mr. ROONEY. I think if the gentleman will read the hearings before this Subcommittee on Appropriations, not only on the pending bill for 1952 regular appropriations, but on the third supplemental appropriation bill, he will find some answer to that question. Most of the testimony, however, has necessarily been off the record.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I ask just one further question: Could you give us for the RECORD here any specific instance where it is thought that the activities of the Voice of America have amplified and increased the unrest?

Mr. ROONEY. The following article from the Washington Star covers one instance:

SEVENTEEN ANTI-RED POLES ESCAPE IRON CURTAIN IN IRON HORSES

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, April 28.—Broadcasts by the Voice of America and the British Broadcasting Corp. inspired 12 Polish rail workers to flee their Communist homeland in two stolen locomotives and seek refuge in Western Europe, it was learned last night.

With the help of a forged collective passport, the freedom-loving 12 broke through the iron curtain and made a 17-day journey across Germany to Courtrai, Belgium. Not even the Russian border guards in East Germany questioned their credentials.

Five of the escapees have been given asylum in Belgium. The other seven continued on to France.

One of the railroaders, Stanislav Oles, told newsmen this version of the escape:

Two Belgian-made locomotives broke down and Polish officials ordered them sent to Belgium for repairs. Six good Communists were supposed to take the engines, but the 12 nonconformists steamed off in them instead. And with the help of their forged passport and the connivance of a minor railroad official they made their escape without being questioned.

Oles said he and his friends, several of whom had been threatened with arrest for their opposition to the Red regime, had heard about the free labor organizations of the Western World through Voice of America and BBC broadcasts.

Oles said some 2,500 Polish railroaders are under arrest for antigovernment activity. He added:

"You can imagine how many more are taking part in the anti-Communist underground fight in Poland."

The fact that the Russians spend so much money for jamming the Voice of America is proof of the fact that the output of the Voice of America is very, very damaging to their cause behind the iron curtain and causing unrest. Contrary to what some speaker said earlier today, the cost of jamming the Voice of America exceeds the cost of putting out the Voice of America. The operation is more expensive to the Russians than the Voice of America is to us because it demands the use of their transmitters which are not then in use in behalf of their propaganda against us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has used 3 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, one of the chief arguments that was used in favor of our shipping grain to India was the alleged propaganda value to the United States and the cause of democracy generally. But there is good reason to believe that on this question, as on dozens of others, the Voice of America has missed the boat completely.

I would like to read excerpts from an Associated Press story from New Delhi in India, that appeared in the New York Times on May 15, 1951. This story said:

United States officials are chagrined at the pro-Soviet feeling engendered here by the shipment of Russian wheat to this nation, announced on the same day that Prime Minister Nehru accepted the terms for much larger United States aid.

The United States had been shipping 100,000 tons of wheat to India each month, and in addition had just voted a relief shipment of 2,000,000 tons. The Russians, on the other hand, sent a trivial 50,000 tons, yet they were reaping all the propaganda benefits. The Associated Press story told exactly where the blame belonged. It said:

The Indian Government and the United States information services have failed to get across to the Indian people that the United States has been doing for a long time on a large scale what the Soviet Union proposes to do on a small scale.

If the State Department's information services are unable to present to the Indian people the elementary facts about a simple matter like our grain shipments, it will never be able to do an acceptable job with more complex matters in other countries. The State Department's propaganda failure in India is typical of many others that are taking place every month. This House ought to make a thoroughgoing investigation of the State Department's failure in India so that something may be done to prevent any more of these fiascoes from taking place. The stakes are too high to permit the State Department to continue its endless blundering.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read at this time a portion of an unsolicited letter which I received from Hon. Richard P. Gale, a former Member of this body. Mr. Gale had made a trip at his own expense over into the area which was referred to by the gentleman from Maryland who just preceded me, which I think has some bearing upon the matter:

Last winter we had quite a trip through southeast Asia and came in touch with the USIS everywhere; I thought they were doing a swell job. The personnel was good and were working with considerable enthusiasm.

In Bombay, Clark and Hartwell looked good—in their reading room there averaged about 550 readers a day and believe me, they were getting a cross section of American literature—from the Saturday Evening Post to Agriculture yearbooks.

In Delhi, Remington in charge of moving-picture shorts was hitting 300,000 Indians a month; he had 300 films in 7 dialects, some of these films were in commercial channels, some were shown before small groups, others by mobile units, 4 of which were operating out of Delhi.

In Jakarta, Hannah was plugging the movie shorts. He also had small-size illustrated throw-away magazines which were doing well.

In Singapore, Henry Laurence, in Ceylon, Tressider were doing much the same type of work.

The reading rooms were covered with pictures of American life, especially the fact that Negroes were a part of our communities.

Walt Disney pictures were the most popular and have a real following throughout the East.

Printed matter is not quite so important because of the extremely high illiteracy.

Our Voice of America was weak because of technicalities and remote broadcasting stations. I am sorry to say that I heard radio Moscow much more clearly and often than I did the Voice. I think we should get going on radio broadcasts. The Indonesians and Malayans do not have to read or write for this.

In other words, I was very much encouraged with the USIS effort. It should be kept up and intensified.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, people want peace. Every citizen in this country wants peace. I think that it is safe to say that in the hearts and minds of individual citizens of other countries there is a similar yearning for peace.

Grasping this concept better and more quickly than we have here in the United States, Russia has beat us to the peace offensive. She has misled people in other parts of the world into thinking that communism is a peace-loving doctrine; that those who preach communism are honest crusaders for world peace.

Russia's peace offensive has strengthened her position not only behind the iron curtain but also abroad—in Germany, in Asia, and everywhere else where Russia propagandizes her aims and actions.

In the battle to capture the minds of men, Russia is leading the United States. She has not won the battle because this Nation had the foresight to adopt an information program of international broadcasting, exchange students, motion pictures, libraries, and so forth. But being new to the field of propaganda, we have made mistakes. Some of these mistakes have been unavoidable, others have not.

But the important point is that we are not winning the war of ideologies. And if Congress decides to cut back the proposed plans to expand the Voice of America and other information media designed to cope with the present peace offensive that Russia is waging, then the United States is going to lose the cold war by default. I think that this is exactly what the Soviet Union wants. We must not play into their hands; we must take the offensive away from them, and we cannot do this by cutting back funds necessary to achieve our information goals.

Mr. Chairman, I think that every man in Congress will agree that there should be some sort of an information program abroad—that the United States' leadership in the free world would be meaningless unless we campaigned to explain to those of foreign lands what the world threat of communism really is and what we of the free world are doing and must do to check this threat to our freedom and our security.

But many people have raised the question, "What should our message be?" They agree that there should be some sort of propaganda but they are not sure just what kind of propaganda we should use.

I want to call to the attention of every Member of Congress a statement entitled "What Should Our Message Be?" that was written by several leading social scientists in the United States. This heretofore unpublished statement which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 2, 1951, represents one of the clearest, most concise, and constructive analyses of our propaganda problem that has ever been written. I hope that those Members who say that we should not invest money in ideological warfare, who say that it is useless to wage campaigns of truth, that we should not expand our information media—will read this document. I feel certain that they will gain perspective and feel as rewarded as I did after I studied this statement.

Knowing the importance that this statement can have to our policy makers, I have sent this statement to a number of Government officials including the President and the Secretary of State. Today I received a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Barrett who is in charge of our information programs. I intend to put this letter in the RECORD so that you can see just what our State Department is doing to improve our present program.

Mr. Chairman, before I close I want to reiterate my earnest hope that Congress will rally behind our information programs, that we will reinstate the 90 percent cut the Appropriations Committee made in the Voice of America's plans for expansion during the next fiscal year.

This campaign of truth is as important to us and our allies as our entire mobilization program. It is as important as guns and bullets and tanks.

It is vital to our defense.

It is vital to our security.

It is vital to the survival of the entire free world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the information service of the State Department had on its payroll an average of 5,956 employees during the last fiscal year. For this year the information service submitted a budget calling for 9,883 employees—an increase of almost 100 percent. Despite this huge payroll the information service spent $1,471,593 last year for the purchase of various kinds of free-lance material, and it requested $1,502,355 for this year. The amount paid to free-lance writers alone last year was $443,926.

I can see no possible justification for spending such a sum on outside writing and other material when the information service is already bursting at the seams with 6,000 employees. It is pos-

sible that extraordinary situations may arise when an outside writer might have to be retained to produce a highly specialized piece of work that the regular employees could not turn out, but these cases should happen only on very rare occasions. If the 6,000 employees on the information service payrolls are worth their salt, they should be competent enough to handle virtually any task that might come along. The only conclusion to be drawn, therefore, is that the information service's employees have been hired haphazardly and that they are unable to perform the duties of an effective propaganda program.

I am especially concerned about another phase of this free-lance matter. I have studied a long list of the free-lance writers employed by the International Broadcasting Division during the fiscal year 1951 and I have found the names of several well-known radio commentators. They include Charles Collingwood, who received $900; William Downs, who received $100; Griffing Bancroft, who received $50; and Eric Sevareid, who also received $50. All four of these men are political commentators in the Washington bureau of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

In hiring these men the State Department, to put it mildly, has placed itself in a highly dubious position. As political commentators they frequently have occasion to pass judgment and express opinions regarding the same State Department that is making cash payments to them. In this regard I should also mention that the Columbia Broadcasting System has the reputation of being, through its so-called news programs and commentaries, a strong supporter of the Truman administration and of socialistic tendencies generally. The Columbia Broadcasting System has been well treated by the Truman administration; it was Columbia's color television system that received the approval of the Federal Communications Commission and is now being adopted as the standard color system for this country. Columbia stands to gain many millions of dollars from this decision. The agency that handed down the decision, the Federal Communications Commission, is, of course, the same agency that holds the power of life and death over radio stations through its licensing requirements.

There is one additional well-known name among the free-lance writers on the payroll of the State Department. He is Ben Grauer, who received $680 during the last fiscal year. Ben Grauer is a commentator and announcer for the National Broadcasting Co. His commentaries during the televising of the meetings of the United Nations in New York attracted considerable attention for seeming to go out of their way to present the Russian viewpoint in a favorable light.

Mr. Grauer has a lengthy record of affiliation with Communist and Communist-front organizations. According to the House Un-American Activities Committee, he was a sponsor of the Artists' Front To Win the War, which has been cited as a Communist front by the House committee. The Daily Worker of June 17, 1946, listed Grauer as a signer of a statement of the Action Committee To Free Spain Now, which has been cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Grauer has been especially active with the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, which has been cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities. According to the Daily Worker, he was one of the sponsors of the organization. He also became a member of the board of directors and a member of the executive committee of the radio division.

To give you some idea of Grauer's close relationship with this so-called Citizens Committee, I will list his connection with some events sponsored by it:

In 1945, he was a speaker at a dinner for Jo Davidson. In 1946, he attended a dinner for United Nations delegates, was a speaker at a Broadway for Mead and Lehman dinner, and was a speaker at a One World or None rally. In 1947, he was the narrator at a show called The Fashion in Politics.

Grauer has been a delegate to the New York State convention of the Progressive Citizens of America, which has been cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities. He was also a sponsor of a dinner of that organization in 1947.

Grauer was a sponsor of a Win the Peace Conference in Washington in 1946. The Attorney General of the United States cited this organization as subversive and Communist on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

If the State Department persists in buying free-lance material from outside writers, the least it can do is make sure of their background.

Two years ago some small-town Illinois newspaper editors and reporters were castigated from one end of the country to the other for receiving as little as $8 a week from the State government. In fact, the two newspapermen who dug up the story about their colleagues received a Pulitzer prize. I do not expect to be awarded a Pulitzer prize for my efforts here today but I do hope that the newspapers and radio stations of the country, and particularly the pious breast beaters who shook with rage at the Illinois situation, will permit their blood pressure to rise regarding the State Department payments.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly about another activity under the State Department budget, namely, UNESCO.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Relations with International Organizations of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I believe there is a real place for a well-run, carefully coordinated activity like UNESCO was intended to be.

I do not believe there is any place in the field of international organization for boondoggling, and I am afraid that boondoggling has gone international, and, as usual, it is the American taxpayer who is footing most of the bill. The United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organization, commonly known as UNESCO, is the "fond baby" of the American clique of Caucasian internationalists who presently dominate State Department thinking. I call them Caucasian internationalists because their internationalism stops with their interest in the profitable areas of Europe dominated by the white race.

The State Department's budget request included $2,785,400 for this year's dues for UNESCO, plus $209,945 for employees to handle UNESCO matters in the Public Affairs Division of the State Department. This makes a total cost to the American taxpayers of $2,995,345. For this sum we are entitled to expect UNESCO to function efficiently and accomplish its worthy objectives.

Naturally the United States is paying the largest share of the UNESCO bill. Our proportion is 35 percent—or three times as much as the next largest contributor, Great Britain. What are we getting for this money? A good answer was presented in a story, not from the United States but from a French source, quoted in the Washington Star July 15, 1951, by Marcel Wallenstein. UNESCO, according to a European editor who was quoted in the Star article, is a "crackpot carnival." The Star article also said that UNESCO employees "have the softest jobs in the world, at good pay and tax-free."

I will quote a few other excerpts from the Star article to establish my point that UNESCO, a worthwhile project in itself, is being woefully mismanaged:

> The chief beneficiaries of this organization, according to critics in Europe, are the employees. They get fat salaries. They are paid traveling expenses to and from all parts of the world and receive a per diem of $25 a day. They pay taxes to no government. They get whisky, wine, and cigarettes duty-free and have other diplomatic privileges. * * *
>
> An investigator in Paris wished to find out what the UNESCO staff does to earn a living. This is what he discovered: The organization seriously put forward a plan to take information criticizing any country out of school books throughout the world. * * * It suggested a new Garden of Eden on the Amazon River, the funds to be supplied by members of the United Nations. It studied the case of an African tribe which extracted the front teeth of children so that they could pronounce words of the native dialect.

This is not the UNESCO concept I have supported.

> He discovered that Miss Myrna Loy, the Hollywood actress, a member of the organization, was concerned with explaining to the world certain international customs—such as why Englishmen carry umbrellas. * * * UNESCO sent a delegation to study newspapers in Brussels which is said to have reported three newspapers were published in a city that has none. In the same report it praised what it believed was a newspaper when actually the institution concerned in the report was a lunatic asylum.

The Star article concluded with the case of a retired English politician in France who found it difficult to bring

money from England for his living expenses. This man got a job with UNESCO at $1,500 a month, plus traveling expenses of $25 a day. He has junketed repeatedly to New York. This summer, wishing to vacation in North Africa, he arranged to receive his traveling expenses from UNESCO. Under unanimous consent, I include the complete Star article at this point:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of July 15, 1951]

UNESCO DOINGS CAUSE EUROPEAN GRUMBLING AT "CRACKPOT CARNIVAL"

(By Marcel Wallenstein)

PARIS, July 14.—Men and women who have the softest jobs in the world at good pay—and tax free—are beginning to worry. A fire has been lit under the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which has been meeting here in plenary session.

The British, who pay one-eighth of UNESCO's expenses and the French, who pay less, are beginning to grumble. The United States taxpayer, who pays twice as much as anybody else for what one European editor has called the "crackpot's carnival," seems not to be worried about the drain on his small change.

Next year UNESCO will spend $8,500,000. Since 1946 it has spent $34,000,000. What have the nations which have footed the bill obtained for their money? It is doubtful if they have had anything except the information which the UNESCO committee members have sought in many parts of the world.

EMPLOYEES GET GOOD PAY

The chief beneficiaries of this organization, according to critics in Europe, are the employees. They get fat salaries. They are paid traveling expenses to and from all parts of the world and receive a per diem of $25. They pay taxes to no government. They get whisky, wine, and cigarettes duty free and have other diplomatic privileges.

Investigating the finances of UNESCO recently Viscount Simon, former British Secretary of Foreign Affairs, complained: "They keep books in a haphazard manner."

An investigator in Paris wished to find out what the UNESCO staff does to earn a living. This is what he discovered: The organization seriously put forward a plan to take information criticizing any country out of schoolbooks throughout the world. It supplied cash to numerous strange causes, including a search for mythical Inca treasure. It suggested a new Garden of Eden on the Amazon River, the funds to be supplied by members of the United Nations. It studied the case of an African tribe which extracted the front teeth of children so they could pronounce words of the native dialect.

EXPLAINING CUSTOMS

He discovered that Miss Myrna Loy, the Hollywood actress, a member of the organization, was concerned with explaining to the world certain national customs—such as why Englishmen carry umbrellas. John Gordon, editor of the London Sunday Express, who is attacking UNESCO as a useless and wasteful group, suggests Miss Loy explain why Americans chew gum.

UNESCO has sent scientists to many parts of the world to study the causes of war. It has published a report on education and agriculture in remote places in Mexico and Africa. It sent a delegation to study newspapers in Brussels and is said to have reported three newspapers were published in a city that has none. In the same report it praised what it believed was a newspaper when actually the institution concerned in the report was a lunatic asylum.

The critics list many such cases.

HE NOW DRAWS $1,500 A MONTH

Last year a retired English politician in France found it difficult to bring money from England for his living expenses. He knew officials of the UNESCO and succeeded in having himself nominated to its Paris staff. He draws $1,500 a month. When he travels he is paid expenses of $25 a day. He has been repeatedly to New York. Wishing to spend a holiday this summer in North Africa, he applied for and received traveling expenses from UNESCO.

The positions are obtained by nomination by members within the organization. The staff is an international body drawn from most nations which are members of the United Nations. The Director-General is Torres Bodet, a Mexican poet, who draws $20,000 a year and has a very large expense account and other privileges. Secretaries, messengers, and other minor employees are paid three times the salaries such work normally brings in Europe. All salaries are payable in United States currency.

Another case in point is the recent junket to Paris by Howland H. Sargeant, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Mr. Sargeant was married to Miss Myrna Loy, the movie actress, on June 2, 1951. Five days later they left for Paris, where Mr. Sargeant was chief of the United States delegation at a UNESCO meeting. His bride is a member of the United States National Committee for UNESCO. Mr. and Mrs. Sargeant returned to Washington on July 19.

I admire Mr. Sargeant's choice of Paris as a place to honeymoon. My only regret is that the average American taxpayer is not able to arrange a honeymoon there at the Government's expense. In fact, I think most of the free Government-paid trips to every corner of the globe have become a racket. The formula is merely to get oneself appointed a delegate to some convention or other such as UNESCO. And the way to arrange that is to have the proper "in" at the State Department.

What is the answer to those of us who want an operative and effective UNESCO to replace this mismanaged socialite travel club? We must curtail appropriations for UNESCO until it has cleaned out its own house.

Congress should adopt a bill such as S. 1166 which the Senate passed this week and H. R. 3406, introduced by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] which provides for the creation of a commission to make a study of the administration of all overseas activities of the Government and to make recommendations to the Congress. No nation, however virtuous and powerful, can have the mandate to make the world over in its own image. It is time we surveyed our activities in the current light of reality and abandoned the spongy sentimentalism of the State Department. In promoting and encouraging the present frivolous activities of UNESCO, over the protests of responsible representatives of France and Great Britain, we have again exhibited that in world affairs there is too much voice of America and not enough ears of America. Let us listen to our allies' warnings and insist that UNESCO be revitalized before we continue appropriations at a level which supports such waste, extravagance, and parasitism.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, the budget for the State Department's informational activities includes an item of $630,717 for publishing the Russian-language magazine Amerika, which is distributed in Moscow to the Russian people. A few years ago the plan for this magazine was sold to Congress on the basis that the publication would be sold to the Russian people and would be on a self-sustaining basis as far as American taxpayers are concerned. Under an agreement reached with the Russian Government 50,000 copies of each issue of Amerika were to be distributed.

Today, according to testimony before the Appropriations Committee, only 22,642 copies are being distributed in Russia because of obstacles put in the way of its sale by the Russian Government. Yet the State Department is continuing to print and ship 50,000 copies, even though it is a foregone conclusion that more than half of them will never reach the Russian people. In other words, the American taxpayers are paying $630,717 to reach only 22,642 Russians.

I shall not comment on the State Department's failure to make the Russians live up to their agreement—but the State Department's stupidity in continuing to print 50,000 copies of the magazine Amerika, when only 22,642 are distributed, is worthy of calling it to the attention of the House. If the State Department could adjust its operations to reality, it would be able to make a substantial cut in its annual cost of operation.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey which were not such as should be uttered in this Chamber.

If we on this side could be convinced that the Voice of America is spreading the words of the Bible, emphasizing the American flag and the Constitution of the United States, we would not object to $100,000,000 being spent. As a matter of fact, we would want to up it 5 or 10 times that amount.

Why does the State Department continue to throw suspicion on itself? Why, yesterday, in a United Press release, we find that they are protecting the reputation of this man John Patton Davies, Jr., the man who was sent home from China by General Stilwell and General Hurley because they thought that he was too close to the Communists of China, and yet the State Department has kept that man employed ever since.

In these 2 minutes I think that we should observe, too, the propaganda that is going on in the Chamber. I noted that when the gentleman from New York, [Mr. TABER] made some remarks here relative to the State Department appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] immediately had an answer and he said that the State Department forwarded him copies of every-

thing that they sent to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. On every speech that has been made since, the gentleman from New York, or someone sitting at the committee table, has placed in the RECORD information which they said came from the State Department. There is your propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is grossly misinformed and I am sure he does not want to misrepresent things. Does the gentleman mean to criticise the gentleman from New York for being prepared in this debate? Why, the matter mentioned by the last speaker concerning an article in the Washington Star is stale stuff. I have a file here full of satisfactory answers to the sort of nonsense being passed out here today.

Mr. BUDGE. And each of them, according to the gentleman's own admission, comes from the State Department. There is your propaganda.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not so. Some of the material comes to me from the State Department at my specific request and it is so mentioned as coming from the Department when inserted in the RECORD. The gentleman surely would expect the committee to be prepared to defend its action when we so vigorously and economically cut this bill, reducing the so-called Voice of America item from $115,000,000 to $85,000,000. Apparently the gentleman is displeased because we cut it as much as we did and he does not have enough to talk about.

Mr. BUDGE. Will the gentleman answer this question?

Mr. ROONEY. I will, if I can.

Mr. BUDGE. Why does the State Department send the gentleman a copy of everything requested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. ROONEY. Because I demanded it of the State Department, and that is my prerogative as the chairman of this committee. I want to know what's going on. I think that is my responsibility.

Mr. BUDGE. If I ask for something, do they send the gentleman a copy of it, too?

Mr. ROONEY. If it amounted to anything, they would.

Mr. Chairman, I must point out that the mimeographed speech of the gentleman from Idaho with regard to the Russian language magazine Amerika is old stuff. This committee through the gentleman from New York addressing you, recounted that whole story here on the floor of the House last April when we considered the third supplemental 1951 appropriation bill. Not a detail of his speech was disclosed at that time. Every one of the facts in regard thereto were fully considered by this committee in marking up the bill now before you and the substantial cut the committee made was based on a number of instances of mismanagement uncovered by the committee, including the one with regard to the magazine Amerika. The gentleman and most of the gentlemen who spoke here today do not seem to understand that they are talking about amounts requested in the department's budget and not the amounts provided in the bill we are debating.

Mr. Chairman, a previous speaker here this afternoon mentioned an article published in the Washington Star with regard to UNESCO. I include in this extension the Department's answer to the charges contained in that article, which I had immediately demanded of the Department when I read it in that newspaper. The Department's analysis follows:

ANALYSIS OF ARTICLE BY MARCEL WALLENSTEIN IN WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR, JULY 15, 1951, ENTITLED "UNESCO DOINGS CAUSE EUROPEAN GRUMBLING AT 'CRACKPOT CARNIVAL'" DATELINE PARIS, JULY 14

BACKGROUND

1. The Marcel Wallenstein article purports to have been written in Paris on July 14, thus giving the impression that it is an analysis and a conclusion based upon the Sixth General Conference of UNESCO which was held in Paris, June 18–July 11. Actually, the piece is based almost entirely upon an article by John Gordon which appeared in the London Sunday Express on July 1.

2. The Gordon article was available to the United States delegation which investigated it while in Paris. It concluded that the piece was biased, not factual in content and that parts were based on certain episodes which took place in UNESCO as long ago as 1946. The leader of the British delegation at the Paris conference, David R. Hardman, member of Parliament and parliamentary secretary to the ministry of education, issued a statement based on the British delegation's investigation of the allegations made by John Gordon. Mr. Hardman charged that Mr. Gordon's article was both misleading and inaccurate, and challenged the Sunday Express to print his reply which contained specific point-by-point refutations of the greater number of John Gordon's allegations. Up to July 11, 1951, the Sunday Express had not printed Mr. Hardman's reply.

3. Although we do not know whether Wallenstein ever went near UNESCO during the Sixth General Conference to do any original investigation or reporting, the following facts are clear:

(a) Wallenstein derives most of his material, usually without identifying his source, direct from the John Gordon article of July 1 in the Sunday Express;

(b) Wallenstein at no time consulted the chairman of the United States delegation at Paris, or, so far as can be ascertained, any other member of the United States delegation;

(c) Many of his statements are not only completely inaccurate, but could have been demonstrated to be false if Wallenstein had made the slightest effort to check the facts.

These are important considerations because the original Gordon article makes no pretense at having sounded out opinions prevalent in Paris or in Europe—whereas the Wallenstein piece, derived almost entirely from the Gordon column, is carried under the headline, "UNESCO doings cause European grumbling * * *" and conveys the misleading impression that Wallenstein is reflecting a wide range of European opinion.

4. Since Wallenstein had added an original inaccuracy, namely, that "The United States taxpayer seems not to be worried about the drain on his small change," it is important to note, that so far as can be ascertained, Wallenstein never approached any member of the United States delegation to ascertain the opinions or the actions being taken by the delegation. As noted below, the United States delegation took firm actions in a constructive spirit on many matters relating to the budget and the scale of contributions. In fact, the United States delegation led a vigorous fight to keep the 1952 UNESCO budget down to the current level of activity, and successfully waged a campaign to reduce the United States contribution to UNESCO from 35 percent to 33⅓ percent.

5. Each of the 56 delegations present at the conference was an official delegation of its government. The members of the United States delegation heard no grumbling among this official group of the kind mentioned by Wallenstein.

ANALYSIS

First paragraph: "Men and women who have the softest jobs in the world at good pay—and tax free—are beginning to worry. A fire has been lit under the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which has been meeting here in plenary session."

The facts: Pay received by employees of UNESCO is in line with that received by employees of the U. N. and the other specialized agencies. The conference did not attack the wages paid employees nor the size of the Secretariat. There was no indictment of the manner in which the employees have been carrying out the program.

Second paragraph: "The British, who pay one-eighth of UNESCO's expenses, and the French, who pay less, are beginning to grumble. The United States taxpayer, who pays twice as much as anybody else for what one European editor has called the crackpot's carnival, seems not to be worried about the drain on his small change."

The facts: The British and the French voted at the general conference in favor of an increase in UNESCO's budget to $8,700,000. The United States and two other nations voted against this proposal. The United States delegation argued strongly that a lower budget of $8,500,000 would be sufficient to enable UNESCO to carry out its programs in 1952 at the same level as this year, even taking into account increased costs due to price rises. In addition, a vigorous and effective presentation by the congressional adviser acting as spokesman for the United States delegation resulted in a decision by the general conference to reduce the United States percentage of contribution from 35 percent to 33⅓ percent.

Third paragraph: "Next year UNESCO will spend $8,500,000. Since 1946 it has spent $34,000,000. What have the nations which have footed the bill obtained for their money? It is doubtful if they have had anything except the information which the UNESCO committee members have sought in many parts of the world."

The facts: Although UNESCO's job is in many respects a long-term one—just as is the task of the schools and educational systems of the United States and other countries—UNESCO's work has provided many practical and immediate benefits to its member states during the first 5 years of its existence.

Some examples: UNESCO established and administered a book coupon plan which has permitted the exchange of over $1,000,000 worth of books, films, and scientific equipment among the nations of the world, and which cut through the red tape and difficulties of currency restrictions and differences. The books were largely medical books going to countries which had been unable to obtain such works since before the war. The United States has benefited directly as the largest seller of these books. In the United States the book coupon transactions have been handled by the American Booksellers Association.

UNESCO has assisted in raising millions of dollars for the reconstruction of the educational institutions of war-devastated areas. It published a Book of Needs which advised nations in a position to give of the needs of the devastated areas. It assisted materially in the reconstruction of the ruined schools and libraries in many of the war-torn countries of Europe. For example, voluntary groups in the United States contributed $25,000,000 for educational reconstruction in 1950 alone—three times the amount of the entire UNESCO annual budget.

UNESCO has established a center in Mexico which is training teachers of many of the Latin-American countries in methods of is producing teaching materials which will be used throughout Latin America in a confundamental education. This same center certed effort of fundamental education to reduce illiteracy throughout the area—an essential for laying the ground work for improved standards of living and of health.

UNESCO has sent educational experts to some of the newly independent countries of the world to advise them on methods of establishing educational systems. Missions have gone to Burma, Afghanistan, Thailand, and the Philippines, and results of their work are already being reflected throughout the schools in those countries.

UNESCO has established field science cooperation stations in New Delhi, Manila, Cairo, and Montevideo, to make available to those less-developed areas of the world the scientific information necessary for their economic development.

Fourth paragraph: "The chief beneficiaries of this organization, according to critics in Europe, are the employees. They get fat salaries. They are paid traveling expenses to and from all parts of the world and receive a per diem of $25 a day. They pay taxes to no government. They get whisky, wine, and cigarettes duty free and have other diplomatic privileges."

The facts: UNESCO salaries are not "fat." In fact it has been the experience that it is often difficult or impossible to recruit competent employees in the United States because the salaries for certain types of work are inadequate by United States standards.

Per diem pay by UNESCO is as follows: The Director General and the Deputy Director General, $20; department heads, $15; high level staff members, $12.50; all others, $10. The average per diem paid to persons on UNESCO missions is $12.50. This amount includes all expenses of the employees, including hotels, taxis, and incidentals.

Taxes on the salaries of UNESCO employees are paid by the Organization to any nation which levies such taxes. This is necessary in an international organization in order to equalize the salaries of the employees in the same classifications. If this were not done, employees doing the same work would receive substantially different net pay, depending on the tax assessed by their countries.

The privilege of duty-free articles does not extend to any employee outside the immediate office of the Director General.

Fifth paragraph: "Investigating the finances of UNESCO recently Viscount Simon, former British Secretary of Foreign Affairs, complained: 'They keep books in a haphazard manner'."

The facts: This statement is completely misleading. It refers to a condition in UNESCO in 1946 which was promptly corrected by the Executive Board and the Director General.

The internationally-known firm of Price, Waterhouse & Co. audited UNESCO's accounts in 1948 and 1949, and the Comptroller and Auditor General of Great Britain audited the accounts for the financial year 1950.

This is the statement made by Price, Waterhouse: "So far as was disclosed by our tests of detailed operations and by inquiries we have made, money has not been obligated or expended for purposes other than those for which the appropriations voted by the general conference were intended to provide except so far as the Director General and the Executive Board have authorized transfer within the budget, and the expenditure conforms to the authority which governs it."

This is the statement made by the Auditor General of Great Britain, whose audit is in accordance with the United Nations plan of establishing a joint panel of public auditors for the purpose of auditing the accounts of the United Nations and the specialized agencies:

"1. Report of the auditors on the accounts for the financial year 1950: (A) Sir Ronald Adam (Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Executive Board) introduced the reports of the Director-General and the External Auditor on the accounts of the organization for the year ended December 31, 1950 (Doc. 6C/ADM/2 and addendum). He expressed the conviction of the executive board that the accounts were in good order. The External Auditor, Sir Frank Tribe, made a brief statement on the scope of his audit and reported that the financial accounts of the organization were in order."

Sixth paragraph: "An investigator in Paris wished to find out what the UNESCO staff does to earn a living."

The facts: This may refer to Mr. John Gordon. It would have been possible to estimate UNESCO activities from three convenient sources: The report of the Director General, the reports of member states, and the draft program for 1952 which was being considered by the conference when the Gordon article was published in London. This could have been supplemented by interviews and by attendance at the public sessions of the various commissions which were considering budgets, program, and administration.

While it is almost impossible to identify precisely those activities which Wallenstein chose to extract from the Gordon piece, the intent appears to be to hold these activities up to ridicule.

Sixth paragraph (continued): "The organization seriously put forward a plan to take information criticizing any country out of schoolbooks throughout the world."

The facts: This must refer to the constructive efforts being made for the improvement of textbooks, a step applauded by educators in many countries. Part of this is an effort to eliminate nationalist bias, especially in textbooks. Generally, the approach is toward an improvement in teaching materials, for example, in geography and history. Forty-six representatives from twenty-four countries attended a seminar in Brussels in 1950 on the improvement of history books. As a first result of the seminar, several Belgian publishers have declared themselves willing to apply certain of the suggestions put forward. Arrangements are being made to set up nine schemes for bilateral textbook exchange and criticism. Five member states have undertaken a systematic survey of their school textbooks from the standpoint of their bearing on international understanding.

Sixth paragraph (continued): "It supplied cash to numerous strange causes including a search for mythical Inca treasure. It suggested a new Garden of Eden on the Amazon River."

The facts: It is evident that Mr. Wallenstein had no knowledge of these matters himself and that he lifted these two errors from the John Gordon article.

UNESCO has never contributed a dime to a search for mythical Inca treasure. UNESCO has never suggested a new garden of Eden or any other garden on the Amazon River.

These two misstatements of fact undoubtedly refer to UNESCO's efforts to bring about a study of the untapped resources and possibilities for development of the vast wooded area known as the Hylean Amazon.

It is the contention of many scientists that this is a region of great resources and that a concerted effort would reveal new sources of important strategic raw materials and provide the answer to some of the population pressures in other areas of the world.

To get such a study under way, the first session of the general conference of UNESCO in 1946 approved the establishment of an international institute of the Hylean Amazon in which Brazil, Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela would cooperate.

UNESCO did not plan to finance or operate such an institute, but it has offered assistance to the countries involved in finding the technical experts to carry out the work of the institute, and has provided a limited grant in order to enable the institute to be organized.

Sixth paragraph (continued): "It studied the case of an African tribe which extracted the front teeth of children so they could pronounce words of the native dialect."

The facts: Evidently Wallenstein is trying to ridicule one of UNESCO's fundamental educational missions. In some areas where UNESCO carries out campaigns against illiteracy both a native language and a secondary language are used. In teaching the elements of reading and writing, public health, improvement in agricultural methods, etc., UNESCO encourages the use of native languages in order that a larger percentage of the population can be reached.

Wallenstein deliberately tries to mislead his readers as to the purpose of UNESCO's fundamental education efforts.

Seventh paragraph: "He discovered that Miss Myrna Loy, the Hollywood actress, a member of the organization, was concerned with explaining to the world certain national customs—such as why Englishmen carry umbrellas. John Gordon, editor of the London Sunday Express, who is attacking UNESCO as a useless and wasteful group, suggests Miss Loy explain why Americans chew gum."

The facts: Whether or not the reference to Miss Loy is correct as stated, the process of explaining national customs is a legitimate enterprise. Miss Loy is a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO and has been active in a voluntary capacity.

Eighth paragraph: "UNESCO has sent scientists to many parts of the world to study the causes of war. It has published a report on education and agriculture in remote places in Mexico and Africa. It sent a delegation to study newspapers in Brussels and is said to have reported three newspapers were published in a city that has none. In the same report it praised what it believed was a newspaper when actually the institution concerned in the report was a lunatic asylum."

The facts: (a) In a limited way, inquiries have been carried out into social tensions. For example, there is an important India-UNESCO tensions project which is making important findings and which is, at the same time, laying the basis for the development of social-science studies in India. (Full details can be supplied on this group of activities.)

(b) While the precise reports referred to have not been identified on agriculture in Mexico and Africa, UNESCO has been praised for its share of the technical assistance work which is also related to the fundamental education campaigns in agricultural and other areas.

(c) In 1947 UNESCO undertook surveys of the needs of the press, the radio, and the film in a number of war-devastated countries. Thus far 61 countries and territories

have been studied. In 1950 UNESCO published the first single-volume survey ever prepared of such facilities under the title "World Communications: Press, Radio, Film." These surveys have been concerned both with material factors and with the professional training of journalists and technicians. These surveys have been widely used. We are not able to identify the factual errors reported by Wallenstein.

Ninth paragraph: "Last year a retired English politician in France found it difficult to bring money from England for his living expenses. He knew officials of the UNESCO and succeeded in having himself nominated to its Paris staff. He draws $1,500 a month. When he travels he is paid expenses of $25 a day. He has been repeatedly to New York. Wishing to spend a holiday this summer in North Africa, he applied for and received traveling expenses from UNESCO."

The facts: This is poppycock. The Director General of UNESCO is the only employee of the organization who has a salary of $1,500 a month. Except for the Director General and his deputy, the highest salary paid in UNESCO is $11,000 per year. These salaries are fixed and no exception may be made. The only other type of employment is that of highly qualified consultants or experts who may be employed on a short-term basis under fee or contract. As noted above, no employee, including the Director General, receives $25 per diem, and only the Director General or his deputy receive above $15.

Tenth paragraph: "The positions are obtained by nomination by members within the organization. The staff is an international body drawn from most nations which are members of the United Nations. The Director General is Torres Bodet, a Mexican poet, who draws $20,000 a year and has a very large expense account and other privileges. Secretaries, messengers, and other minor employees are paid three times the salaries such work normally brings in Europe. All salaries are payable in United States currency."

The facts: UNESCO recruits through member states, national commissions for UNESCO, and qualified organizations and experts in the field of competence desired.

Torres Bodet, in addition to being a scholar and a man of letters, was formerly Minister of Education and Foreign Minister of Mexico. His salary is $18,000 a year.

Since January 1, 1951, secretaries, messengers, and other minor employees are hired locally at prevailing local rates under the new local salary schedule adopted by the organization.

All salaries at the headquarters in Paris are paid in French francs, with permission for a limited proportion of the salary to be paid in the currency of the employee's home country, as provided in regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following those of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am sure that the former Member of this body, the Honorable Richard P. Gale from Minnesota is going to be quite shocked when he learns that the remarks which I put in the RECORD were instigated by the State Department. Mr. Gale is an able, experienced man and is not a stooge of the State Department. It is merely a matter of his being over in Asia seeing it firsthand on a trip that he took through that area and submitting to me unsolicited information, feeling that it was in the interest of the United States, like the good American he is, he sent the information to me.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Gale was on a trip at his own expense, is that right?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the private power interests of America cannot escape a major share of responsibility for the appalling disaster in the flood-stricken areas of Kansas and Missouri. And every American Congress in recent years must accept a share of that responsibility, together with a number of State governments and a large segment of the American press.

The private power interests, through their lobbying organizations, have successfully opposed every effort to enact legislation for an adequate flood-control program in the Missouri River Basin, such as was proposed by President Franklin Roosevelt.

The obstructive tactics of the private power lobby were supported by a number of State governments on the pretext of opposition to Federal authority over flood control, and by many newspapers which receive large advertising contracts from the power companies. It is an ironical fact that the power companies make the American people pay for these advertisements in their bills for electricity. This is a practice which the late United States Senator Hiram Johnson once described as "picking the people's pockets to poison their minds."

Instead of adopting President Roosevelt's recommendation for a Missouri Valley Authority similar to TVA, Congress in 1944 approved a weak substitute known as the Pick-Sloan plan, which is subject to no central planning authority and has made little progress. During the past few days the Chief of Army Engineers told a congressional committee that the construction of additional dams at a cost of $300,000,000 could have averted last week's disaster, which has caused property damage estimated at more than a billion dollars.

I freely admit that there is little to be gained in an hour of disaster by trying to place blame upon any individual or group of individuals. Blame cannot repair damage nor cure the wounds of disaster. The only worth-while thing that Congress can do now is to proceed forthwith to establish and finance an efficient control authority in the Missouri Valley which will prevent any recurrence of such flood catastrophes in the future. Similar authorities should be established in every hazardous flood area in the country.

A large part of the cost of these projects would eventually be repaid from the proceeds of the sale of the hydroelectric power developed and from the sale of water for irrigation purposes. Every properly conceived flood-control project can be at least partly self-liquidating, and enormous benefits to the American people and the national economy can be accomplished without any important cost to the taxpayers. It is up to this Congress to act now, and it is up to the American people to observe and remember what we do in this vitally important matter.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, how many voices speak for America?

How many international information and education programs and propaganda machines do we operate within our Government?

How many foreign public relations offices and publicity men do we maintain abroad?

How many Federal agencies have international programs underway?

It would take another Hoover commission to ferret out the complete picture of confusion and duplication that exists in these overlapping activities. Just by going through the budget I found a multitude of overlapping international programs, each with a voice in international affairs and each claiming to speak for its segment of American activity. Let me give you a few illustrations of duplications that I found.

The Department of Agriculture has an office of foreign agriculture relations. I suppose it is the voice of the American farmer.

The Federal Security Agency is expanding its international health program so it can more efficiently compete with the point 4 program and UNESCO. I suppose it wants to be the voice of American medicine.

The North Atlantic Treaty organization has its publicity bureau.

The Army, the Navy, the Air Corps and the Marine Corps all have their foreign press bureaus.

ECA has its far-flung technical assistance and information programs scattered the world over.

The State Department, Maritime Commission, Defense Department, and ECA each have their student and/or persons exchange program—a sort of glorified free travel agency—all under the name of education, information, or technical assistance programs.

Each of these—and I am sure that investigation would find many others—claim to be voices in the international picture.

There once was a time when the career men in our diplomatic corps and consular service were the ones who were

charged with the duty of promoting the foreign policy of the United States. But that was back in the days when we had a foreign policy to promote. Now that we have no foreign policy—and I think that you will agree that is the basic trouble with our State Department today—we find that the State Department now has to compete with and try to outshout the many other Federal agencies whose voices are also crying out of the Washington wilderness. To do so the State Department depends on its gigantic bureau of international information and educational activities. This is the department that produces motion pictures, prepares press features, photo displays, publishes magazines such as Amerika, issues daily news bulletins and semiweekly newsletters, operates a library, conducts scientific and technical programs, and, of course, operates the world-wide radio network which is known as the Voice of America. It has 142 USIE missions abroad—employing 574 American and 2,200 local employees, operating in 86 countries. It is for this bureau that the State Department requests $115,000,000 to operate in 1952.

But the USIE is not the only State Department agency with international programs, for within the Department there is also the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. It, too, has a program of slanted information for the American Republics. It, too, offers technical cooperation in the fields of public health, agriculture, and education. Then there is the German-Austrian information program, separate and distinct from USIE.

The State Department also has what it calls Missions to International Organizations. These missions, says the State Department, "insure effective participation and presentation of United States viewpoints."

In addition, the United States, through the Department of State, contributes money and support to about 30 international organizations, ranging from UNESCO to the International Whaling Commission.

I wonder how many other bureaus or Federal agencies there are purporting to speak for America.

This is hardly the way to present a picture to the world of a clear-thinking America that is supposed to know exactly where it is going. No wonder the world thinks we are confused.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, the United States is undoubtedly the most thoroughly reported country in the world. Thousands of newspapers and magazines report in great detail every conceivable phase of American life. There are approximately 2,000 daily newspapers in the United States, 10,000 weeklies, I am informed, and 7,500 magazines. Among the magazines are Life, Look, and many others that specialize in photo stories. We also have the three great photo services connected with the Associated Press, International News Photos, Acme, and several smaller agencies.

I have said that to emphasize an important matter in connection with this bill virtually all of the material produced by these organizations is available to the Department of State for reprinting in its publications. Yet our State Department has 10 writer-photographers who constantly travel around the United States, duplicating the work of these publications. The travel cost alone of these 10 men comes to $36,900 a year. Last year the average American paid $301 in taxes to the Federal Government. So it took the taxes of 123 persons just to meet the travel expenses of these writer-photographers for the Department of State. The American people are getting fed up with back-breaking taxes. Here is one place we could save.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, all of the several activities of the public-affairs part of the State Department are carried on to implement Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress—that is, The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, commonly known as the Smith-Mundt Act.

Section 402 authorized the Department to provide for the interchange of books and periodicals, for the translation of books and periodicals, and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational material. It would be foolishly uneconomical for the Government to maintain on its permanent staff all the thousands of specialists required to do one or another of the vast number of subjects and disciplines dealt with. Much of this material, therefore, is bought on contract from private suppliers.

Section 502 enjoins the Department from claiming a monopoly in any medium of information. Heaven knows that the Department cannot claim such a monopoly, not even in the field of shortwave international broadcasting.

Section 601–602 provides for the establishment of two advisory commissions, one for the information and one for the educational exchanges programs. The membership of these commissions, and the various subcommittees, consist of eminent citizens who serve without pay. These commissions report and advise the Secretary of State every 3 months and the Congress every 6 months. The Congress is therefore informed by eminent men who are not creatures of the Department on the content and conduct of the several programs. These men advise those responsible for conducting the program. Their findings, and advice are matters of public record, as well as the action taken by the Department to implement the advice of the commissions. Section 801 of the act authorizes the Secretary of State to, among other things, make grants of money to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries if doing so will promote the basic objectives of the act. Section 1008 stipulates that the Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this act, inclusive of appraisals and measurements, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs in each country where conducted.

The funds expended by contract or by purchase order referred to in the series of articles in the Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune are expended to meet the requirements of these two sections. The appraisals and evaluations required by the Congress and by good management are done on contract by individuals and organizations preeminently fitted and qualified to do so. The fact that they are done by reputable organizations like Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, and Rutgers Universities, and by public opinion research organizations like Gallup, Wilson, and Roper provides a greater measure of objectivity than if they were conducted by the very persons who are conducting the programs themselves.

The suggestion that the moneys spent for free-lance writers constitute some form of illicit bribe is a lot of nonsense. "Free lance" here is merely a bit of information jargon meaning moneys spent to obtain materials on contract or by purchase order. This amount of money spent judicially in obtaining articles from persons specially qualified in a particular field or discipline is actually an efficient and economical way to get the most for the taxpayers' dollar. It would require an unconscionably large permanent staff to cover all the myriads of special fields. By using so-called free-lance writers the Government can get the very best kind of writing done on a particular special subject for the least amount of money.

Furthermore, section 1005 of the act specifically states that in carrying out the provisions of this act, it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, and motion-picture agencies, and so forth.

Services of writers who are not full-time employees of the Department are obtained in accordance with section 4, 302 C, Public Law 152, professional categories. This, of course, applies to the expenditures for so-called free-lance writers. Larger contracts for services and facilities are let through the standard contract regulations of the General Services Administration. The products of the writers are always available to the public and the Members of the Congress as is specified in Public Law 402. The expenditures are reported to the Congress in the Secretary's semiannual report; they are reported in a general way in the reports of the advisory commissions; and they are further dealt with in the various stages of the budget presentation process. The General Accounting Office in its good time reviews all payments made.

In regard to the third article in the Chicago Tribune series in which the Department is alleged to have "concealed" the contracts or is said to have been "nicked," one must note that the figures given are probably correct. These figures were supplied to the appropriate

committees of the House and the Senate. The whole impressive list of figures is simply what the Department has spent to obtain the necessary services, materials, and technical professional advice for conducting its radio operations. The various categories of items ranging from electronics equipment to promotion through advertising of the VOA programs are the very kinds of expenditures that any radio operation, private or public, has to make to carry on its operations.

In conclusion, it is difficult to understand how the gentlemen of the Chicago Tribune or the Times-Herald can believe they have discovered or uncovered anything startling when the whole business is virtually conducted in a glass bowl with very clean clear glass in the bowl.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT].

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Chairman, the constituents in my district are duly alarmed over the last tax bill that was passed by the House. In their opinion it has reached the point of confiscation. I again call your attention to the figures that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] placed in the RECORD yesterday in that fine statement of his calling attention to the appropriations for the Department of State since 1942. In 1942 the appropriation for the Department of State was $37,433,599. The request for 1952 is $283,566,476. The people in my district are also alarmed over the large number of employees that have been hired by these various departments that make up the State Department, and justly so. They are duly alarmed over the type and character of some of these individuals and the lack of morality in our Government.

Many Americans were shocked recently to read of the appointment of Raymond Gram Swing as an adviser and special political commentator for the Voice of America. Once again, the Voice hired one of the most unsuitable persons it could find.

An article in the Freeman magazine by William Henry Chamberlin says of this appointment:

> An adviser should presumably be a man who had displayed special insight and foresight, who had criticized, or at least not endorsed, our costly past blunders.
>
> But Raymond Gram Swing was a passionate advocate of many of them. He repeatedly stated in broadcasts, speeches and articles that our troubles with Russia were due to unreasonable distrust of Stalin. He endorsed the so-called Curzon line frontier for Poland. He crowed enthusiastically over Yalta. At least as late as 1949, he seemed more concerned over cartels in the Ruhr than over the Cominform as a threat to peace and freedom. A worst choice, and one more calculated to confirm the suspicion that something is radically wrong with State Department judgment, could hardly be imagined. It is comparable to making Owen Lattimore adviser on far-eastern policy, and J. Alvarez del Vayo on European.

I have studied the text of Mr. Swing's first commentary on the Voice of America, delivered on June 25, 1951, and I have found that all of Mr. Chamberlin's remarks regarding him are more than justified. For instance, speaking of cease-fire negotiations in Korea, Swing said:

> It should be noted that the United States vote on the cease-fire resolution in the United Nations on January 13 is not necessarily a statement of present United States policy. In that resolution a broad negotiation for the far eastern settlement was provided which would deal with the membership of Chinese Communists in the United Nations and the future of Formosa. These terms, transmitted to China, were rejected by Chou En-Lai, who insisted on negotiating first a cease fire only when agreement was reached. Before the MacArthur hearings Secretary Acheson recently declined to endorse these terms and said the United States delegation had voted for the resolutions only because we were sure that Peiping would reject them.

In that paragraph Swing was advertising to the world the insincerity and double-dealing of his own State Department. Of course, Swing was attempting to justify Acheson's actions, but the fact sticks out that the United States is placed in the worst possible light before the world. If that is the best Mr. Swing can do, he ought to resign.

In bringing these facts before the committee it is not my intention to deal with personalities but rather to discuss principles.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] with regard to travel expenses for writer-photographers. Apparently he, or whoever it was that wrote the speech, lifted that material right out of the committee hearings. All the speeches we have heard here today concern themselves with the very matters that this committee criticized in the operations and budget of the Voice of America. It was for such reasons that this committee cut the Voice of America appropriations by $30,000,000. We can assign a reason for every dollar of this cut which is something the minority speechmakers, excluding members of this committee, cannot do.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, much has been said today and in the course of the debate yesterday concerning the Voice of America. I think all of us are agreed that the Voice of America can do a tremendous job in fighting communism and in trying to sell the principles of democracy and freedom to the world. I am particularly interested in this program, so much so that at my own expense I traveled to New York not so long ago to tour the Voice of America studios. I also attended some of the Voice of America demonstrations conducted here in Washington by the Department of State.

I have talked with numerous travelers who have been to Europe and Asia in recent months to ask them what reaction they found to the operations of the Voice of America. On the basis of my own investigation I became convinced that the Voice of America is not doing an adequate, decent job in the project assigned to it. I only hope that in the course of this debate we can help outline some of the things wrong with the Voice of America, and make some suggestions as to how it might be able to improve, so that it can do the job expected of it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I would be glad to yield but I have only a short time.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall be glad to yield the gentleman one additional minute. The gentleman has made the most sensible remarks and taken the most sensible approach to this problem of the Voice of America mentioned here today. While I do not agree with him in his too drastic description of the failures of the Voice of America, he at least constructively criticizes their operations, unlike his colleagues on that side of the aisle, who would cure the patient's sore throat by cutting the patient's head off. Those gentlemen are just against having any kind of a program such as the Voice of America. I commend the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. I thank the gentleman, but I say to the gentleman in response to that, in listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], yesterday that he shares the gentleman's viewpoint, that the Voice of America is essential. I think most of my colleagues on this side have that feeling, but it is important that if we are going to appropriate $85,000,000 for the Voice of America, we must have a good product in return for that money. We must constructively criticize in order to get the right kind of product.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield further, would not the gentleman say that constructive criticism of your committee is indicated in the cut from $115,000,000 to $85,000,000?

Mr. HILLINGS. I would think that is a pretty strong expression of criticism of the Voice of America. I think that in any event whenever we are faced with this kind of problem, it is the power and prerogative of the Congress, by virtue of control over appropriations, to express that criticism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. I yield the gentleman one additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

May I pursue one question further with the gentleman? Would not the gentleman say that to reduce the expenditures for the Voice of America beyond the amount of the drastic cut to $85,000,000 would be foolhardy at this time, with the world situation as it is?

Mr. HILLINGS. Of course, I am not as familiar with the details of the operations and expenses of this agency as would be the gentleman and other members of the Committee on Appropriations. I am sure the other members of the committee will advance some suggestions in that regard during the course of the debate. But if the Voice of America is not doing a good job, we should not continue appropriating large sums of money for its operation which may be wasted.

One of the best criticisms of the Voice of America that I have seen was printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch last September 5. I need hardly remind the House that this paper is generally friendly to the State Department. The story was written in Manila by Albert Ravenholt. He said that if United States propaganda aims are to be achieved "we will need to scrap many of our present ideas and revise our methods. The mere appropriation of more funds is not enough."

He went on:

It will be necessary to eliminate some of the fuzzy thinking that now handicaps American information efforts. One of these mistaken ideas is the often unconscious assumption that what works in the United States and Europe will work in Asia—at least, if it is translated into the native language. A lack of realism is sometimes evident in Voice programs beamed to China. Chinese who often fear they may be penalized for listening are rarely interested in long descriptions of life in the United States. They want to know what is happening in the world, particularly as it affects them. They want news about other parts of Asia, about the United Nations and American actions concerning China.

After that, they would like to hear about ideas they can put to work in their own lives, including suggestions on health and food and news of progress in the various professions.

Recently a well-informed Chinese came out of Hong Kong from north China. He listed the following as some objections of Chinese listeners to the Voice.

1. The announcer did not speak well the Mandarin dialect.

2. Programs in the Chinese language were delivered in a drab and uninteresting style.

3. The content of programs was only in part related to the immediate interests of the persons to whom it was directed.

As a contrast, the Communist-run Peking radio broadcasts usually are delivered dramatically by female announcers who speak the colloquial tongue.

Probably only a drastic decentralization of Voice operations will enable them to implement a successful program in China or elsewhere in Asia. Anyone working in New York is so far removed from the actual conditions of life in China that the programs he produces are bound to sound phony.

If the studios producing Voice programs for Asia were in this part of the world it would at least be possible for the staff once in a while to get a smell of the rice paddies.

It was less than a year ago that the Voice officials came to the House Appropriations Committee and requested $7,000,000 to purchase as their headquarters the building containing Sherry's Restaurant, across Park Avenue from the Waldorf-Astoria, in New York City. That apparently is the State Department's idea of how to get close to the rice paddies.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, probably the most controversial subject matter in the pending bill, is the item of International Information and Educational Activities, which includes the Voice of America and related propaganda activities.

Our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has yesterday, and on other occasions, given constructive criticism of the efficiency of that service, and in that I wish to join him wholeheartedly.

I have made an attempt to learn more of the workings of that organization and have even participated in several broadcasts to Poland and its people.

I have come to the conclusion that the people at the head of this service have not fully understood their mission. That mission, in my opinion, is not necessarily to convince those victims of Soviet aggression what a wonderful country and system we have in the United States. That is not what they are waiting to hear. What they want to know and what they have been waiting for in vain, is to learn from us what hope there is for them for eventual liberation from the shackles of tyranny and oppression. It is of little comfort to them to learn of the fine conditions existing here in the United States, as long as they have a feeling that there is no possibility that their own plight will be improved.

The failure of our Voice of America to give these enslaved people, our most important future allies, any ray of hope is, in my opinion, a most tragic error of our foreign program. Add to that the irresponsible statements of some of our ambassadors, and you can understand the reasons why our foreign propaganda is not as successful as it could be.

And in this, we need not lay all the blame on the Voice of America, nor on those in charge of the program. Neither of the major parties has yet clearly expressed its policy and objective to be the restoration of freedom to the enslaved people behind the iron curtain. We speak of an understanding on the basis of stopping any future aggression, but we are not prepared or willing to assert a demand for the liberation of those already caught in the brutal net of oppression and tyranny through no fault of their own. How, then, can we expect our voice to these people to be effective?

I cannot, however, agree with the logic of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who proposes to do with this bill what he and his party have succeeded doing last week to the Defense Production Act, namely, to destroy the Voice of America, not directly, but indirectly by emaciating amendments.

If the Voice of America needs improvement, and I am sure it does, we cannot get that improvement by cutting its funds so as to make it inoperative. Let us rather give it more strength by reorganizing it, weeding out the inefficient, and by this Congress making a firm declaration of our objectives and policies insofar as the future of the iron-curtain countries is concerned.

A good start would be the early enactment of the resolution which I introduced several months ago, calling for the repudiation of the Yalta and Tehran Agreements. It was the violation of these agreements by Soviet Russia that brought about the enslavement of the iron-curtain countries. Adoption of that resolution, followed by further positive acts in its furtherance, will do more to inspire confidence and good will in these people than anything else that we can possibly devise.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that what those people want to hear is what the gentleman said? And through the Voice of America we try to get over to the rest of the world that we are not an imperialistic Nation as those nations understand that term.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] mentioned the law that requires officials of the United States to travel on American flag ships. Heretofore the State Department bill has included a waiver of this law. In this bill, the waiver has been deleted. For this action I commend the gentleman from New York and the committee.

To ascertain whether fares on American-flag ships might be more expensive to the Government than fares on other ships I had a little investigation made of the matter. I find that the first-class fare on the *America*, our finest ship, is $325 from New York to Southampton: The fare on the Dutch ship *Nieuw Amsterdam*, the pride of their fleet, is the same. The fares on the *Ile de France* and the *Liberte*, the two French-flag ships are $335 and $340, respectively; on the *Queen Mary* and the *Queen Elizabeth* the fare is $375 on each.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not mean to compare passenger fares on American and foreign liners when I made my remarks yesterday. I was referring to what it might mean in per diems for State Department officials and employees if they had to wait over in order to get an American ship. As I said yesterday, I am willing to go along on this so that we may have the American merchant marine get every revenue that it possibly can from the State Department. But I reserve my right in the final analysis to change my mind if it does not turn out satisfactorily, or if it is detrimental to the interests of our American taxpayers.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I thank the gentleman and agree with him. I am pleased, however, to have the RECORD show that as between American and foreign-flag ships, the American ships are not only as fine as any in the world but as inexpensive in the cost of travel upon them.

Mr. ROONEY. I am pleased that the gentleman has pointed this out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, when the President appointed Ed Barrett Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Elmer Davis, talking over the ABC network, remarked:

> The job has been filled with the best man they could have found—one who knows the job already. We now get the best-qualified man in the country.

That was a newspaperman talking about a newspaperman. That was a former top-side Government information man talking about a man with whom he had worked and with whose abilities he was thoroughly familiar and who was about to take over the top-side information job of the world.

I do not know whether or not Barrett was listening to the Elmer Davis broadcast that evening, but, if he was, he must have felt pretty happy about that remark. I felt glad, in fact, to have an expert's opinion on the man who, in my opinion, was being given one of the most important jobs in Washington.

Mr. Davis was not the sole voice raised in approval of the appointment. Men who had worked with Barrett on newspapers, on magazines, in Government, were equally cordial in their endorsement of the President's choice. Editorial comment throughout the country was uniformly laudatory. The New York Times, for example, had this to say:

> The President's choice of Edward Ware Barrett is a happy one. * * * He has been reporter, editor, and editorial director of Newsweek Magazine, wartime overseas director for OWI, and a United States representative with UNESCO. * * * In these and related capacities he has shown character and ability.

In my opinion, that "character and ability" has shown up in the kind of job Barrett has done. He has put real "guts" into the State Department information program both here at home and abroad.

The results have not surprised me. In the first place I have great respect for the opinion of Elmer Davis, the New York Times, and these other newspapermen and newspapers. Secondly, I have liked Ed Barrett's attitude toward his job. I remember reading a magazine article somewhere in which he was quoted as having said that no information program could be worth more than the policy upon which it was based. In fact, he came right out and said:

> We will be judged more by what we do than what we say.

I liked that. He was not trying to sell his program—the information program—by itself. He felt the merchandise he was offering had to be what it was alleged to be. He felt that that merchandise—our foreign policy—had to be topnotch if he was to put on a topnotch information program.

I have a feeling when I look at Ed Barrett that he would not be interested in the program under any other condition. But I have a very strong feeling when I look at him and when I hear him talk that he is very sure that this present program—our foreign policy—is just what he is telling the world it is.

We, the American people and particularly the United States Congress, have given Ed Barrett a tremendous job. I am convinced, with Elmer Davis, that he is just about the best man we could get to do it. I am for giving him the tools with which to do the kind of job he, and every other good American, wants to see done.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to say to the gentleman that the choice of Ed Barrett has proven quite satisfactory, since so much of the opposition to the Voice of America seems to go back prior to the time that Mr. Barrett took over as chief.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I certainly think there is merit in what the gentleman has said. Of course, as you know, the criticism that is directed has been directed to anybody who has received that appointment.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. Is it not true that there are a great many people who expect Mr. Barrett to pull a rabbit out of the hat and reform the thinking of the entire world overnight and expect him to come up with a finished product in a field in which we in America are entirely new at? This is a new practice, this business of international propaganda on a broad scale.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That anxiety has been expressed over and over again. It reminds me of the doctor giving his patient a prescription. He goes to the drugstore and gets it filled and takes one dose of it, and if he is not immediately cured there is something sinister and wrong with the doctor who wrote the prescription.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to yield time now?

Mr. ROONEY. I was looking forward to the illuminating address by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am highly complimented by the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, [Mr. ROONEY,] and I am sure that he knows so much about this subject that I will be unable to illuminate it any further for his benefit. Suffice it to say that anyone might think from the course of this debate that this was a State Department, and particularly a Voice of America appropriation bill. Actually the bill involves the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments and the Federal Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to be on the floor to hear every minute of the debate, but I must say that in the course of my long hours here I have not heard any mention made of either the Justice Department or the Commerce Department by any others than the two gentlemen who are the chairmen and the ranking minority member of the committee; therefore, perhaps, I may be pardoned for stepping outside of the present debate and mentioning the subject of the Commerce Department and in particular the Civil Aeronautics Administration which is in that department.

I recognize that in the eyes of my colleagues perhaps the Civil Aeronautics Administration does not have as much sex appeal as the Voice of America and the Department of State but, on the other hand, it certainly would be a matter of great concern to the people of the United States, if they knew what the entire story was. I will say to the gentleman from New York, I have read with great interest the entire hearings in respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, including all of the figures that were inserted in the RECORD at his suggestion by those who appeared before his subcommittee. I hope that the subcommittee members have also read those figures and the statements that are printed in small type in the hearings. If they have read those statements and those figures, I am sure that they will have been illuminated far more than I can illuminate them in the course of 10 minutes.

I should like to advert, if I may, to a time in 1940 when the President of the United States, sometime previously, in the course of an Executive order, abolished the Air Safety Board. Prior to that action there had been no serious air accident in something like 18 months. Shortly upon the issuance of that order there came a rash of air accidents in the United States. It was very serious indeed. The House of Representatives set up a committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable Jack Nichols, of Oklahoma, known as the Air Accident Investigating Committee of the House of Representatives. The other members of that committee were the Honorable Everett Dirksen, the Honorable Richard M. Kleberg, the Honorable Herren Peason, of Tennessee, and myself.

We proceeded in the next 2 years to investigate 28 fatal air accidents in the United States. One of the objects of the investigations was to find out, if we could, whether or not this Executive order had in any wise contributed to the rash of accidents. We thought at first it had. Later, toward the conclusion of our investigations, and indeed a detailed investigation of each of these accidents, we came to the conclusion that it probably had not; that the accidents were the result of suddenly increased transportation by air which overtaxed the facilities that then existed.

Among those facilities which then existed were a number of control towers operated in several airports in the United States by the local municipalities. I might say here that the employees of those control towers were generally patronage employees of the city council or the mayor of the city. For the most part the jobs paid so little that competent men could not be found to take them.

I remember particularly the accident that took place in Atlanta, Ga., which resulted in the broken back of Capt.

Eddie Rickenbacker and the death of our beloved colleague, Mr. Byron, of Maryland. That was a horrible thing. It was our opinion, as I remember it now, that the control-tower operators were not as competent as they should be, although they were the best that could be had, and that if the control-tower operators had had greater experience, greater training, and were, let us say, men of higher caliber, the chances were that that accident would not have occurred.

Similar reports were made in respect to other places in the United States where accidents occurred.

We came back to the House of Representatives with a very strong report that all control towers at airports in the United States should be certainly under the supervision and licensing of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, if not the actual control of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

About the time World War II broke on the country, and the Air Force and the Navy, realizing the vital importance of control towers at airports, took them over and operated them. Through that intervention, control and operation of airport towers by the Federal Government established a method of procedure for the operation of these control towers and a uniformity was established throughout the Nation.

At the conclusion of the war, it was determined by the Federal Government, and our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce agreed entirely, that these control towers should remain under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and that all personnel engaged in their operation should be licensed and trained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The Congress agreed.

Subsequent to that time the number of control towers that were so operated has increased. There is a criterion established by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for any airport where a control tower should be established. I believe, if I remember correctly, that the maximum number of operations in an airport uncontrolled should be 15,000 per month. Over and above that number that is determined by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the traffic of that airport is considered so hazardous that a control tower with licensed personnel should there be established.

So now we have some 165 or more control towers which are operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Some of them are on a part-time basis. It is possible that others might go on a part-time basis. But at the same time we have not had accidents attributable to faulty control-tower operation except perhaps the one here at the National Airport where the Bolivian pilot got tangled up with an Eastern Airlines' plane—an accident which resulted in the untimely and tragic death of one of our colleagues, as well as many others who were on the plane.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that this committee for as long as I can remember has never done anything appropriationwise to impair the accident-safety program of the CAA?

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the committee has done pretty well in the past. I notice they have stricken certain funds from this bill which provided, among other things, for the inclusion of four additional control towers, in their handling of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not so, I must say to the gentleman from California. The amount recommended for salaries and expenses for the CAA is $600,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951. However, when nonrecurring items, deductions for rents, utilities, and procurement charges assumed by the General Services Agency, and so forth, are taken into consideration, the amount allowed is actually $2,324,895 over the 1952 basis.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, although I disagree. I notice, according to the committee report, that salaries and expenses for the CAA are reduced $3,700,000 from the 1952 estimate. I notice also in the course of the hearings the gentleman who appeared on behalf of the Civil Aeronautics Administration stated, and stated quite clearly to the committee, that they were putting in a very minimum operating budget. I am not criticizing the gentleman from New York, but I am merely pointing out the facts as stated by them. If the gentleman has other ideas, and evidently he has, then he must assume the responsibility for those ideas. But I am merely stating them as I find them in the record.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I desire to include in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Administrator of the CAA, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 16, 1951.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Congressman HINSHAW: In reply to your request, as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, for information as to the effect on operations of this agency of reductions made by the House Appropriations Committee in the appropriation estimates of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for fiscal year 1952, I am pleased to give you the following information arranged according to appropriation headings as they appear in the bill:

Salaries and Expenses

Budget estimate	$102,800,000
House Committee allowance	99,100,000
Reduction	3,700,000

The appropriation requested under this head for the fiscal year 1952 was based on holding all activities to the level authorized for the fiscal year 1951, except in the case of the program for operation and maintenance of the Federal airways system. The increase requested for the Federal airways program is necessary to provide for operating on a full-year basis, facilities first commissioned during fiscal year 1951 and, therefore, operated only for part of the year in 1951; and to provide for the necessary expansion in facilities and services to handle the greatly increased workload generated principally by greatly increased military use of the airways system. Dollar requirements for other activities financed from this appropriation are very important but are relatively small. Any substantial reduction in these other programs, such as aviation safety, would render their operations ineffective. Hence, it will be necessary to apply practically the entire reduction to the program for operation and maintenance of the Federal airways system. Although time has not permitted a final study, I believe the reduction of $3,700,000 will have to be applied as follows:

1. We will be unable to commission the new facilities previously authorized and now under construction and scheduled for operation during fiscal year 1952 (item such as instrument (blind) landing systems, radars, electronic distance measuring equipments, control towers, and communications stations are included), $1,600,000.

2. We will eliminate additional services, principally interphone and teletype rentals required for relaying air traffic control and weather data; and, normal replacement equipment purchase requirements will not be met, $900,000.

3. We shall have to decommission some facilities presently in operation (probably about 27 aeronautical communications stations and 10 airport traffic control towers), $1,200,000.

Prior to finally determining which of the facilities would be decommissioned, a careful evaluation of each of the 167 control towers and 462 communications stations presently in service would be made, to determine what relative effect eliminating individual stations and towers would have on the needs of military and civil aviation. This analysis would give consideration to the necessary program for decommissioning specific towers and stations. The following is a tentative list of relatively low activity facilities which may have to be decommissioned.

Airport traffic control towers: Reading, Pa.; Van Nuys, Calif.; Salem, Oreg.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Niagara Falls, N. Y.; San Antonio (Stinson), Tex.; Pendleton, Oreg.; Fargo, N. Dak.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Ogden, Utah.

Aeronautical communications stations: St. Croix, V. I.; Green Bay, Wis.; Scottsbluff, Nebr.; Winnemucca, Nev.. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Madison, Wis.; Huron, S. Dak.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Sheridan, Wyo.; Butte, Mont.; Fargo, N. Dak.; Laredo, Tex.; Dodge City, Kans.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Moorecroft, Wyo.; Rapid City, S. Dak.; Hanksville, Utah; Mullan Pass, Mont.; Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; Galveston, Tex.; Butler, Mo.; Casper, Wyo.; Chadron, Nebr.; Lexington, Nebr.; Watertown, S. Dak.; Tonopah, Nev.; Kalispell, Mont.

While these adjustments would provide the most reasonable basis of curtailing our regular operating programs to conform with the House committee's recommendations, continued operation of the facilities listed above is highly advisable and it should be recognized that their elimination would seriously interfere with services currently provided to users of both civil and military aircraft. In particular, the facilities listed above are considered important to the national and the civil-defense programs.

Establishment of air navigation facilities

Budget estimate	$37,150,000
House Committee allowance	20,000,000
Reduction	17,150,000

The reduction recommended in this appropriation will further delay the completion of the "common system" (Navy, Air Force, and civil) of air-navigation aids. In addition, it will seriously curtail necessary relocation, modernization, or improvement of certain existing communication, electronic and visual air navigation facilities in the amounts indicated:

1. Air navigation, electronic, and visual aids, $9,638,203 (includes 17 precision approach radar systems, 22 high intensity

approach light installations, and 162 distance measuring equipment installations).

2. Repairs to intermediate landing fields, $288,725 (required for the repair and improvement of emergency landing fields at four locations, namely: Columbus, N. Mex.; Salt Flat, Tex.; Vichy, Mo.; and Beaver Marsh, Oreg.).

3. Air traffic-control towers and centers, $5,003,690, (includes funds for (a) establishment of four new towers at Springfield, Mo.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Newport News, Va.; Twin Falls, Idaho; (b) installation of 13 surveillance radar equipments in towers at Akron-Canton, Ohio; Amarillo, Tex.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Great Falls, Mont.; Greensboro, N. C.; Miami, Fla.; Omaha, Nebr.; Richmond, Va.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Toledo, Ohio; Wichita, Kans.; Windsor Locks, Conn.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; (aeronautical center); (c) modernization and improvement of some existing radar and radio equipments used in towers and centers).

4. Aeronautical communications facilities, $2,219,382 (includes funds for enlarging certain aeronautical communications stations and to replace existing VHF air/ground communications equipments with new and reliable units).

The original plan was to have installation of the "common system" completed by the end of fiscal year 1953. The action taken by the Congress on estimates for fiscal year 1951, when only $5,500,000 was appropriated for new facilities, required moving this date ahead to 1954. The reduction proposed by the House committee on the 1952 estimate will further delay completion of this system. The Congressional Air Policy Board urged the rapid completion of the system.

Technical development and evaluation

Budget estimate	$1,375,000
House committee allowance	1,200,000
Reduction	175,000

The Technical Development and Evaluation Center, located at Indianapolis, Ind., carries on a number of projects for the purpose of developing and evaluating improved electronic air navigation aids, aircraft safety devices, and other projects having as their objective the improvement of various aeronautical equipments, such as aircraft radio receivers; aircraft fire prevention, detection, and extinguishing equipment; instrument landing systems; surveillance radar; and approach and runway lights. The reduction made by the House committee would require the complete elimination of at least five projects and would curtail the work to be performed on six continuing projects.

Federal-aid airport program

Budget estimate	$54,000,000
House committee allowance	35,840,000
Reduction	18,160,000

Our 1952 estimates were based on a program of $21,000,000 for new projects, of which $20,000,000 was for projects in the continental United States. Against this amount we have requests from 255 city, county, and State sponsors, with matching funds available, in the amount of $58,000,000 for airport-improvement work, all of which meet the President's criteria for the present defense-construction program. The effect of the $3,000,000 reduction in project funds would, of course, curtail both the number of locations and the scope of the planned airport-construction projects. In addition, it would retard work we are currently doing with the military on the reactivation of certain airports to achieve joint civil-military usage, $3,000,000.

The reduction of $15,000,000 in the amount requested for liquidation of prior-year-contract authority may cause some delays in making funds available to meet authorizations already granted, $15,000,000.

The reduction applied to the administrative expense limitation could have been absorbed by carrying over prior-year balances produced by agency economies in 1951, except that regulations recently issued by the Labor Department, which are mandatory in this program, require additional activities not included in the original budget which must be financed in 1952 at an estimated cost of $275,000. Thus, the $100,000 requested will be required or the effectiveness of engineering supervision will be seriously reduced, $100,000.

Reducing the limitation in the amount transferable to "Salaries and expenses" will curtail, by approximately 10 percent, services such as accounting, supply, legal, project auditing, contracting, and payroll. Workload in this area involves servicing the total program on an accrual basis and is not subject to change in direct proportion to the new program allowance, $60,000.

Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska

Budget estimate	$450,000
House committee allowance	225,000
Reduction	225,000

This appropriation was requested for the first year's operation of two new airports constructed with Federal funds at Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, at the urgent request of the Air Force. The action taken by the committee was apparently based on the premise that all facilities at the two locations would not be available for operation during the fiscal year 1952. While it is true that the administration building and certain other structures will not be completed, the runways and other basic operating facilities are ready, and should be placed in service. These airports were constructed pursuant to Public Law 562, Eightieth Congress, by the Federal Government primarily to permit removing civil air traffic from Air Force bases at the two locations. The Department of Defense is insisting that civilian operations be moved to the new airports at the earliest possible date.

As the Air Force bases have been operated by Air Force personnel, it will be necessary for the CAA to provide a new complement of personnel to operate the new fields. The allowance of $225,000 will be inadequate to hire the necessary personnel and to purchase services, supplies, and equipment required for the new operation. On the basis of an evaluation just completed, it is believed that the requirements of these two airports may be met with an appropriation of $370,000 to cover operating costs during fiscal year 1952.

Transport aircraft development

Budget estimate	$600,000
House committee allowance	
Reduction	600,000

The appropriation under this head was submitted as the first step in carrying out the provisions of Public Law 867, Eighty-first Congress, which authorizes an appropriation of $12,500,000 over a 5-year period which will be used for the development of engines, airframes, rotors, instruments, accessories, and, particularly, turbine-jet and turbine-prop-powered aircraft. It is considered essential that funds be provided for this purpose if the United States is to regain its position as a leader in the field of transport-aircraft production and if we are to develop to the necessary extent the vast potentialities of jet- and turbine-driven air transports for civil and military purposes.

As stated to you in my letter of July 9, 1951, this agency has improved its management and has effected savings in personnel and equipment so that we have absorbed workload created by a 24.1-percent increase in commercial- and military-aircraft operations, without over-all increases in personnel during the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951. However, we have now arrived at the point where there can be no substantial reductions in the funds programed and requested for maintenance and establishment of airways without corresponding reductions in our airways services and installations, which are in use by, and necessary to, both our military air power and to all our civil air industry which is essential to our national economy.

The foregoing outlines the probable effects of the major changes made by the House committee in the budget estimates of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. If you desire further details, I shall be glad to furnish them.

Sincerely yours,

C. F. HORNE,
Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. In this item for salaries and expenses for the Civil Aeronautics Administration there is a total of over $26,000,000 for other objects, including travel, transportation of things, supplies and materials, equipment, and so forth. A considerable portion of the reduction made by the committee can be applied to those other objects, rather than to the operation of the Federal airways.

Why should the cut be applied practically in its entirety to operation of the Federal airways? Why cannot reductions be made in other activities such as: general counsel, operation of aircraft, executive direction, staff and administrative services, and so forth, for which several millions of dollars are budgeted? I might point out to the distinguished gentleman that under the appropriation, title salaries and expenses CAA, there were over 600 vacancies as of June 30, just past.

Of course, if we were to give them all the money they requested I have no doubt that they would find ways and means of spending it. One method would be to continue the wholesale upgrading of personnel. I was amazed to discover just the other day that during the last 3 years they have increased the number of GS 14's and 15's, the generals who are paid from $8,800 to $11,000, from a total of 73 to 205. Between 1948 and 1951 they have almost trebled the number of positions in the top-salary bracket. If we choose, we can encourage them to continue until they do not have any privates but so far as I am concerned that's no way to run a railroad or an airways system either. I can't see why CAA needs over twice as many 14's and 15's as the FBI and seven times as many as the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield me some further time?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have been, of course, very deeply interested and concerned in this subject because I was a vice chairman of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board in 1947 and 1948, a board upon which the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr.

STEFAN] sat. In 1947 my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held some hearings on safety in air navigation. We studied the matter very carefully because there again arose a rash of air accidents. We discovered at that time a very important fact not related directly to those accidents. We discovered that the Air Force, the Navy, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration were about to go off in three different directions at the same time in respect to the adoption of means to aid in air navigation. It would be the same thing as if you were to set up three separate traffic light systems here at the intersection of Constitution Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue, one of which the Navy could see and nobody else could see, one which the Civil Aeronautics system users could see and nobody else could see, and the other which the Air Force could see and nobody else could see. That would result in the utmost confusion and probably result in serious accidents, to say nothing of the fact that by the adoption of three separate systems of aids to air navigation, you would have three very large bills against the United States for the establishment of these three separate systems.

So we demanded of those three agencies of Government dealing in aeronautics that they get together and come up with a system that was common to all three, so that everyone who flew would know the signs and signals and would know the roads. That resulted in the establishment of a subcommittee 31–3 of the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics. They studied the subject. They wrangled with each other. They came up with a report and presented it to the Congress of the United States through the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, what was to be known as the common system of aids to air navigation and landing, and the CAA proceeded, through appropriations made by the Congress, toward the installation of the equipment required to establish that common system. It was hoped that the transition stage of that common system might be completely established by 1952. That was a certain target date that was set up in the interest of the national defense when that should be completed. The system included surveillance radars which could be used in conjunction with the defense of our country against attack by air.

Last year there was a reduction in appropriation for the establishment of these aids to navigation which has caused a postponement of the completion date. This year the CAA has come up with a request amounting to $27,000,000 for establishment of air-navigation facilities, including radar sets. I find in the committee's report that they have cut that request by $17,150,000. All that does is postpone for a certain further period, which could be calculated, perhaps another year, the completion of this very important system. It is important not only to civil aviation. It is important to the Navy and to the Air Force and to the defense of our country against air attack. It is a completion date that is vitally important to all concerned and should not be postponed.

On inquiry from the Department of Commerce, Civil Aeronautics Administration, I learned that the reduction in personnel items has been such that they are unable to commission the facilities allowed last year, let alone supply the needed additional personnel for the year 1952. I am sure the committee did not intend to do any such thing as that, and that it was their zeal for reduction in budget—and with that I cannot disagree, of course—but their zeal for a reduction of budget, a zeal in which we all join, that caused them to make that reduction, which I believe to be a very serious mistake. I would not be standing here arguing for the restoration of funds in this budget unless I believed in their necessity so heartily that I would be willing to go home and defend my action before my own people. I am sure nobody else on this floor would take a different position. I am sure I can defend that action.

I am not going into the other arguments, but there are several things of importance. But at this point I desire to include another letter to me from the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *July 9, 1951.*

HON. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: In response to your inquiry regarding the utilization of CAA personnel and the relationship between personnel, workload, and commissioning of facilities, I am pleased to give you the following information.

On June 30, 1949, total employment in the Civil Aeronautics Administration was 16,677 compared with 16,718 on May 31, 1951, the latest reporting date. In addition to regular operating personnel, these figures include employees engaged in the program for establishment of new and improved air navigation aids and the Federal-aid airport program.

As you know, the Civil Aeronautics Administration maintains and operates facilities used both by military and civil aircraft. The following tabulation sets forth the increase in the major types of facilities and in miles of airways serviced since June 30, 1949:

Description	Number June 30, 1949	Number May 31, 1951	Increase
Miles of airways	60,213	71,859	11,646
Very high frequency radio ranges	230	354	124
Air traffic control towers	158	165	7
Instrument landing systems	89	96	7
Traffic control centers	30	32	2
Low frequency navigation aids	486	521	35
Precision approach and surveillance radar	6	18	12

In those regular operating activities of the Administration which are financed from the salaries and expenses appropriation, actual employment on June 30, 1949, was 14,825. On May 31, 1951, employment was 14,796. There has, therefore, been no increase in numbers of operating personnel during the last 2 years despite a substantial increase in workload resulting from an increase of 24.1 percent in commercial and military aircraft operations, and an increase of 18.1 percent in CAA facilities as listed above.

We have now arrived at the point where the operation of additional facilities and the handling of greatly increased air traffic, which are essential to our national defense and to our national economy, cannot be accomplished without additional operating personnel as requested in our fiscal year 1952 appropriation estimates. The situation is further complicated by the fact that, while we had contemplated the discontinuance of 53 low-frequency four-course radio ranges in fiscal year 1942, the Navigation Panel of the Air Coordinating Committee has stated that their continued operation is essential from the standpoint of national defense and civil aircraft operations. We will, therefore, be unable, in fiscal year 1952, to discontinue the operation and maintenance of these facilities, although the funds required for this purpose were eliminated from our 1952 budget estimates.

The following are other examples of increases in workload which we have absorbed without an over-all increase in personnel from June 30, 1949, to date:

1. During the past year there has been a considerable increase in civil airways traffic and a large increase in military airways traffic, particularly since the outbreak of the Korean conflict.

2. At the request of the Department of Defense, we have materially increased the scope of services rendered, particularly in controlling the air space in specified air-defense zones and in air-ground and point-to-point communication services to military aircraft. The cost of operating these services during fiscal year 1951 was $1,268,000. These dollars were made available by eliminating the least important civil functions being performed, thereby obviating the necessity for requesting additional appropriations from the Congress.

3. The National Production Administration has assigned to this agency the responsibility for acting as claimant agent for air navigation facilities, for airport construction, for all non-air-carrier aircraft, and for all civil aircraft parts and components. This responsibility required the establishment of a special office to handle the work, the cost of which was absorbed within the funds available to the agency.

To date, we have been able, through various methods, to handle this increased workload without increasing the staffing of the agency.

Considerable improvements in efficiency and economy resulted from a program for improved management which was initiated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the fall of 1948. At that time, we decided to review our organization structure to determine whether it was properly established to achieve its objectives in the most economical manner. To help us with the analysis of our organizational and general management problems, we employed the services of a competent management engineering firm. This firm made numerous recommendations, most of which were adopted. We approached the problem from the point of view that we should scrutinize closely the manpower required to carry out our responsibilities. Consequently at the start, as vacancies occurred, we required a complete review of the need for each such position and if the position proved essential we filled it, wherever possible, by reassignment rather than by new employment. This procedure was adopted to eliminate all nonessential positions and was continued in effect for the greater part of two years. The net result of all efforts at management improvement was the elimination of 446 positions and the reassignment or transfer of 1,119 employees. Since that time, it has been necessary to establish 417 positions to handle a portion of the increased workload and all of the new facilities referred to above. By these reductions and reassignments, the morale of the agency has greatly improved because each employee has a full day of essential work to perform.

After establishing our organization as a result of these studies, we gave attention to

other management improvement devices. Among these has been the inauguration of a system of periodic appraisals of the management of our larger field installations. The objective of these appraisals is to obtain a critical analysis of the effectiveness of the Administration's program in the field.

To insure that we continue to obtain maximum results for dollars expended, the CAA has materially tightened its budgetary review processes and has installed a system of planned work programs to control and monitor the utilization of personnel and funds.

Through these various methods, I believe we have held the manpower and dollar requirements of the Civil Aeronautics Administration at a minimum consistent with approved programs which are necessary to American air power. However, as pointed out earlier in this communication, we will be unable to commission facilities now under construction and to maintain essential services rendered unless the increases in operating personnel requested for 1952 are granted. These increases recognize certain essential defense services being performed and the necessity for increases in these services as the National Military Establishment grows and as essential civil aviation increases.

Your continued interest in the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration is appreciated. If you desire additional information, I shall be glad to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

C. F. HORNE,
Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. There are several points I would like to bring out, but here is one that I am unable to understand at all:

We have a sum of money that was requested in the amount of $600,000, which is called transport aircraft development. It actually comes under a bill which we passed some time ago, that came out of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to provide for the testing of prototypes of transport aircraft. Why did we ask for that money? Why did the Congress authorize this committee to provide $12,000,000, I believe it was, for the testing of prototype transport aircraft.

Mr. PRIEST. As I recall the authorization at the time, that was the amount.

Mr. HINSHAW. For the testing?

Mr. PRIEST. For the testing. That is the amount.

Mr. HINSHAW. Now, why have they asked for $600,000 of that money? Let me go back a little. At the conclusion of World War II the Germans had just got their jet-type aircraft into the air. If they had been developed by the Germans a couple of months before they actually were put into the air, the chances of our propeller type fighters and bombers being knocked out of the sky would have been good, and the whole course of the war might have been changed.

Shortly after the end of the war the British started out developing the jet-type transport aircraft. What did the United States do about it? Precisely nothing. We here unanimously passed a bill in this House in 1948 to provide for the construction of prototype transport aircraft, which would have kept us abreast of the world in respect to the jet-type transport aircraft, but it did not get passed in the other body, and hence nothing has been done. The British, however, went ahead and they have spent perhaps a hundred or two hundred millions in the development of jet-type transport aircraft. Where they got their money I do not know, but you can figure that out yourself. Mr. Chairman, the British are now offering to sell those jet aircraft to other nations of the world; they are even offering those jet type transports to our own airlines in the United States, to say nothing of the National Defense Establishment itself. Where, for goodness' sake, have we been all this time?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Is it not probably true that if we had an air navigation system adequate at our airports that some of our commercial lines would be having some of those jet type aircrafts today?

Mr. HINSHAW. Certainly they would. We are running the risk in our manufacturing industry of finding ourselves completely out of date in respect to the building of jet-transport aircraft and the entire business going to Europe, if you please. How silly and absurd that is. Why is that so? The reason is that the cost of developing modern air-transport types is so great, running now from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000 to perhaps $50,000,000 that there is not a private manufacturer in the United States who can afford risking that kind of money on his own.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will give me a little more time.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman discussing this subject has had ample time.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; give me a little more time.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is making so many misstatements.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield unless the gentleman yields me more time, and I have not made any misstatement.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman does not want to answer me.

Mr. HINSHAW. Certainly I do, but I want sufficient time in which to do it.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman's time expired?

Mr. HINSHAW. Practically.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not; the gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HINSHAW. I cannot yield if the gentleman cannot give me more time for I wish to use this remaining minute in concluding my remarks.

In conclusion let me say that I find no justification in the record for striking out the $600,000 for transport aircraft development. Actually the purpose is to permit the Civil Aeronautics Administration to borrow two B–45 jet-type aircraft from the Air Force in order to test the operation of such jet aircraft in and about congested airports such as Chicago, New York, and so forth, to see whether or not they might be able to fit into the traffic patterns without hazard to slower aircraft, and other similar purposes.

Another subject is the testing of helicopters. There are new helicopters that ought to be tested in commercial operation, and I do not know how it is going to be done unless the appropriations are provided for it. At this point I desire to include a quotation from American Aviation Daily which summarizes the Government's basic commercial helicopter policy as follows:

[From American Aviation Daily of July 20, 1951]

GOVERNMENT ADOPTS BASIC COMMERCIAL HELICOPTER POLICY

Continued and broadened Government support of commercial helicopter development and utilization has been assured by the approval yesterday of the Air Coordinating Committee's report entitled "Federal Policy Regarding the Development of Commercial Transport Helicopters." This report, in preparation for the past 6 months, was requested of ACC by the Post Office Department to determine the advisability for further Government support in this field and the extent and manner of this support.

In addition to answering the Post Office request for an objective report on helicopter accomplishments and potential, the ACC report has been adopted by the Prototype Aircraft Advisory Committee as the basis for prototype development in this field.

Principal value of the document, in addition to establishing a concise and constructive Government policy favoring the continued Federal support of helicopter development, is the outlining of a proposed program of action for each of the Government agencies involved in helicopter activities:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

1. Continued use of existing helicopter mail services in Los Angeles and Chicago and maximum use of such additional metropolitan area services as the CAB certificates in the future.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

1. Continued encouragement of existing helicopter services.

2. Similar services should be authorized in other large metropolitan areas as required by convenience and necessity.

3. Study probable impact of multiengined transport helicopters on the travel market in connection with future route pattern planning and route proceedings.

4. Continue its generally sympathetic and promotional approach in formulation and application of helicopter rules and regulations.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

1. Collaborate with CAB in sympathetic and promotional approach in the formulation and application of civil air regulations.

2. Under Public Law 867 (prototype testing law) request funds for testing and simulated airline operation of transport helicopters. Such tests should take into consideration the military operational experience of the helicopters.

3. Through the Technical Subcommittee of the Prototype Aircraft Advisory Committee draft specification for one or more transport helicopter types of advanced design.

4. Study communications, traffic control, navigational and landing-aid facilities and related operational aspects of such helicopters.

5. Continue its study of heliport requirements and make appropriate provisions for heliport construction in the Federal-aid airport program.

6. Offer airport advisory service to communities which include heliport construction, maintenance, and operation information.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

1. Through established claimant agencies permit purchase of a limited number of transport helicopters by commercial airlines for prototype testing and simulated airline operation when the international situation permits.

2. Make available on loan or otherwise to designated contractors a limited number of transport helicopters for prototype testing under Public Law 867.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

1. NACA should increase its emphasis on basic rotary-wing research covering stability, fatigue, rotor-blade sections, anti-icing, instrument flight, drag and power requirements of compound helicopter configuration and design parameters for higher flight speeds.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot get along with these vitally important projects without the interest and cooperation of the Appropriations Committee, and particularly its subcommittee dealing with this subject.

Mr. Chairman, under authority granted on yesterday I intend to include certain excerpts and correspondence in my remarks.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, when he states that he finds no justification for striking this $600,000 request from the bill, he apparently has not read the committee's report on the subject which reads as follows:

The budget estimate of $600,000 contained in House Document No. 178, for expenses relating to the development of improved transport aircraft is denied. It was testified that this testing would contribute very little to national defense, but would be primarily for the benefit of the commercial airlines. This type of aircraft development should be carried on and financed by the plane manufacturers and the commercial airlines rather than the Federal Government.

Under permission heretofore granted me by the House I insert at this point in the RECORD the entire testimony given by Mr. Amos Heacock before this subcommittee on Wednesday, June 27, 1951, which I believe will satisfactorily explain the action of the committee in this regard.

TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT, WEDNESDAY JUNE 27, 1951

(Witness: Amos Heacock, representing domestic nonscheduled air carriers)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Heacock, I have been given to understand that you have sought the privilege of appearing before this committee and giving us the benefit of your views with regard to some requested appropriation?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Which appropriation?

Mr. HEACOCK. The appropriation, I believe, is for $600,000——

Mr. ROONEY. Civil Aeronautics Administration, the turbo-jet testing?

Mr. HEACOCK. That is correct; the testing program.

Mr. ROONEY. What is your idea concerning approval of that request?

Mr. HEACOCK. I represent the domestic nonscheduled air carriers, the Air Coach Transport Association.

Mr. ROONEY. You might, before you give us your views, give us your background.

OBJECTIONS TO PENDING REQUEST

Mr. HEACOCK. I have appeared representing the nonscheduled air carriers of the country in opposition to the bill, the prototype testing bill involved here.

My basic objections are the objections of our carriers—which are nonsubsidized carriers, as you understand—that the bill was pre-Korean legislation, and did not take into account the totally new and different requirements of semimobilization.

It was designed at a time when we believed, or at least the proponents of the bill believed, that they had to catch up with the British lead, their commercial lead, in jet aircraft. I pointed these deficiencies out at the time and opposed the plan.

I later became a member of the Prototype Advisory Committee appointed by Mr. Lee, and for a while I believed that some defense purpose could be served by the bill. The crying need of the military now is for large numbers of cargo transports and since, as a kind of an afterthought, they provided in the program for the development of cargo aircraft, we hoped that we might get something in the way of defense usefulness.

However, this appropriation, as you will see, is primarily concerned with testing a B–45 bomber, to gather theoretical information for jet-transport operation.

It was admitted during the course of the proceedings that the information gained would be of very limited value. First of all, the B–45 is not a transport. It has different wing loadings. Any stress testing for effect on passengers from vibration, and so forth, would only be applicable to a B–45 and not to a comparable jet transport.

The information that the CAA would gain as to proper and safe procedures for handling these aircraft in traffic patterns, they will certainly be gaining through the numbers of jet bombers that are being shuttled back and forth on training missions.

The benefits, if any, gained for jet-transport development would have to be deferred until after this war. There is no military authority yet that can see any use in jet transports and none such, except for extremely special-purpose jobs, have been ordered because of the high cost of operation of that craft.

Therefore, if you did gain information, the production of these transports would occur at such a late date that the data obtained would be obsolete.

Also, there is a heavy expense involved in this program. I have pushed for the maximum development of the airlift reserve and our companies right now are moving maximum loads of passengers, military passengers, out of the ports of embarkation at Seattle and San Francisco, and moving military personnel to those ports. The military idea is to give a forced expansion——

Mr. ROONEY. And all without subsidy presently being received by the airlines which carry the mails?

Mr. HEACOCK. That is correct; absolutely without subsidy. Furthermore, the Army has figured that it costs them 7.3 cents a mile to move these soldiers by rail, including the cost of providing the kitchens and services such as MP's, guards, and so forth, and the time of the men involved.

They are now moving by air for around 4.25 cents per mile average; that is, 4.25 cents per air mile as compared to a surface mile—there are a great many more of them—at 7.3 cents.

So the Army is enthusiastic about the idea because of the developments, projected by Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Major General Gavin, General Ridgway, and these airborne people, of getting our Army airborne.

And then we had hoped that maybe we would get some good out of this prototype testing bill by testing and developing a cargo transport, to help get that into production for this emergency.

As to my own background, I was in the Troop Carrier Command in the last war. I know the need for this type of transport. I advocated in 1943 the assault-type transports, which the Army embraces today. As a result I became liaison officer of the Troop Carrier Command for Gen. Carl Spaatz. I followed this development through the Army to the present day, and there is quite a struggle within the Army, and between the Army and the Air Force, with the Army demanding an assault-type of transport that will be able to take off and land in about 500 or 700 feet, and deploy the troops right along the battle front, instead of concentrating upon the long-haul huge transports which cannot land on anything but a 6,000-foot concrete runway.

The deficiency, as the Army points out to the Air Force, is that when you get the troops to an airport in Japan you have to unload everything, truck them over to another airplane, a C–46 or a C–47, and fly to the southern part of Japan, and then they transfer into a C–19, and then they get into the battle area as best they can, and they have to have a prepared runway.

They want a type of airplane which is going to bring up these troops from the bases in the United States, transport them the whole distance, and deploy them along the battle line, because they can land on an open field. That is the theory.

That is why I opposed this bill in the first place, asking instead a realistic approach toward an air merchant marine bill—an air merchant marine bill which would build the type of aircraft that the Army wants, and lease them for commercial operation, and the lessors would pay back the cost to the Government in leases. This could be done as a nonsubsidized operation.

I am an operator myself, gentlemen. I have my own company. In a year it came to the top in the field of the Alaska office, and has developed one of the low-cost operations in the country. I assure you that, with the aircraft, it is possible to develop an airlift reserve in the United States today completely self-sufficient, without subsidy, of about five times the airlift capacity that we have today.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. ROONEY. Since you mentioned the subject of subsidy, Mr. Heacock, what are your views with regard to separation of air mail pay from subsidy money?

Mr. HEACOCK. I will speak on that tomorrow before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Will you just briefly tell us your idea of it?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes. We are in favor of separation of subsidy, but we want to go further than that. We believe that there is no necessity for subsidy at all in the air transportation system today. We have proved it.

We have gone out and provided 4-cent-a-mile transportation when it was said that it could not be done. We saw one airline after another cut their rates and make more money at lower rates than they made at the higher rates.

As an example, in 1949 the scheduled air carriers had an average price of 5¾ cents. With the impact of trying to compete with nonscheduled rates, getting their coach rates into effect, the family plans, and so forth, they came down to an average of 5½ cents for 1950, and increased their profit.

We have established through nonsubsidized operations a 3-cent-a-mile operation between Los Angeles and San Francisco, and we have seen two scheduled lines follow into the path. We have seen something happen that has happened no place else in the world, where 60 percent of all traffic moves by air

between Los Angeles and San Francisco, because many people will not bother to take the train, since it is cheaper to fly by air at 3 cents a mile.

The aircraft are for us the real method of transportation.

They get the same revenue as a 5½-cent-per-mile transport in transcontinental operations.

We have proved it can be done. We believe that we have to have a radical disassociation from subsidy.

If you want to put your money where it will do the most good for developing a sound air transportation system, do it just like you would in building a house. If you want to build a house, and you find that you have been dealing with a carpenter who was sitting around on a cost-plus contract and doing a slothful operation, and was not getting the work out, you could go around and get a group of four or five unemployed carpenters and say, "Okay; we will finance your tools to do the job and then rent them to you, and you can pay for your tools out of your pay. If you do not prove efficient you will get 'canned.'"

In other words, let us build an air transportation system that way. If the carrier is efficient and pays its leases and puts the money back into the Public Treasury, it is all right; if it is inefficient it falls by the wayside.

Since 1938 there has not been an air carrier fall by the wayside which has had a certificate of public convenience and necessity. It cannot. The difference between its revenues and its expenses is paid out of the public purse.

We have an amazing situation in Alaska now. There is the Alaska Service case. There are two carriers serving a population of only 100,000. There is Pan American and Northwest. On top of that there were two more certificated carriers, the Alaska Airlines and Pacific Northern. Their ton-mile costs of operation range from 45 cents a ton-mile for Pan American up to fifty-some-odd cents per ton-mile for Northwest, and up as high as 84 cents a ton-mile for Pacific Northern, and yet those four carriers have been declared fit, willing, and able to carry freight at 19 cents a ton-mile, just to knock out of the picture some 13 to 25 nonscheduled air carriers that went in there with a low-cost operation and provided the freight at a low price. That is the situation.

Today the cost of $6,500,000 mail pay in that Alaska picture may well be doubled—in the face of an offer, at least by my company, to carry the mail up there for $1 a year, 1,000 pounds each way, and the excess to be paid for at our common-carriage rates of 19 cents a ton-mile plus 5 cents a ton-mile. That kind of an operation is similar to that af air freight operators in the United States such as Slick, the Flying Tigers, and United States Airlines, who have proved they can establish, on a nonsubsidized basis, much lower costs of operation.

If the mail, for instance, were disassociated from the subsidy we would be having a 4-cent air-mail stamp and an expanded service. The subsidy should be obsolete. It should be a thing of the past in connection with airline operations. It is not necessary.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to assure you, Mr. Heacock, that your remarks are, to say the least, highly enlightening to this committee. I think we should have heard this testimony quite a few years back. We all would have felt more assured of our position. Our position has been similar to yours.

When I say "our position" I refer to both the minority and majority members of this committee. We are indeed grateful that you took the time to come here today and give us the benefit of your views on this subject. Mr. Marshall?

Mr. MARSHALL. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. STEFAN?

GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Mr. STEFAN. What is the name of your company, Mr. Heacock?

Mr. HEACOCK. My company is Air Transports Associated.

Mr. STEFAN. Where is your headquarters?

Mr. HEACOCK. At Seattle. That is my company.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the name of your association?

Mr. HEACOCK. Air Coach Transport Association.

Mr. STEFAN. What is your title in that association.

Mr. HEACOCK. President of the association.

Mr. STEFAN. How many people do you have in that association?

Mr. HEACOCK. We have 30 carriers in the association at the present time.

Mr. STEFAN. A membership of 30?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. How many planes do they own?

Mr. HEACOCK. They own from 1 to 10 apiece. I would say an average of about 3 per airline.

Mr. STEFAN. Do they normally own their own planes, or lease them?

Mr. HEACOCK. Both; a great number of them own their aircraft and a great number of them lease them.

The big argument that is used against us is that we could not be in business if it were not for surplus transports at cut-rate prices, or if we did not lease our aircraft.

Mr. STEFAN. Have the operations of these 30 members of your association been profitable operations?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The record has been that?

Mr. HEACOCK. Very profitable. The safety record in the last 2 years——

Mr. STEFAN. I was coming to that. Go ahead.

Mr. HEACOCK. The safety record in the last 2 years since our last accident in July 1949 has been a perfect one. That is in the common air carrier transportation available to the general public.

Mr. STEFAN. What was the record?

Mr. HEACOCK. A perfect safety record. One and one-half billion miles with no passenger fatalities since July of 1949. That is in the common carrier air transportation available to the general public. There was one accident in Florida which was a contract operation not available to the general public, one of the high-ball operations for transporting Puerto Rican workers.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Heacock, what amount of credit do you give to the CAA facilities for that safety record?

CAA FACILITIES COMMENDED

Mr. HEACOCK. We gave a very great credit to the CAA. I would like to say that our carriers represent the type of carriers that have survived. There was a sporadic type that would move from one place to the other and use all the pilots they could, and developed a more or less "sloppy" operation. But through the years that type of operation has been eliminated in favor of the competent operator who runs along more or less regular routes, which, of course, is frowned upon by the CAB.

We have had the best of relations with the CAA and the CAA has helped us to establish this safety record by working with our maintenance personnel and working with us at our bases of operation and helping us to establish this record. We are grateful to them for it.

OTHER NONSCHEDULED ASSOCIATION

Mr. STEFAN. Is there another nonscheduled association in the country?

Mr. HEACOCK. There is one. It has less than 8 members, however. It comprises those carriers principally who are engaged in the overseas operations such as Seaboard and Western, Transocean, Overseas National, and so forth.

REGULATION WITHIN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. STEFAN. How are you regulated?

Mr. HEACOCK. We are regulated out of business.

Mr. STEFAN. No; I am not talking about that. How are you regulated within your association, to keep up a high type of air transportation? Do you have your own regulations among your own members, and are they strictly adhered to?

Mr. HEACOCK. The discipline that we have over our own members is principally being effected now through the military contract work.

Mr. STEFAN. That is temporary.

Mr. HEACOCK. Well, yes; but here is how it works. If we see something that is wrong with a member carrier's operation we can call them to task because they know that we have control over some traffic that is being distributed through the association. In other words, the military deals with the association.

Mr. STEFAN. What standards do you have for your pilots and your engineers and so on?

Mr. HEACOCK. Our pilots all have the airline transport ratings. Individual companies have stricter standards than others. As an example, my own company will not have a first pilot unless he has a minimum of 3,500 hours and unless he has spent a full winter of operation in Alaska.

Mr. STEFAN. You have an age limitation; physical tests and all the other tests that regular commercial airlines have for their pilots and copilots?

Mr. HEACOCK. That is correct. Every 6 months the CAA sees to it that there is an equipment check; that the pilot is checked to see that he is at top proficiency in the type of aircraft that he is operating. Then we have our company check pilots. They are required at least every 6 months to check the other pilots as to their proficiency and bring them up to date. We have our training programs.

Mr. STEFAN. How about the inspection of your aircraft?

Mr. HEACOCK. The inspection of aircraft is handled under CAA regulations. We have CAA inspectors; we have CAA licensed mechanics. We have our maintenance procedures; that is, every 50 hours you are supposed to check these things and every 100 hours you are supposed to check these things. They are the same as for the scheduled airlines and the CAA sees to it that those inspections are carried out.

Mr. STEFAN. Your operators are familiar with the CW communications?

Mr. HEACOCK. We have found no necessity within the continental United States for CW communication. Voice communication is almost exclusively used within continental United States. Overseas operators—yes.

Mr. STEFAN. All the overseas operators use CW or are familiar with CW?

Mr. HEACOCK. I believe such operators as Transocean and Seaboard and Western are familiar with CW operation; yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. And are all familiar with the new navigation aids?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Do any of your craft have radar?

Mr. HEACOCK. No.

Mr. STEFAN. One association with which you are not connected you say has approximately eight ships?

Mr. HEACOCK. They have approximately eight members.

Mr. STEFAN. How many ships?

Mr. HEACOCK. They have many more airplanes.

Mr. STEFAN. What would you say is the total number of airplanes in both nonscheduled organizations?

Mr. HEACOCK. I believe the CAA gave the figure at one time——

Mr. STEFAN. Does not your association know?

Mr. HEACOCK. In both associations? No.

Mr. STEFAN. How many ships are there in your association?

Mr. HEACOCK. Approximately 100 aircraft.

Mr. STEFAN. What kind are they?

Mr. HEACOCK. They range from DC–3's, through C–46's and C–54's and a sprinking of odd types.

PERCENTAGE OF TRANSPORTATION HANDLED

Mr. STEFAN. At the outset of the Korean war, what percentage of the airlift transportation was handled by your outfit?

Mr. HEACOCK. Speaking of nonscheduled carriers as a whole, the operators of nonscheduled planes, which represent only about 5 percent of the total lift, performed 45 percent of the Korean airlift.

Mr. STEFAN. Are you taking into consideration the general commercial airlines that went into this service? Or is that your own?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. You are taking into consideration also the commercial airlines?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes; we are taking them into consideration.

Mr. STEFAN. As between the nonscheduled and the scheduled airlines, what percentage of this transportation was performed in the defense effort?

Mr. HEACOCK. You are referring to the operations between the west coast to Tokyo, called the Korean airlift?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly.

Mr. HEACOCK. As I say, at the outset, it was about 45 percent. In the meantime, many of the scheduled aircraft that have been relied on were taken out of the airlift, because they cost more to the Government; about 2.25 cents per mile. A C–54, exactly the same as a nonscheduled C–54, would be operated side by side, and one cost the Government 2.25 cents to 2.5 cents per mile and the other nonscheduled would cost 1.75. So, they reduced the scheduled aircraft first and, as a result, I believe the majority of the Korean airlift is now being performed by nonscheduled aircraft.

Mr. STEFAN. Coming down to this bill which you oppose, or this appropriation of $600,000 for the testing of jet planes on the part of the CAA——

Mr. HEACOCK. I would like to make a little clearer that I do not quite oppose it——

Mr. STEFAN. Do you perhaps fear that the CAA will develop a jet transport plane that will be so effective that it might kill the nonscheduled business; in other words, is there something selfish about your attitude?

Mr. HEACOCK. No. We would jump right into the operation, if it were capable of doing it; no. Just to give you an idea, a jet transport will be operated by Canada, perhaps between Seattle and Tokyo and their fare is $750. It is possible to take these lower-cost transports and put them into operation and conduct many times the business, for a fare of $250.

We think that it is not necessary to go in there and knock out that $750 operation, commercially speaking. What we need is the quantity of aircraft at a lower-cost operation, because jet aircraft is costly to operate; to go into turbo-prop transports and develop the maximum transportation for the least cost.

That is what the Army wants. They do not need a luxury-type transport that will go a couple of hundred miles an hour faster, but at a great increase in cost.

Mr. STEFAN. So you do not oppose experimentation in these jet transports, do you?

Mr. HEACOCK. No; useful experimentation I would approve. I cannot see that experimentation with the B–45 would be of any value. It would just use up the funds that might be used for the development of cargo transports.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand it, Mr. Heacock, you feel that if they start this project by testing the B–45, by the time they get through with that, that will be an obsolete plane; also, they are testing an Army plane rather than a regular transport that could be used for commercial transportation?

Mr. HEACOCK. That is right. Even if I were in favor of jet transport development, I would say that you are not going to get any comparable value out of testing the B–45.

Mr. STEFAN. Suppose this committee disallowed this item, would we be doing something unfavorable to the national defense effort?

Mr. HEACOCK. You certainly would not. You would make more of the funds available for the development of turbo-prop aircraft, cargo-type aircraft. I am very familiar with the work that these people are doing, the CAA. I have worked with them. They are very conscientious people. But the scheduled airlines are looking to getting developed a jet-type luxury transport at comparatively high per-mile costs.

What the Army and what our carriers want to see developed are cargo-type transports which are also useful for passengers at a low passenger rate; get them developed, because that is the crying need. I believe that if the item were disallowed for the testing of the B–45 transport and were used for other purposes—for example, in development of the helicopter, with which Mr. Waldo over here has worked so closely, and which needs extreme attention, because the Army intends to use those as special transports, to transport a squad of men from one hilltop to another; the development of that, and getting it into commercial operation would be useful; but not the B–45.

Mr. STEFAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Heacock. You say the nonscheduled carriers have approximately 100 airplanes. What do the scheduled companies have? How many airplanes do they have in operation—about 400?

Mr. HEACOCK. No. I believe somewhat less than 10 times that.

Mr. STEFAN. I thought at one time they had around 400 in actual operation. I think that we had that figure from you at one time, Mr. Lee.

Mr. LEE. That was back in 1941, I believe.

Mr. STEFAN. And they have increased their active airplanes to how many?

Mr. LEE. Just over 1,000.

EXPANSION OF NONSCHEDULED OPERATIONS

Mr. STEFAN. Do you envision an expansion of the nonscheduled operations?

Mr. HEACOCK. I envision a tremendous expansion. You just mentioned 1941. In 1951 the nonscheds alone will be transporting over 1,250,000,000 passenger-miles, which was the total amount that the scheduled airlines transported in 1941, and yet the nonscheds in 1951 are still transporting only 2.8 percent of the passengers and 9.6 percent of the passenger-miles of the entire total.

Mr. STEFAN. What is stopping the expansion of the nonscheduled operations which you say can be operated at a profit without any subsidy?

Mr. HEACOCK. The restrictive regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. ROONEY. The CAB.

Mr. HEACOCK. They recently put through an order which would have put us out of business entirely. It would restrict us to three trips in any 4 weeks between any two of the major traffic points in the country, such as New York, Los Angeles, Miami, or Chicago.

OPPOSITION BY REGULARLY SCHEDULED LINES

Mr. STEFAN. Are the scheduled airlines opposing your expansion?

Mr. HEACOCK. They are bitterly opposing our expansion and are very effective through the CAB by putting numbers of us out of business for alleged frequency and regularity of operation. Many have been put out of business.

Mr. STEFAN. No further questions.

Mr. ROONEY. We thank you very much, Mr. Heacock.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. ROONEY. I yielded the gentleman 5 minutes just a little while ago.

Mr. HINSHAW. Which was very much appreciated by me.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not like the idea of the able gentleman getting ahead of me. I would have yielded him 2 or 3 minutes when his time expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure the gentleman would, but I wanted to make certain that I was able to complete my statement.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to ask the gentleman who Mr. Amos Heacock is.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Amos Heacock is the head of the domestic nonscheduled air carriers, the competitors of the scheduled airlines, including the Big Four, that have been the recipients of so many millions of subsidy dollars of the taxpayers' money to keep them in business that it is not funny.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to have time to talk about that at great length. I am sure I could convince the gentleman he is entirely in error. I cannot get the time to do it, however.

Mr. ROONEY. We have discussed the subject on previous occasions and arrived at no agreeable conclusion with regard thereto.

Mr. HINSHAW. Doubtlessly, and that fact I regret.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to a discussion of the United States Information Service in the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly disturbed by a recent trend toward careless criticism of the United States Information Service. Frequently we hear that the Voice is a Fancy Dan outfit, that it does not hit hard, that it does not speak in plain language. One critic went so far as to say that the Voice of America speaks with a mumble.

I know that the Members of this House wish to be fair at all times. Indeed, when the national interest is at stake—and let us make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, the national interest is at stake—it becomes the duty of this House to form honest judgment based upon all the facts.

I say this because I am convinced that a fair examination of the output of the Information Service, particularly of the Voice of America does not, and cannot, support these criticisms.

I wish to make some personal observations. I have heard some of the demonstrations of the Voice of America given. I have visited the Voice of America in New York. During the demonstrations there were brought here to Washington

and presented for the benefit of Members of Congress and other interested persons, probably these were prepared demonstrations, but I would like to say that in October of 1949 as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I had the opportunity to visit for a very, very brief time in Hungary, as a matter of fact for just a day and a half.

That visit to Budapest was not with any prior information to our mission there. They were not aware I was coming and it was almost by accident that I was permitted to visit Budapest. It was exactly the same time that Robert A. Vogeler was picked up and arrested. I was going to Budapest when he apparently was leaving Hungary. I saw some of the searching parties that had been looking for him.

It was at that time that I had firsthand opportunity to see the effectiveness of our Information Service. They had fine reception and a great amount of interest by the people in Hungary who had almost to take their lives in their hands in order to seek information about the United States.

I asked some of the people who were at the head of this department in the city of Budapest why they had their offices on the second floor, why they did not have the facilities on the first floor where the entrance would be more accessible. They told me it was necessary that they be on the second floor so that anybody who was trying to avail himself of information about America would not as easily be picked up by the police of Hungary. They had been doing an effective piece of work. Similarly all of our foreign missions in the satellite countries have been doing likewise. Therefore, I think if we really want an effective United States Information Service we can only have as effective service as we are willing to appropriate money for such service. If we are going to tie the hands or give just a limited amount of money for them to go forward with their work, we can only expect a proportionate amount of success.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Is it not true that the Hungarian Government has just closed our Information Center?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true, sir, and it points out that the Information Service in Hungary was very effective, otherwise they would not have closed it. Because the Office of Information was an effective piece of work of information and propaganda is the very fact why they closed it.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Does not the gentleman think that that action will be followed in the other satellite countries?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Probably, and for the same reasons.

Mr. CLEVENGER. But it will probably be done in one right after another.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is very true, and it is because they are effective, and I think, because of the fact that they are closing these information services in the various satellite countries, we must give more attention to the Voice of America. The Communists may close the doors of our information centers, they can try to jam the Voice of America and the broadcasts we beam to those countries, but they cannot be as effective in broadcast jamming as their determination to stifle our information centers behind the satellite countries. It is true, perhaps, that there is room for improvement, but whatever program, whatever undertaking, there is room for improvement.

The Voice has a difficult and complex mission. It seeks to give a true picture of the United States and its peaceful objectives. It seeks to rally our friends abroad, so that there will be better teamwork among the free nations. It seeks to show those who are neutral that it is in their interest to joint the team. It constantly exposes the falsehood of Communist charges against us and the deception in the rosy picture of Utopia put out by the Red propagandists.

I wish that each of us had time to see how this job is carried out—to examine the scripts turned out by the competent professionals who staff the Voice. I have been impressed, and I am sure other Members of this House would be impressed, by the manner in which patterns of psychological attack are selected and hammered home, day after day.

One of these attack patterns calls for exploiting the weaknesses and tensions known to exist in the Soviet Union. I am sure we can all agree this is most important.

Let me call your attention to a broadcast to Russian workers last May:

Dealing with the current economic report from Moscow, the script began by noting that the Communists devote millions of words per year to painting the achievements of Russia and her satellites. Then it pointed out, and I quote:

As time goes on we seem to be getting more and more words—but fewer and fewer facts.

The Voice asked why these reports contained words and not facts. Let me read from the script again:

What are the Soviet planners afraid of? There is only one answer. They must not like the conclusions that have been drawn on the basis of the facts that have been available. Even the scanty facts revealed have led students of the Soviet economy to some rather startling conclusions. One conclusion is that the Soviet worker today, in spite of all his hard work, labor discipline, and continual speed-up, is still far down on the economic ladder. In fact, he has made no advances since 1928—the year when the first 5-year plan was adopted—and in some respects he has lost ground. He still has much less than a worker in any other industrial country of the world—far less than in any one of 17 other countries.

Such conclusions are distracting to Communists. And what do they do when facts and fancy don't agree? Black out the facts of course.

The script then goes into a comparison of living conditions in Russia in 1929 and in 1951. This analysis shows that the average Soviet worker in 1929 could buy six and a half baskets of food per month and that today he can buy only half that much.

The Voice then compared this with the situation of the average American worker, who could buy 12 comparable baskets of food per month in 1929 and today can buy 17 and a half baskets per month.

Mr. Chairman, this script is typical of the job being done by the Voice of America. This is the type of program that has been so freely criticized. Yet it does not seem to me that it pulled any punches. It seems to me that, when you talk in terms of how much food a worker can buy, you are talking in plain langauge. I do not think you are mumbling when you come right out and say the Russians are afraid to tell the truth about their own country.

I have here several typical scripts which I think bear out my argument. I shall ask unanimous consent when the Committee rises to insert them in the RECORD, and I would urge the Members of this House to read them, if possible, and to form their own conclusions.

[Special projects, Howard Maier commentary No. 39, July 18, 1951]

THE KREMLIN'S NEW PEACE OFFENSIVE

Good evening. This is — —. It's quite obvious to anyone who's been around for the past couple of years that the men in the Kremlin have embarked on a new "peace offensive." Even if you disagree with their evaluation of the naïveté of the people of the world, you have to give them credit for one thing—gall—pure, unmitigated gall.

Their last so-called peace offensive—remember it? The Stockholm Peace Petition—wound up with over 1,000,000 signers of the petition charging into the Republic of Korea, wielding swords, machine guns and tanks. The Soviet peace offensive in Korea—which had such laudable slogans as "push the United Nations into the sea"—didn't work. All the people of the world watched the new prophets of peace as they butchered and burned, and saw that it didn't work. Nothing abashed, the men in the Kremlin decided to change their pace. Malik smiled. Gromyko smiled. And Stalin had a new picture taken of himself receiving a bouquet of flowers from two pretty young girl children. And the new peace offensive was on its way.

Having lost out in the battle of arms, the Stalinists return to their first love: The conference table. Now, the free world has no objection to the conference table, but the Soviets have such strange methods of using such a table. For instance, last November the United Nations Economic Commission under Gunnar Myrdal was trying to explore the possibilities of expanding East-West trade, and, as you know, trade between nations is often the basis for peace. At that time, last November, the Soviets would have nothing to do with a conference table in Geneva. They refused to attend or send representatives.

Why should they? Last November the Soviet peace offensive in Korea was going full swing. Soviet bullets coming out of Soviet guns—held, of course, by Chinese volunteers—were bringing peace to the peninsula of Korea. What did they need with a conference table in Geneva? But, then it was no longer last November in Korea. Old General Ridgway, General Fire Power, had come to personally inspect the credentials of the "peace-loving" Stalinists on the Korean peninsula. It was a rough inspection. The Stalinists didn't like it, and Malik smiled.

And now—the leopard changes its spots. Forget what happened in Korea, says the Kremlin, show us a conference table, any conference table, and we're ready to draw up chairs. Remember that invitation, the boys in the Kremlin say? What invitation, the free world wants to know, there've been so many of them; in fact, we've invited you to anything and everything that might just possibly ease the tensions in the world.

Who's talking about easing tensions, the Kremlin says? How naive can you be? We're talking about that invitation back last November—you know, the one to come to Geneva and talk over expanding east-west trade.

But, the free world says, you refused to attend. Don't be silly, the Kremlin says, that was only a temporary refusal—that was last November when we were bringing peace to Korea. Now, we want to attend. Yes, sir; this is one leopard who changes spots so fast they're practically fluid. Let's take a good look at the spots as they change.

Suppose the leopard was to suddenly appear at this small conference in Geneva. Personally, I don't trust leopards. Besides spots, they have great big fangs. My dear men in the Kremlin—could it just possibly be that your new interest in the expansion of east-west trade might go something like this? The east—that's you and the satellites—sell, say, grain and timber. Naturally, the west—that's us, and mostly western Europe—would have to sell you something in return. And just suppose, my wily friends in the Kremlin, that something in return should be certain products, let us say, products which you made good use of in Korea. In other words, my dear leopard, war materials or the raw material from which war material can be manufactured. Naturally, we would not care to have Western Europe ship you such things—not after your wonderful peace offensive in Korea. Then what would we have—that wonderful leopard wanting to bring necessary things to Western Europe and that bad United States saying it doesn't think it should have them. You wouldn't want to use a conference table for any such purpose, would you my dear leopard?

It's not that we or any other free nation objects to sitting down with you at any table. It's just that you use them so peculiarly. One would have to be a leopard himself to sit down at the leopard's table. For instance, suddenly, recently, out of nowhere, you walked back into the four-power conference in Berlin. Everything was going to be fine. We'd all sit down and work out the economic problems of Berlin. But where were your little leopards all this time? You know, the ones who surround the city of Berlin. While you smiled and were most gracious at the table in Berlin, these little leopards were holding over 6,000 permits which would have allowed Berlin to ship 6,000 truckloads of goods to West Germany. So, in frustration, the West had to suspend the trade talks. Which, of course, gives you the opportunity to say, "Look at those bad, bad men; they don't really want peace."

Ah, well; all I can say is that I'd much prefer to do this kind of phony maneuvering with you than the kind that takes men's lives in Korea. But please, my dear leopard, when you change your spots put up a larger screen—the spots are beginning to stick out all over your hide—and now, this is ——— ———, saying good-bye, good leopard rugs for the wall, and see you again.

[Program Services Section, Features Unit, special commentary No. 534, Howe Bancroft, July 18, 1951]

LITVINOV AND SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

Maxim Litvinov, once regarded as the foremost Soviet exponent of peace and cooperation between the U. S. S. R. and the democratic world, observes his seventy-fifth birthday this week. The Soviet press has preserved a stony silence on the event, however. Divested of all offices, the former Soviet Foreign Minister and Ambassador to the United States is now living in obscurity.

The long-standing official silence on Litvinov is hardly surprising. Nor is Litvinov's removal from any direction of Soviet foreign policy. The man who once spoke in ringing terms against aggressor nations is sadly out of place in the U. S. S. R. of today. A crusader—or even an apparent crusader—in the cause of peaceful international cooperation could have no possible role in the Stalinist plans for world conquest.

Litvinov is not forgotten in the West however. He is remembered as the man who pleaded for collective action within the League of Nations to halt the menace of Hitlerian Germany.

He is remembered too as the man who in 1933 issued a famous definition of aggression. The first part of this definition said that an aggressor nation is one that declares war on another state, invades its territory with armed forces, attacks by land, naval, or air force the territory, vessels, or aircraft of another state, or imposes a naval blockade on another state.

Last August Jacob Malik, the Soviet delegate to the United Nations Security Council, read this part of the Litvinov definition of aggression to the Council in an attempt to prove that the United States was the aggressor nation in Korea. For, said Malik, this was just what the United States had been and was doing in Korea.

Malik, however, conveniently forgot to refer in any way to the remainder of the Litvinov definition. This said that any nation would become an aggressor through provision of support to armed bands formed on its territory which have invaded the territory of another state.

This omission on Malik's part was understandable enough. For the North Korean and Chinese Communist invasions of the Republic of Korea were directly instigated by the Soviets. And, more specifically, these invaders were supplied with arms, training, and other support by the Soviet Union.

Even had his audience not remembered the full text of the Litvinov definition, it still might have been wiser on Malik's part not to bring Litvinov's name into these discussions of aggression. For, rightly or wrongly, the free world regarded Litvinov as a barometer of Soviet foreign policy. When the Kremlin wanted to make a gesture toward international cooperation, he was given high authority. And his removal from such authority usually presaged a renewed Soviet policy of aggression, isolationism, and "hate" propaganda against other nations.

It was so in 1939, when the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed. This ran directly against the policies with which Litvinov had been identified and so he was quickly withdrawn as foreign minister before the pact was signed. Later on, in 1941, he lost his membership in the Communist Party's central committee.

But when Hitler invaded the U. S. S. R. he was again brought to the fore. He was instrumental in gaining material aid for the Soviets from Britain and the United States, and in obtaining an alliance with Britain. Just before Pearl Harbor he was made Ambassador to the United States. But even Litvinov couldn't get the West to accept all of Stalin's demands, and in 1943 he was removed from this post. He has remained on the sidelines ever since.

Litvinov, however, is more than a symbol or barometer of Soviet foreign policy. He is also a symbol of the exception that proves the rule—an old Bolshevik and devout follower of Lenin who yet survived Stalin's great purges. His escape was not due to any clemency on Stalin's part, however, but to sheer accident.

For during the great purge trials of 1937–38, when his comrades were being mowed down like wheat under a farmer's scythe, Litvinov was foreign minister. In this capacity he was conducting delicate negotiations with foreign powers, and was therefore considered more useful alive than dead. By the time he had finished this work the purge had died down.

He was somewhat more fortunate than such giant figures of the early revolutionary days as Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, and Piatakov. During the purge years they were found guilty of every kind of sabotage, treason, attempted assassination, and disloyalty to the cause for which they had worked so many years. Found guilty along with them were a large percentage of the leading younger Bolsheviks in power at the time of the trials—enough high rank, in short, to staff the upper echelon of any government.

But although Litvinov survived, it is doubtful if any government official ever had his staff so thoroughly cut from under him as did this Soviet foreign minister. Indeed, when the purge died down in 1938 only two of his men were left—Ambassador Maisky in London and Ambassador Suritz in Paris.

All the others were rooted out. Leo Karakhan, Ambassador to Turkey, was shot. Bogomolov, Ambassador to China; Skvirsky, Minister to Afghanistan; Tikhmenev, Minister to Denmark; Bekzadian, Minister to Hungary; Yakubovich, Minister to Norway; Ostrovsky, who was with the Soviet Legation in Rumania—all were recalled and have now vanished. Stein, Ambassador to Italy, was removed. Alexander Barmine, Chargé d'Affaires in Greece, and Fyodor Raskolnikov, Minister to Bulgaria, escaped abroad.

On what might be called Litvinov's home front the carnage was equally great. N. Krestinsky, his chief assistant, was sentenced to be shot. Gershelman, his private secretary, was arrested. Several other secretaries and translators were seized by the NKVD in Litvinov's own offices. Also arrested were most of the department heads.

These men were replaced, not by career diplomats or experts in foreign affairs, but by members of the NKVD and in a few cases by Red army men. The entire foreign office was brought under the sway of the Soviet secret police—and the ennunciation of foreign policy is now in the hands of such men as Vishinsky, Gromyko, and Malik. And a Litvinov who tried to sound like Malik would not be the same man who spoke in the League of Nations in behalf of collective security.

[Program services section, operations intelligence, operations intelligence summary No. 6, Don Shea, July 17, 1951]

SPECIAL REPORT: SOVIET DIFFICULTIES WITH SATELLITE HARVESTING

(Documentation will be furnished upon request)

ANNOUNCER. The harvesting which is just beginning in many satellite states is already causing the Soviet regime untold difficulties.

Reports smuggled from behind the iron curtain as well as those published by other news sources state that Balkan peasants this year are showing increased resistance to the unceasing Soviet looting of their fields. It is predicted that the situation will become even more serious as the summer progresses.

We bring you now a summary of last week's harvest news from Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

NARRATOR. In Bulgaria resisting peasants and harvest workers have contributed largely to the general unrest and violence which have marked that satellite state during the past few weeks.

Reports from inside Bulgaria indicate that peasant resistance is growing, especially against government measures in connection with grain deliveries to the state. In return, according to a report from the Yugoslav news agency Tanjug, Bulgaria 2 weeks ago banned the free sale and purchase of all grain, beans, and sunflower seeds. Bulgarian consumers and producers are now forbidden to transport these agricultural products.

But the real reason behind the order, according to the Yugoslav news agency, was

because even the Bulgarian state farms are withholding quantities of their output for sale on the free market.

The Bulgarian Soviets are also severely hampered by the active work of internal resistance groups who have now singled out the Soviet thievery of crops as a current target.

In one of their latest pamphlets—which was smuggled out to the West last week—they bluntly declare:

"The Soviet murderers are trying to disunite the farmers * * * to divide the workers from the farmers. Bulgarians are free farmers and want to remain such. Resist."

And there is resistance.

For example:

Underground groups are reported to have begun setting fire to Bulgarian wheat, much of which has been marked for shipment to Russia. According to Bulgarian refugees in Belgrade, the wheat has been fired with the slogan—"Not a grain of wheat for the Soviet Union."

The harvest news from Rumania indicates that the harvest situation in that satellite state has been the most violent to date.

In Rumania armed guards and militiamen have been placed over every field to curb unrest and assure control of grain deliveries to the State.

But serious disturbances have nevertheless occurred in many localities.

Enraged peasants reportedly killed a militia captain and two militiamen in the village of Piscul, District Gorj. Militia units opened fire on resistant peasants at Afumatz, Stefanesti, and Bolintin. And at Fagarasi three militiamen were killed by farmers who were aided by partisans.

In order to keep news of these Rumanian unrests from the public, it is stated, soldiers needed in Rumanian emergency areas are transported by air to keep the trucks off the roads.

In Rumania, too, the need to mobilize Rumanian peasant women for harvesting is being stressed in an intensive propaganda campaign organized by the Rumanian Democratic Women's Federation which is carrying out "explanatory work among working peasant women."

And finally, from Rumania, comes the officially-announced news that more than three hundred employees of the State-controlled food distribution organization have been arrested on charges of theft.

But this, state recently escaped Rumanian refugees, is not true. The real reason for the arrests, they declare, is because the Rumanian Communist Government desperately needed scapegoats to quiet the population. The people were becoming increasingly resentful against food shortages caused by inefficient collective farm food deliveries.

In Hungary—normally a bountiful, food-laden country—the Soviet regime is extremely worried about the labor shortage for this year's excellent harvest. The Ministry of Food has already officially warned that the enemies of the people are already trying to frustrate the harvest work. The enemies of the people, it is reported, are the independent farmers who are enticing the workers from the cooperatives with bounties of bacon, wine, and brandy.

The newspaper Szabad Nep adds: "We must fight against the private farmers who are seducing the harvest workers." And the workers' newspaper Vilagossag declares: "Members of cooperatives are neglecting their farms to work for private farmers."

Vilagossag continues to state that emergency youth brigades have been formed to meet the labor shortage. And then—with a straight face—it adds:

"The enthusiasm of the youth increased greatly when state security police also volunteered for work as peace guards."

The alarming need for armed guards and militia to keep workers in the fields is seen everywhere in Hungary. And the collaborationist members of the clergy adds their bit by offering church steeples to be used as guard observation posts.

Further—in connection with Hungary's harvest-labor problems—letters smuggled into Vienna from Budapest reveal that much of Hungary's harvest slave labor now comes from the thousands of exiles being uprooted from their homes under the current Budapest mass-deportation program. They are shipped to eastern Hungary to work on collective farms, where they receive little pay and reportedly live under miserable conditions.

Largest thorn in the Hungarian Government's side, it is stated, are the independent farmers, who continue to hide produce for their own use or funnel it into the free market. But the state-controlled farms are reportedly almost as bad—and certainly wastefully inefficient. In this respect Radio Budapest consistently reports that Communist state farm managers are being jailed or dismissed for bad leadership resulting in nonfulfillment of planned harvest targets.

In Czechoslovakia a worried Ministry of Agriculture has also issued an official appeal asking for public assistance to get in the harvest.

Here, too, the independent farmers have been plaguing the Communist government. As a consequence the Czechoslovakian Cabinet is urging peasants to spy upon these independent farmers. It especially urges them to watch carefully for evidences of kulak sabotage, or failure to implement delivery obligations. Slovak farmers were also warned by Minister of Agriculture Duris at a July 10 harvest festival at Velke Ulany to "beware of the capitalistic mentality" of the kulaks.

But despite the warnings, peasant resistance in Czechoslovakia continues to grow.

ANNOUNCER. You have been listening to a special report concerning peasant resistance to Soviet harvest demands in the satellite states. Today's report has included the latest harvest developments from Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, believing that the eventual solution for many of the world's ills lies in broader education and a common understanding of the problems of other peoples, many of us had great hopes for the Voice of America program. Regretfully, we learn that it has not been satisfactory. If that be the case, and I have no reason to doubt that it is, then we must ask ourselves why this program that could have been so valuable has not lived up to expectations. An answer to that question may be found in the opinions of those who have studied it carefully over past months.

Raymond Moley, the newspaper and magazine columnist, has written a most concise description of the State Department. Mr. Moley wrote on June 28, 1951:

> An overwhelming majority of Americans have lost confidence in the State Department, and there must follow from this a general disbelief in what the Department says. It is ridiculous, therefore, to call the voice of the State Department the Voice of America.

Mr. Moley goes on to point out the great damage to our cause from the suspicion directed to the State Department from all sides.

> This lack of confidence at home—

He says—

> is exactly what the Soviet will use to discredit all propaganda from that source.

Mr. Moley also pointed out the similarity of the Office of War Information during World War II and the Voice of America at present. Both were attempting to promote wrong policies. During World War II, Moley said:

> The more we talked to the people of the enemy countries, the more determined they were to fight to the end. Something of the sort is likely to be true of the present broadcasting of the policies of the State Department.

Mr. Moley was one of the founders of the New Deal and worked intimately with President Roosevelt during its early years. As an Assistant Secretary of State during that period he is not unfamiliar with the State Department. We should heed his warning about the price this country is paying in letting the voice of the State Department masquerade as the Voice of America.

In this country we want and need a true and valid Voice of America program. It is fundamentally important. But, it is also very necessary that it be the real Voice of America and not the voice of the State Department.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, in the last few days there have been a lot of attacks and insinuations on the personnel of the Voice of America. Now, it is a good old American custom to present both sides of a question. I do not agree with everything that Ed Barrett has said. I do not agree with everything that has been done by the Voice of America, by the State Department, by the Defense Department, or even by the Congress of the United States. But I do know that Ed Barrett is a friend of mine, and that he has done a good job.

I have visited the Voice of America in New York, and I was amazed at the magnitude and the scope of the undertaking of the Voice of America. I think we must realize that this program just recently started from scratch, and that much has been done even though much more can and must be done. Our criticism should be tempered by the facts and it should be constructive.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say a kind word for my friend Ed Barrett, the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

The name of Barrett means a lot to us in Alabama. In case you do not know it, Secretary Barrett's father was for many years editor and publisher of one of our great newspapers, the Birmingham Age-Herald. He was very highly thought of throughout the State.

The present VOA boss was born in Birmingham. He went North to school, but after prep school and Princeton, he came back to Birmingham and began his newspaper career on the Birmingham News.

Alabama lost him after that, but we have followed his career with pride. When he left his job at Newsweek to accept his present post at State we felt Newsweek's loss was State's gain. We knew he was going to make a success of the new job as he had of the old.

I do not know of any better yardstick by which to judge that success than the increasing venom of the attack being made on the VOA program from the other side of the iron curtain. A man may be known by his friends, but he is also known by his enemies. Secretary Barrett has made some very fancy enemies in the Kremlin gang. I think all of us honor him for those enemies.

However, despite all these attentions being bestowed upon him and his program by the Moscow boys, Secretary Barrett has remained a very modest man. He tells me VOA's mounting success is due to his team, the men and women working under him at State on either the domestic or foreign information program.

I like that in him, but we all know even the best team has to have a good captain to go places. And VOA has gone places. Make no mistake about that. It has gone, and is going, into literally hundreds of millions of homes in Europe, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and perhaps most importantly of all, Soviet Russia and her satellites.

Slowly at first, but with increasing tempo over the past year or so, the Voice of America is carrying America's message to the world. Under Ed Barrett's expert generalship the radio, movies, magazines, newspapers, and television are playing their part in this global battle for the minds of men.

This is a new kind of attack for the United States. Russia long ago saw the value of this kind of warfare. She had the jump on us when we got into the game. No doubt about it. Using the technique of the big lie and the little lie—any kind of lie—she had rolled her propaganda batteries into place almost before the smoke of World War II had settled.

It took us some time to wake up. But we did wake. Do not forget that. And our attack, which is founded on truth rather than falsehood, is being effective.

Listen to this. A letter smuggled out from Siberia and received by VOA tells about the punishments the Russians inflict on anyone caught tuning in on the Voice.

But everyone listens—

The letter declares.

The commander of a concentration camp listens, the director of a plant listens, the chairman of a collective farm listens. And if they listen other people do the same or learn from them. People young and old listen. They meet in groups, post guards and later spread the news everywhere.

Ed Barrett has thousands of letters similar to that one.

To me that spells success for a boy from Birmingham and his team. It tells me that they are doing their job.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked Mr. Barrett about the question of information policy guidance on our foreign information program, and I would like to give his reply to the membership at this time.

WHY GUIDANCES ARE NECESSARY

When the foreign information program was established in accordance with the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, it was conceived largely in terms of winning friends abroad. The worsening international situation brought about a corresponding change in the information program, placing less and less emphasis on winning friends and more and more emphasis on influencing people abroad. This resulted from a realization that it was not adequate merely to disseminate information in order to increase knowledge and understanding of the United States, its peoples and policies. What was required instead was a carefully planned and skillfully conducted information campaign to foster abroad the attitudes, behavior, and actions which would further the foreign policy objectives of the United States. In the conduct of the program, therefore, the art of informing assumed a role secondary to the art of persuading.

This program is popularly known as the Campaign of Truth. Presenting the truth, as we understand it, means a great deal more than the mere reporting, willy-nilly, of facts. Truth is not only the presentation but also the interpretation of facts and ideas. Although the presentation of facts and ideas often reflects the truth, the presentation of facts and ideas without interpretation can also create false impressions. In accordance with this reasoning the foreign information program not only presents facts and ideas, but also supplements this presentation with an interpretation of their significance in the present world scene. It is this presentation of facts and ideas in perspective which creates the reactions that further the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

In a sense, although the analogy cannot be labored, the foreign information program is comparable to a newspaper. By and large, facts and ideas are presented in the news columns merely for the purpose of informing the public. But in the editorial column of the newspaper these facts and ideas are interpreted according to the policies of the newspaper with the objective of influencing public opinion. However, since the newspaper does not maintain that its interpretation is the only legitimate interpretation, it also publishes by-line columns, plus letters to the editor, which present other interpretations of the facts and ideas covered in the news columns. It might be added that each of these interpretations, however much it may differ from the others, is in the opinion of the writer the truth.

The information program of the United States has its news columns in the form of newscasts, wireless bulletins, and similar material. As in the case of the news columns of the newspapers, these presentations are straightforward and objective. It is, of course, impossible to achieve complete objectivity in the news columns of a newspaper, in a VOA newscast, or in any other news presentation. Different writers select different facts for emphasis, not through design but simply because they see the subject differently. Moreover, the placement of an item in the newspaper or in a radio newscast has a bearing upon its impact. But the information program, like the newspaper, also has its editorial column in which it interprets facts and ideas in accordance with the foreign policies of the United States Government in an avowed effort to influence public opinion abroad in ways that will be helpful to the United States. This editorial column includes commentaries on the VOA, pamphlets, motion pictures and other materials.

Again, to carry the analogy further, the foreign information program does not present its opinions exclusively but also presents, in round-ups of editorial comment, in reports of debates in the Congress and elsewhere, in speeches and statements, the opinions of many others as well.

The information program cannot present the opinions of the executive branch of the Government alone. To do so would be to create a false impression. It would also negate one of our fundamental—and, to foreign audiences, one of our most appealing—freedoms, the freedom to differ.

For these and other reasons we present as complete a picture as we can but in ways that will achieve maximum gain from what is favorable and minimum loss from what is unfavorable. Determining these ways is a complicated problem that cannot be left to the casual judgment of any person who happens to be writing a script or story or pamphlet. It must be done by experts who understand the techniques of influencing mass opinion, who have a wealth of background information not available to all operators, and who understand the target audiences. But since these few experts cannot prepare all of the material disseminated, their understanding and know-how must be transmitted to the operators. This, in essence, explains the necessity for Information Policy Guidances.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration today, H. R. 4740, proposes that we spend $85,000,000 on the Voice of America programs. It is this project in this appropriation bill to which I wish to direct our attention at this moment.

We have been told repeatedly that one of the aims of the Voice of America is to expose communism as a diabolical fraud and to convince the peoples of the world of the superiority of our free democratic Government.

But just listen to this statement that was broadcast by Norman Thomas on the Voice of America on November 16, 1950. Thomas said that communism "is police-state capitalism at its worst." Thomas was asserting that communism is a form of capitalism and that the two, therefore, have a great deal in common.

Mr. Thomas, the leading Socialist in this country for many years, was trying, of course, to disown communism because he is embarrassed by the fact that communism is the Marxist twin of so-

cialism. Thomas was attempting to link communism with our free enterprise system—the system he is out to replace. I hardly need point out that it is this same free-enterprise system that the Socialist countries of the world keep coming to beg for aid.

Here is another statement by Thomas on the Voice of America:

I, and all Socialists, would oppose any effort to reinstate Chiang in China.

On that one, Thomas really let the cat out of the bag. This Government's official position is supposed to be to support the legitimate government of China, which is the one headed by Chiang. Yet here are Thomas and the Voice of America telling the world we do not mean it—that we have no use for Chiang's government.

What is the alternative to Chiang's government? Only the Red government that has been making war on us and the other United Nations for 9 months. What has Thomas to say about that Red government? Just this:

No aid or recognition should be extended to Red China or Fascist Spain or Tito's Yugoslavia except under certain conditions, one of which should be a pledge not to try to impose their totalitarian ideology by force upon neighboring lands.

There we have Thomas openly discussing the possibility of handing out aid to the very Chinese Communists who are the sworn enemies of America. All that Thomas requires, apparently, is a promise that the Chinese Reds will confine their killings to anti-Communists in their own land.

I ask the Members of this House to consider the effect of a message like this one on the patriotic, freedom-loving Chinese guerrillas on the mainland, who are daily risking their lives to harass the Communists and bring liberty back to their country. What must they think when they hear the United States Government's official radio berating their legitimate government and discussing the Communists in the friendliest of terms? What must American soldiers in Korea think when they hear the United States Government radio discussing the possibility of giving handouts to the Reds?

The Voice of America is not a debating society. It is supposed to be exactly what its title says—the official spokesman for this country, but the people of the United States have shown in election after election that Norman Thomas is not the one they would choose as their spokesman. Norman Thomas is entitled to hold all the Socialist views he pleases; but Norman Thomas is not entitled to promote socialism in other countries on our own Government's radio. Nor is the State Department entitled to assist in promulgating the left-wing line.

Broadcasts such as this cause me to look with suspicion upon the management of the Voice of America. One is constrained to feel that the best service they could render the country would be to resign and let the Voice become the true Voice of America.

What is the difference between communism and socialism? Their end objectives are the same: socialism, communism, naturalization, or whatever you choose to call it means in the end the same absolute control by a central government and the regimentation of a people.

Now what is the Voice of America? The people of other nations would like to know; they are confused. They cannot understand why we fight communism abroad and protect it at home; they do not understand why we protest so loudly against socialism at home and support it in Great Britain; they cannot understand why we fight communism in Korea and lend aid to it in Yugoslavia.

What is the true Voice of America? It is time we find the answer to that question before we spend another $85,000,000 in a venture of this kind. The place to begin such action is right here in the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we have just heard another one of those speeches I have been talking about. I understand that up in the Press Gallery they have a pile of hand-outs this high. Those speeches have been prepared in a certain central place and all directed to various and different points in the Voice of America program. Up to now I think we have satisfactorily answered every one of them. Insofar as the last speech is concerned, I feel that I must point out that Norman Thomas is known to millions of Socialists and labor groups around the world for his courageous anti-Communist stand. Whether we agree with them or not, many of the countries to which the Voice of America broadcasts have important Socialist parties and populations. Some of these people have tended in the past to try to collaborate with the Communists, especially in Eastern Europe. Those are the people we want to get to; those are the people who must be awakened. As an American, and conceding that we do not agree with his socialistic ideas, Norman Thomas helped the Voice of America to do that job.

In one of his broadcasts Thomas made a direct appeal to the North Koreans:

The Kremlin has left us no choice but to meet armed aggression with armed defense. I also want to express my deep and abiding sympathy with the 800,000,000 victims of Communist dictatorship in the Soviet Empire, and with those now threatened by the world-wide Communist conspiracy.

I who tell you this am myself a Socialist. I have been a sharp critic of many things in my own country that I want to change. But no American wants anything in Korea except peace for free people. We want nothing but the end of a war which has caused the needless loss of blood.

Our sons fight for one reason and for one reason only—to stop Dictator Stalin's march to world-wide conquest, using you North Koreans as his dupes and tools.

In another one of his Voice of America broadcasts, speaking as a Socialist, he answered a resounding "No" to the question "Is America an imperialist power?"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, what is the situation with regard to the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has 43 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] such time as he may require.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in assuming that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has sufficient requests for time to consume his entire 25 minutes?

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman have sufficient requests to consume his 45 minutes?

Mr. ROONEY. We do not expect to use the 45 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield some time now?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, for years those of us who have worked to harness one of nature's greatest resources, water, have been attacked by some as promoting pork-barrel projects. But every so often nature takes steps to prove the worthiness of our endeavors. The terrible havoc of floods in Missouri and Kansas last week has eclipsed the writings and voices of those short-sighted opponents to such legislation.

Along the Rio Grande we, too, are faced with the problem of averting the damages of floods. In the arid lands of south Texas dams controlling the water flow serve a multiple purpose. The damages of flood are averted, power is generated, and life-giving powers of water are fully utilized to bring into bountiful productivity some of the country's most fertile soil.

Through the cooperation of the Congress, the Appropriations Committee, and particularly the understanding and help of the able chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], great strides have been taken in this cooperative effort with Mexico to utilize and control the waters of the Rio Grande.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to say to my distinguished friend, one of the ablest Members of the House, in connection with the appropriations for the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, particularly in regard to the Falcon Dam, that his great interest and convincing advice to this committee with regard to appropriations therefor has resulted all along in past years in the committee going along 100

percent in such appropriations. I believe I bespeak the thoughts of every member of the committee on both the majority and minority sides when I say that each year when we appropriate for the completion of the Falcon Dam we advance sufficient funds so that the progress of the project is not in the least interfered with; and I say this is due in great part to the interest and the convincing advice of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for those very kind remarks. They are somewhat embarrassing, but I enjoy them.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It is not clear to me from the record and the bill itself, and perhaps the gentleman can clear it up, or the chairman of the subcommittee—Am I correct that this provision for construction on page 9 of the bill is entirely new?

Mr. BENTSEN. No; that is not correct.

Mr. KEATING. The report shows for this item of construction an increase of $12,700,000 over last year.

Mr. BENTSEN. That is because the construction is in full swing now.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, last year it was just getting started.

Mr. BENTSEN. Yes. The original treaty went into force in 1944 between the United States and Mexico, but the preliminary work of drawing plans and the working out of negotiations with Mexico on a division of the cost have taken this much time.

Since the beginning of my tenure in Congress, funds have been appropriated by Congress which has resulted in the beginning of an international dam at Falcon on the Rio Grande. This is a magnificent example of how two democracies can work together to develop the resources of their countries as the costs and construction are shared between Mexico and the United States.

Mexico has shown even more vision than this country in developing this natural resource. The joint efforts are undertaken under the treaty entered into between the United States and Mexico in 1944.

This treaty provides for additional dams needed to fully harness the river. One of such dams is a small flood-control and diversion dam, costing approximately $6,000,000 located at the Anzalduas site. The cost to the United States would be approximately $3,000,000 for its half. In anticipation of the United States completing its part of the bilateral agreement, Mexico has constructed a huge multi-million-dollar gravity canal to the point where the Anzalduas Dam is expected to be constructed. This Mexican canal is scheduled to be completed this month, but as yet the dam which would help control damaging floods and divert the water into the canal for a useful purpose is not built, has not been commenced, nor even had the money appropriated for it by this country.

Mexico is anxious for its early completion, has authorized it, and has the funds set aside for its construction.

Now as to the main reason for my speech, "Why the United States has yet to fulfill its part of the agreement."

It is my understanding that the State Department has held up granting a favorable report on the project to the Appropriations Committee for its consideration on the grounds that the construction of this small international dam would violate the President's policy generally prohibiting new construction that is not for defense projects. I think that generally the President's directive is a wise policy, but as in most over-all directives there are instances in which it is not only not practical but in actuality does not achieve the objective to which it is directed. In instances such as this, judgment and common sense must be used in exercising such directives.

First, this is not a new construction, within the meaning of the President's directive, but is simply a part of the lower Rio Grande flood-control project and has always been in the plans for that project.

At the joint meeting of the International Boundary and Water Commission between the United States and Mexico in 1932 this plan was outlined in detail. As revealed in the engineering report, the original plan of the lower Rio Grande flood-control project contemplated two diversion dams to divide the floods in the Rio Grande about equally between the two countries so as to restrict the flow in the lower reaches of the river. The original plans for this project were approved by both Governments, except that the Government of Mexico withheld approval of the construction and operation of the proposed diversion structures pending an agreement regarding the division of the waters of the river between the two countries. The treaty between the United States and Mexico dated February 3, 1944, resulted in that anticipated agreement.

Without a diversion dam built at Anzalduas, the floods of the Rio Grande will flow on down the river to a highly damaging extent. Heretofore, these floods have resulted primarily in damage to Mexican lands since the levee system on the Mexican side was not as substantial as that on the American side and was inadequate to cope with these floods. Now, however, with increasing developments in Mexico the Mexican levee system has been improved and strengthened so that floods reaching the river channel in the vicinity of Brownsville, Tex., will damage lands and structures on the United States side as well as on the Mexican side.

Both in fairness to Mexico, in order to protect lands in the United States, and in living up to our contractual agreement, it is necessary to provide the agreed effective diversion of the flood waters before they reach the lower reaches of the river. This can be accomplished only by a diversion dam at the Anzalduas site. The plan has been modified to result in a substantial saving over the original plan which called for two such diversion dams. Since this was an agreed project with Mexico many years in advance of the President's directive against construction of new projects, it does not come under the new project classification.

Now as to the practical effects of this directive if it is used to delay the construction of this essential dam. It will be injurious to our good relations to Mexico. They have spent many millions of dollars constructing a gravity canal on their side of the river in anticipation of the dam's construction with joint participation with the United States. Furthermore, it is my understanding in any event, even should the United States fail to live up to its part of the contract, and thereby incur Mexico's ill will, Mexico intends to build the dam without United States participation. This is a right which Mexico has under the treaty.

However, if the United States unreasonably delays the construction of the dam and does not participate in it, it will be designed entirely for Mexican irrigation use and will not be available for the use of the United States as a flood-control dam. Furthermore, should the fertile Rio Grande Valley on the United States side decide to construct a similar gravity canal to that which has been constructed in Mexico, they would be unable to use it for diversion purposes and would be forced to go to great additional unnecessary expense by building another dam whereas the one now contemplated could serve both sides and all purposes.

One of the purposes of the President's directive is assumed to have been to curb inflation. Yet this country, through the Export-Import Bank, has already set up a credit for the use of Mexico in the construction of their part of the dam, and Mexico has indicated that if we fail to live up to our part of the agreement, they will supplement that sum with sufficient money to build the entire dam. Therefore, whether or not we join, as we are obligated to do in the construction of this dam, will have no effect on the additional money being expended, this country financing the project, and the objective of an inflation curb on this project is nullified.

Another important objective of the President's directive was to save on critical materials. Yet, since Mexico intends to build the dam in any event, the materials will be used and therefore once again in practice the directive is not effective on this project. Many of the critical materials will unquestionably come from this country.

In summation, if the State Department continues to refuse to issue a favorable report on the project because of its belief that its construction should be stopped by the President's directive against the construction of new projects not pertaining to the defense effort, then the dam will be built by Mexico regardless. We will have failed to live up to our agreement, no critical materials will be saved, inflation will not be curbed, the United States will finance its construction, and United States tax payers will be denied the benefit of its use.

I have taken this opportunity to address the House to ask their assistance on the project and the assistance of the Appropriations Committee should the

Senate decide to appropriate the necessary funds for its construction or should the State Department decide to exercise common sense and good judgment in applying the President's directive on new projects and issue a favorable report on the project.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in what the gentleman from Texas has said in regard to the international boundary situation in Texas. We have similar problems in Montana in connection with the boundary between our country and Canada.

In our case the agency concerned is the International Joint Commission. It has jurisdiction over all waters that arise on or cross over the boundary between the United States and Canada.

I often feel that these organizations do not receive all of the support and encouragement to which they are entitled. Their work is not done in the limelight of publicity; nor does it concern matters that make headlines. It is, however, one of the most important contributions that is being made by any agency toward the betterment of relationships between the United States and Canada and the development of resources for the mutual benefit of the two nations.

Much credit for the success of the International Joint Commission is due the Honorable A. O. Stanley, who is chairman of the United States section of the Joint Commission, a former distinguished member of the Senate. His colleagues, Mr. Roger B. McWhorter, of the Federal Power Commission, and Mr. Eugene W. Weber, of the Corps of Engineers, are unusually capable men. They are doing a good job of representing our interests.

In the case of references now before the Commission affecting waters of great importance to Montana, I find that our Commissioners are handicapped to some degree by the fact that the Dominion Government and the governments of the Provinces are pushing ahead with considerable speed on vast new projects to make beneficial use of water resources. Our own program because of the war effort has been so curtailed that we are not able to match the Canadian progress. There is considerable danger that we will find that our delay is costing us the use of some of the waters to which we are entitled. This situation complicates the work of Senator Stanley and his colleagues, but I am able to report that they have conducted the negotiations with great tact and have endeavored to safeguard our interests at all times.

A definite agreement has been made in the Belly-Wharton reference that no new use of the water after the date of the reference will be considered as binding in any way upon the ultimate decision of the Commission. This agreement is good as far as it goes, but the Canadians are far ahead of us in making programs for the beneficial use of the water of these rivers and, if our rights are not further protected, this construction will result in difficulties in the future.

In the case of the Libby project, the Canadians have made unwarranted demands upon us that should be opposed by the American section of the International Joint Commission.

The Commission needs the support of Congress in the effort it is making to protect our rights in these international problems, and I am sure that support will be forthcoming.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman. He is the first gentleman on the minority side to walk down to the well of the House today without a mimeographed speech in his hand.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the very able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] yesterday, in a very eloquent and most informative speech revealed some most enlightening and startling facts and figures on the cost of our American State Department and on its failure to make real progress in the fight against Communist expansion.

The gentleman from Nebraska said yesterday that in 1938 there were approximately 5,000 employees on the payrolls of the State Department. Today, 12 years later, there are almost 29,000 employees in this Department. This is a fivefold expansion in number of employees in a brief 12-year period.

The gentleman from Nebraska pointed out that in 1938 the total cost of operating the State Department was less than $20,000,000. For the coming year, the State Department has asked for appropriations totaling more than $283,000,000. The money asked for operation of the State Department during the coming year is almost 15 times as was required by that Department 12 years ago.

Furthermore, between 1939 and 1951, our country has given in gifts and grants to supposed and potential allies in Europe and Asia more than $101,000,000,000 of American taxpayers' dollars. This is equivalent to $700 each for every man, woman and child in our country and to $2,800 for each average family in the Nation.

Most of this give-away program and all of this huge expansion of payrolls and costs in the State Department was done on the claim that it would restrain the expansion of communism.

We, of the Congress, have the duty of inquiring, Has the State Department done a good job with these scores of billions in restraining the expansion of communism? Let us look at the record.

In 1945 there were 179,000,000 people in the world who were under Communist domination. Today, 6 years later, after vastly expanding the payrolls and the spending of the State Department and after throwing scores of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money all over the world, there are 790,000,000 people who are under the control of Russian communism.

This record must force any thoughtful citizen to the inevitable conclusion that our State Department, as now constituted and as it has been constituted during recent years, has made a complete and utter failure of curbing the spread of communism. It has talked much but accomplished little. The more Congress has given to the State Department to spend and the more it has spent, the faster communism has spread and the stronger communism has grown. Surely such a record reveals the record of the State Department as one of complete failure.

Because of this record of State Department failure in the mission to restrain the expansion of communism, the Congress should employ every means at its disposal to express to the President and the country its lack of confidence in the present State Department leadership. Because of the State Department's continued and repeated failures to curb the spread of communism, the Congress should, by its action on this bill, express to the President that the State Department should be reorganized in the hope that under more able and more realistic leaders we can accomplish what the present State Department leaders have failed to do.

There will be amendments offered to this bill which will be designed to express the disapproval of Congress to present State Department leadership. I shall vote for such an amendment because I am convinced that only by a reorganization and thorough house cleaning of the State Department can we adequately protect the security of the American people.

In a critical time such as that in which we now live we must have the best State Department that can be obtained. We cannot afford to trust the security of our people to a foreign affairs leadership which has piled failure upon failure.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for the able gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. MACK], who just spoke. He is a fine Representative and he is my very warm friend. But, I am quite surprised that we would charge the State Department with the responsibility of the existence of 700,000,000 Communist sympathizers in the world today. I do not know what the Republican Party and the Republican Members in Congress expect of the State Department but apparently they expect the State Department to force the thinking of this country on the people all over the world. Well, my friends, I think we have to take stock at home and find out in which direction we are trying to go. We have no right to say to the people of the world that our philosophy is the correct philosophy, but we do have a responsibility to expose them to it, and that is what we are trying to do through the State Department and through our information service.

I would be the last one to say that we must compel people to accept our doctrine. We do not believe in that. We do not compel people in our own country to accept it. You are not compelled to accept it, and to charge our Government with responsibility for the growth of communism is absurd. My friend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] knows better. But I am glad that he did come down and express his views right out of his heart, rather than from one of these prepared documents.

Seeing Members come to the floor of the House today with speeches that someone has put into their hands, saying, "You go down in the well and say this whether you think it or not. This is what we up in the National Republican Committee headquarters believe, but you say it for us," reminds me somewhat of the Shakespearean play, when Othello threw a big party at his house, and everybody got drunk, and Othello got a little too much to drink. In the kitchen his father remonstrated with him, and Othello seized a butcher knife and killed him. Everybody got excited and fled. There was Othello with his father dead on the floor. He looked at the knife dripping with blood and thinking that he had done in his drunkenness said something like this, "O God, that men should put an enemy in their mouths, to steal away their brains that we should, with pleasance, revel, and applause, transform ourselves into beasts."

These good friends of ours over here are simply letting the Republican headquarters downtown steal away their thinking on this proposition. You get these fellows off one by one and talk to them, and they will not admit that they think the Voice of America ought to be destroyed. They say we need an information service. But by their actions in the House they would kill it.

Let me tell you what you do. You do one of two things, and I say this to my friends on the right side of the aisle as well. You either grant this appropriation for the information service of $85,000,000 to operate a normal program or, if you do not believe in that, do not offer an amendment to cut it $5,000,000 or $10,000,000, offer an amendment absolutely to wipe it out. You must make that choice. You have the right to do that. I think that is what you had better do. You must make up your mind whether you are going to have an information service in this country or whether you are not going to have it. If you are not willing to pay the price, just destroy it. The country will suffer. The world will suffer as a result of it. But this organized effort to sandbag the information service does not reflect credit on your party or the members of the party in Congress who are trying to kill it.

Our generation has a grave responsibility. We as Members of Congress have a grave responsibility. We have chosen this as a medium for our generation to carry the principles in which we so firmly believe throughout the world. If it fails, it is money well spent. We tried.

I want to caution you about one thing when you try to evaluate this program. When you say it has not done anything, you know you cannot measure the good this program does. You know you cannot go behind the iron curtain to find out how effective it is. You know that to begin with. Yet you say repeatedly here today that it has failed. The net result shows a favorable balance in favor of what we have tried to accomplish.

You will acknowledge that there is not a serious threat in this country to our falling under the domination of communism. You must further admit that Western Europe remains free today as a result of the dollars we have spent and the program we have carried to them, the program of rehabilitation. Yes, it has cost, true enough, but they are free today. England is free, our main bulwark. It is up to us to continue a program that will guarantee that Western Europe shall remain free.

We have not spent much money in Asia. The majority of the money we have spent has gone into Western Europe. I think any fair-minded person will admit, when you consider the fact that production in every Western European country today is higher than at any time prior to World War II, and that their economic life is much higher, that it has paid off. I was there recently. I saw full employment and prosperity. I saw France in a condition that it has not been in in many years. She is one of our principal allies. England has gotten into the condition, as a result of our help, that she voluntarily said, "We shall not ask you for further economic assistance." This has all come about in the brief span of 7 years, since World War II ended. Those are the things that count. There is your tangible proof of what we are doing with our money. It is there and it is indisputable. It cannot be denied. We have accomplished things with it.

At the same time we are doing that we are building a great wall outside of this country which will guarantee to us that the foot of the aggressor shall never be placed on the shores of our Nation, and that our wives and children shall be protected and our homes will not be destroyed as those in Western Europe have been, time and time again.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I wonder just how thoroughly the Republican National Committee has investigated the background of the public relations men who have written all these canned speeches. It is evidently an organized attempt to discredit the American State Department. My personal opinion is that it plays right into the hands of the Russian Government.

Mr. PRESTON. Of course it does. And this absurd amendment which the gentleman from California is going to propose will be the finest propaganda that Russia could seize upon. If this amendment should be adopted, an amendment which the Supreme Court has already held is absolutely illegal, it will put this Congress in the position of repudiating the Government of the United States in all of its foreign activities. It will completely repudiate our foreign policy, including our entry into Korea.

What do you think our allies in Western Europe are going to say to that, and the small countries in Asia the four countries that recently joined the specialized agencies of the United Nations—countries that have just come into existence. Why, they will say this is a poor nation to follow—a country that will repudiate its foreign policy completely. If this amendment is adopted it means the Congress will repudiate our Government all over the world. That is exactly what this amendment that the gentleman from California plans to offer will do.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], is utterly in error when he states that 790,000,000 people who are under the domination of the Kremlin are Communists. The world knows that millions of these people are not Communists, and someday they will rise against the Kremlin.

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, they are a suppressed people.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Georgia just said about the proposed amendment that seeks to "get Acheson" but cutting out his salary. For the record, let me say that I do not carry any brief for the Secretary of State. Fact is, I have never been an admirer of Secretary Acheson at all. However, in this particular instance I do not propose to allow my personal feelings to sway my sense of fairness. Now I would not say that the amendment that is to be offered cutting out his salary is a cowardly approach—I had rather be charitable and say it just is not the honorable or proper way to go about it.

A lot of my colleagues here often good-naturedly kid me about Kentucky feuds. Well, there is one thing about us Kentuckians—if we should have our differences—and tempers should flare—and in the heat and passion that might result—firearms should come into play—thank God, the shooting is always done face to face and not from behind the back. We Kentuckians, yes all Americans, love good sportsmanship and fair play. So if we want to fire at Acheson, let us do it honorably and fairly, but above all, let us do it to his face. Aim at him between the eyes, if you must, but for heaven's sake, let us not be guilty in the House of Representatives of the United States of ambushing the man from the rear. It just is not American. We do not do things that way. For this reason, I shall not support any amendment designed to cut out his salary or to get him by any other means by circumvention, camouflage, or subterfuge.

Mr. PRESTON. A person's sense of fairness would not permit him to do that.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, tomorrow and Thursday will be important days in the history of this country. Our action will have a far-reaching effect, and if you people on this side of the aisle, and some misguided individuals on our side do not take stock of what you are about to do, you are going to do things which will cause irreparable harm—harm that we cannot recover from.

As I said not too long ago to one Member who was speaking, "When you people attack the Voice of America, it is like a young lawyer who is just out of law school and trying a case for the first time, and expecting him to go into court and be a Clarence Darrow." We are new at this business of operating an international propaganda machine and we are going through the trial-and-error stage. We are likely to make mistakes, but we should give them time to develop some degree of perfection. Russia is an old hand at this business of propaganda. She is a past master. She knows the game and has no ethics. It is effective and she gets the results. That is where you get your seven hundred million sympathizers. It is not because of the conduct of America. No country in the history of the world or the history of civilization that has existed for 10,000 years has ever performed the fine acts of charity and altruism that this United States Government has performed in the last 7 years. It will pay off in the long run.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, what an utterly naive people we are. We are dealing in the United Nations with nations of nationalists, with isolationists, if you please. We are the only internationalist country in the world. Our fellow nations in the unholy United Nations are "gimme" nations. We are just the poor, foolish givers.

Our officials in the Voice of America talk with a feeble, fuzzy language, making a great to-do in the mouthing of mere platitudes, half-truths, or, as we have learned this afternoon, statements by our official speakers that America stands for a world government, that this idea is growing by leaps and bounds in America, or other still worse heresies, bordering upon out and out communism. Cannot you conceive the huge belly-laughs with which these piffling programs are received in the he-man countries behind the iron curtain? For at the very worst the supposed recipients of these programs are not half men.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the voice of America. I want to hear the voice of America. I expect to vote for it. But the voice of America I shall listen for will be heard in the thunder of the machines stamping out airplanes. It is going to be heard in the sizzling crash of the white-hot furnaces turning out big guns. It is going to be heard in the measured cadence of marching feet, of our wonderful army of home boys, marching under the Star-Spangled Banner, not any mongrel spider banner of a foreign- and traitor-born ideology, marching only in the defense of our homeland, this beautiful America of ours.

That is the kind of a Voice of America Stalin understands. It needs no interpreter, nor treasonable wolves in sheep's clothing to put it out over the radio, or through a bought and subsidized press.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that when I have concluded what I have to say, no one will be brash enough to rise to the floor of this House and say that someone put words in my mouth. I do not do business that way. What I write and what I have to say I do on my own responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, heavily burdened taxpayers have every right to doubt that they are getting their money's worth out of one of the most expensive subdivisions of the State Department. I refer to the Voice of America.

For that reason, I will read to the House from an article written by John Crosby, columnist for the New York Herald Tribune and other newspapers, and widely recognized as an expert on radio. This year he went to Paris and sent back a report on the Voice of America, writing as follows on May 24, 1951:

As for the Voice of America—

Said Crosby—

it is, according to all evidence, not heard in Paris. That does not mean it is not broadcast in Paris. It is broadcast here (in Paris), but, as I say, not heard. An acquaintance of mine expressed it aptly: "You can always tell when the Voice of America is on the air by leaning out the windows. You'll hear the click of radios being turned off all over Paris."

There you have an on-the-scenes report by columnist John Crosby, a recognized expert on radio and reportedly widely read and followed by the so-called intellectual circles in New York, most of whom look with high favor on the State Department and everything it does.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. When I have finished.

Mr. ROONEY. I am addressing the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to the gentleman when I have finished if I have the time or if the gentleman will yield me additional time. The gentleman from New York knows that I have only 4 minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want for a moment to turn to the speech made yesterday on the floor of the House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Yesterday the gentleman gave us a long dissertation on how the Republicans have gone on a hunting expedition with Dean Acheson as their target. Mr. ROONEY says the Republicans started with a blunderbuss and are now using a sharpshooter's rifle. If the gentleman from New York is the hunting expert that he infers he is he should know that the Republicans are making progress.

Out in the Midwest it is the mark of an excellent hunter—a mark of real progress in the handling of guns—when he can shift from a scattergun to a rifle and still hit a dodging, shifty target—such as Dean Acheson.

In his discourse of yesterday, the gentleman from New York said this:

First of all, a hunter obeys the laws. The supreme law of the land specifically says you cannot hunt and shoot an Acheson—or any other similar game—with such a sharpshooting rifle as the hunter has now taken into his hands. He has no license for such hunting.

I assume that when the gentleman speaks of the supreme law of the land he is referring to the Constitution of the United States. I am not aware of anything in the Constitution that sets up a prohibition or in any way compels the taking out of a license by any citizen to freely citicize and compel proper performance on the part of any public official. On the contrary, the Constitution is explicit in its provision for free speech and free press. Nor is there anything in the Constitution that prohibits the offering of an amendment to any bill to come before Congress. Of course, we are all aware that during the past 20 years, and particularly the last 6 years, there has been a growing disregard for the plain provisions of the Constitution.

But getting back to the so-called hunting expedition, the gentleman from New York, being the expert hunter that he is, should know that something more than a license and a gun is required.

The hunter must know whether the season is open or closed on the game which he seeks. The game in this case is a public official and the gentleman well knows that never in the history of this country has there been a closed season on public officials, including Members of Congress, and certainly there is not and should not be a closed season on the present Secretary of State.

Dean Acheson is one of the reasons why the American people are bewildered and confused. They cannot understand why a Cabinet officer, as thoroughly discredited as Acheson, was not long ago removed from office.

The responsibility rests with President Truman and his failure to act has left Congress with no other alternative than to use the medium afforded by this legislation to compel action that is in the interest of and for the welfare of the United States of America.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, we have but one more speaker. I wish the gentleman would use his time now.

Mr. STEFAN. How much time does the gentleman from New York have, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who hope that we can have a good Voice of America. I know that we do have one, whether we want it or not. That voice is speaking; it is speaking right in this House, Mr. Chairman.

This bill has been under consideration for several months; it has been deliberately delayed from being presented upon this floor for several months. On our side of the aisle questions have been asked in general debate, Mr. Chairman, presumably to be answered by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. Those of us who wanted to understand this subject stayed here on the floor waiting for the answers. But the gentleman from New York is speechless. Yes; he has prepared this subject much as he might have prepared a rape case in Brooklyn, using that kind of snotty remarks that might be attractive to a jury. No answer has been made to the allegations on this side of the aisle in general debate. We are now at the end of it or approaching the end of it.

The questions raised by the people of this country are not replied to because the gentleman is speechless. There is no answer.

I thank God there is a Republican Party. If that party was not opposed to the Secretary of State and the State Department, unanimously opposed, presenting questions to be answered by the gentleman from New York in his time, I certainly would leave the Republican Party, a party that I joined in 1935 after the "gimme" state started because I knew it should be opposed.

Yes, the voice of America is speaking. It is speaking. Delayed hearings—taking up important legislation when nobody is here—do not debate the subject, make a few wisecracks which part of the fourth estate, kept by this administration, can use in their part of the free press to take half truths and misstatements to a free people. The voice of America is saying these things through the chairman of this subcommittee.

Yes, the voice of America is speaking. The voice of America is writing, if you please. It is writing a great new opera. The gentlemen in this House who think that this Government has not stimulated communism are entirely wrong—they are entirely wrong—because when that opera is finally written there will be a high chorus chanting, "Gimme, gimme, gimme" and as minority pressure groups, political bribery programs, march over the stage they will chant in a low chorus, "Gimme mine, gimme mine, gimme mine."

Yes, the voice of America is speaking. We have a deceptive one that costs us $100,000,000 a year, telling the people of Europe who know Stalin does not want war, that we are going to fight. It is this Voice of America, the salaried Voice of America, that tells Stalin he better fight today.

Mr. Chairman, the Voice of America should be telling Europe that if they want what we have they had better look to their governments. They had better define the powers of government. They had better retain to individuals certain inalienable rights that even a "gimme" program by a power-seeking executive cannot take away from them, even if he packs the courts. That is what the Voice of America had better tell Europe, because that is America.

Then we had better tell Europe that we are doing things that they had better not do. That we in this legislative body have resolved that we are going to define the difference between coveting your neighbor's goods as an individual and doing it collectively by groups called unions or political parties.

Mr. Chairman, one of the basic requirements for a good information service is agility. I mean the information service must be able to think faster and act faster than its opposition. If the United States Information Service is to be worth the millions it is costing, it must be able to beat the Reds to the punch when it comes to landing propaganda blows. In these days of instantaneous communication, world-wide opinion may be formed in a matter of hours, even on the most important subjects. Speed and decision should be the watchwords of our information program.

I am sorry that the Voice of America and related activities, as operated by Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett, are about as agile as a rheumatic rhinoceros. Red tape, lethargy, and inertia are the order of the day. Sometimes it seems that Mr. Barrett's staff is so preoccupied with writing lengthy interoffice memos and with fussing over trivial housekeeping details that they have little time left for anti-Communist propaganda.

For instance, an article in Pathfinder magazine of May 16, 1951, cited the following typical example of how the Voice operates:

> An expert proposes a new program for the Campaign of Truth. The idea goes to Charles M. Hulten, general manager of the Voice. Hulten relays the idea to Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Barrett sends it to James E. Webb, Under Secretary of State. Webb sends it to a committee. The committee sends it to Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson. Then, if the idea is approved, it follows the same route back. Frequently, by the time it reaches the desk of the man who is to execute it, it is so out of date as to be completely useless.

Another instance of bureaucratic slowness is the fiasco of the proposed building purchase in New York. Last August State Department officials appeared before the House Appropriations Committee with an urgent request for funds to buy a building in New York. They testified that such a building was sorely needed in order to consolidate their scattered operations, and they promised they could move within a month or two after the building had been acquired. The State Department witnesses emphasized that the Voice operation was being badly handicapped through lack of proper facilities.

The committee accordingly appropriated $3,000,000 to meet the emergency. Yet today, almost 1 year later, no building has been acquired. No wonder the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] called this building situation a "confounded ridiculous comedy of errors, or amalgamation of stupidity and negligence and dereliction of duty."

If the present Voice of America cannot unwind its own red tape with $3,000,000 in hand and over a year in which to find a place to hang its hat, how can it match wits with Reds in a score of countries around the world?

Still another shocking example of Voice of America fumble-bumbling is found in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee. This one concerns purchase of radio receivers to be given away free to potential—and I use the word "potential" advisedly—Voice listeners in foreign countries. In July 1950 Voice officials told an Appropriations subcommittee that this was an emergency project, and they assured the subcommittee that the receivers could be delivered in about 3 months at the rate of 20,000 a month. The sets were to cost $15 each, and $2,694,000 was made available, or enough to buy 179,600 sets.

But at the time appropriations hearings were held early this year, the only progress on this so-called emergency project was a trial order for 2,750 sets that had been placed on December 6, 1950, by which time the price had risen to $35 a set.

A committee investigator attributed the delay to administrative dawdling. He continued:

> The files disclose that there was considerable shifting of responsibility for the project. Responsibility for various phases thereof was parceled out to several individuals, and there was no one individual held directly accountable for insuring that whatever obstacles existed were expeditiously handled so that invitation to bid could be promptly issued.

And that is how the State Department is waging psychological warfare.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] commented as follows regarding the increase in price to about $35:

> My constituents would think I was becoming senile if I were to go for $35 a set.

I will cite just one more example. In the 1950 supplemental appropriation, there was included an item of $10,475,000 for construction of six new broadcasting stations so that the Voice could pierce the iron curtain. This project, like many others, was represented to be an emergency. Yet when Charles M. Hulten, general manager of the State Department's information and education activities, was testifying on March 8, 1951, he admitted that not a single one of these stations has been completed. In fact, the slowdown was so bad that the National Security Council had to step in during December 1950 and tell the State Department to hurry up and get the stations built.

No one is more eager than I for an effective Voice of America, but the instances I have described make clear that the Voice as now managed and operated has a mouth full of red tape and barely reaches beyond the confines of Foggy Bottom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from California in his remarks—just now made—and I was not listening intently at the moment because I was conferring here at the committee table—stated something about my defending a rape case in Brooklyn. Let me assure the gentleman and this House that I have never defended a rape case in Brooklyn or anywhere else, but I have prosecuted many rape cases in Brooklyn and I will prosecute vigorously insofar as I am able any case wherein the rape is against the integrity of the United States of America.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] to close the debate on our side.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, the Voice of America will always be what the people of America and particularly the State Department makes it. You cannot have an effective Voice of America unless you have an effective State Department with effective, honorable, and most of all, consistent policies.

Let me ask you in all sincerity this question: What can the Voice of America say, for instance to the people behind the iron curtain, when we have a State Department that endorses the risk of 150,000 war casualties in Korea, and at the same time the same State Department refuses to take any action and pays ransom, in fact, to the Communist Government that they have in Hungary in order to get a man like Vogeler free? What can the Voice of America say to the freedom-loving people of the world when we have an inconsistent policy, where we are willing to risk more than 150,000 war casualties in Korea and yet countries behind the iron curtain incarcerate American citizens, imprison them, and there is no protest whatever and no effective action taken by the Department of State? Any voice coming from the State Department or any voice coming as regards the defense of the United States of America in regard to that inconsistent policy would have no effect throughout the world whatever. What is it that the Voice of America can say, for instance, to the people behind the iron curtain in Poland? What is it that the Voice of America can say about that government that they have in Poland? Was it not the Government of the United States at Yalta that helped establish that government? Was it not the Government of the United States that helped formulate the government that they now have in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, part of Austria, and Hungary? How we must look to the eyes of the world when we at Yalta met in conference with two other men who set themselves up above God and set up a government which brought communism to them. Is the Voice of America now to say: "Do not believe that government that we set up for you. Overthrow that government that we set up for you."

I feel sorry for Mr. Barrett. It is the last job I want to have as head of the Voice of America, to keep up with the gyrations and the inconsistencies of the present Department of State. One would have to be more than a genius in order to organize and manipulate an effective Voice of America.

For instance, how can the Voice of America justify three different positions that we had in the last 5 years in Korea? How could the Voice of America sell any one of those three policies to the world? How can the Voice of America justify to the world the three different policies that we have had in the last 5 years regarding Korea? How can the Voice of America, for instance, justify, just a few months ago, where the Department of State was saying that Franco was a dictator; we do not want to do business with Spain, and now we do business with them? Now, what kind of a Voice of America would we have if it attempted to keep up with gyrations from one day to the next of our State Department?

I feel sorry for Mr. Barrett. He has an impossible task to perform. You cannot have an effective Voice of America until you have an effective and honorable Department of State that stands for one thing throughout the world, and only one thing. How can the Voice of America, for instance, justify our State Department's attitude of the last 5 years regarding Yugoslavia? First we were on the side of Mikhailovitch and then on Tito's side, then Tito murdered five Americans in cold blood and we were against Tito. And now we are handing out millions of dollars to Tito. A man would have to be a pretty smart circus performer to keep up with the State Department and the Voice of America and justify those policies throughout the world. It is an impossible task for the Voice of America to perform, and the Voice of America is admitted by everybody not what it should be; it is not effective, and many contend that the Voice of America today is useless, not because of the operation of Mr. Barrett as a person but because of the inconsistent, ineffectual, and dishonorable policies set up by the State Department which no human being, no matter whether he was a centipede or whether he had 15 different faces, could interpret to the world honorably and justly. It is humanly impossible for any voice to interpret what the State Department stands for throughout the world today. There can be no real Voice of America until there is a heart and brain for America. A voice can be only as strong as its heart and brain. A voice cannot be one thing and the heart and brain of a nation another thing. Our task is to formulate a real heart and brain for America. The Voice of America we can all be proud of will naturally follow. That is the task before us. To accomplish less will be a miserable failure, and the Voice of America soon will not even be a peep.

We criticize America's voice. How unfair. How can America have any voice when our State Department permits its visas to become mere scraps of paper? How can our Nation's voice urge others to resist when we have a State Department that has no guts itself to resist? We have no voice because we have no heart, guts, or brains in our State Department. That is why we are losing and Russia is winning.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers on this side, but before concluding the debate on this side of the aisle I want to take this opportunity of thanking the chairman of the committee for his courtesy during this debate.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to close debate.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, closing this debate is a distinction which I do not merit, but one which I will try to fulfill to the best of my ability.

In hearing the debate which has taken place we have heard a number of things about the State Department and the Voice of America which I should like to comment on and which I think are important for us to think about. First of all, with regard to the State Department, it has been charged that it has had inconsistent policies. Obviously, as times change there must be change in policies, providing that the fundamental policy of freedom under God and the fundamental principles upon which our country is founded are carried out. Naturally, each circumstance must be met with the particular weapons which may be available at that time.

It avails very little for us to say, "In Korea we waste thousands of lives because of a particular policy and then in another place we may offer some sort of a reward for the return of a particular individual," without offering some solution ourselves as to what we would like to see done. What would those who criticize have done in Korea?

If I remember correctly, there has not been a thing that the President has done that has met with more popular acclaim, when he did it, than his declaring that we would go into Korea. That certainly was a popular thing when he made that decision. Where were they, then, when that decision was made?

As far as the release of Vogeler and people of that kind by the payment of some sort of recompense is concerned, we are all sorry that the payment had to take place. But they did not have to shed American blood to get him back. If he could be gotten back in a simpler way, without embroiling people in armed conflicts throughout the world, that ought to be done. So I think they ought to be careful in the things they hurl at the head of our Government today. It is a time when he needs assistance, not disunity.

With regard to the removal of the Secretary of State, I am sorry people have taken the position that it would be a good idea to cut off funds to achieve his removal, because I do not think that is a constitutional method. The forthright method is to bring impeachment proceedings against him. That is the way in which Congress can do it openly and forthrightly. The President has the authority and responsibility to employ the Secretary of State. The constitutional authority of the Congress is impliedly

limited to impeachment. Cutting off salary funds in this bill would not accomplish the stated purpose of eliminating the present Secretary of State because there are ample emergency funds with which the President could continue the salary. Removal of the Secretary by such a backhanded method, if it could be done, which it cannot, would give comfort to our enemies by making possible an impression that there is dangerous disunity in our country. In certain ways we are not unified. I certainly differ greatly with Secretary Acheson, probably at least as much as anyone in this Congress, but I believe in upholding constitutional government and I believe that the drastic action proposed would do our own country far more harm than can be readily visualized. Whatever disunities may exist among us, there is certainly no disunity so basic as must be implied in a movement of that sort.

In the battle for men's minds and hearts the democracies have one most potent ally—the spiritual nature of man. It is this thing I want to talk about chiefly in concluding my remarks.

The Communists know this. They have used and are now using every weapon at their command to convince the masses behind the iron curtain that spiritual values are unimportant.

Radio Moscow on June 11, 1948, declared, "There is no place or job for God in the universe."

Such is the Communist philosophy. It has been so from the beginning. Back in 1903 Lenin said, "We must know how to combat religion." I do not need to go into details as to what the Communists have done to combat religion, to try to prove to their people that there is no place in their universe for God, but I am willing to wager that their campaign has not been successful. There must be hundreds of millions, certainly millions, of people behind the iron curtain who know that such a philosophy is false and destructive of human welfare. There are many there who hunger for religious freedom and for the opportunity to worship God and live under and by spiritual principles.

Potentially these millions are powerful allies for the democracies. To reach them we must build a bridge over which our spirits can meet. I believe that the Voice of America is building that bridge. Through its religious broadcasts it is establishing common bonds between these spiritually hungry millions abroad and our own people.

I have made a study of the Voice of America's religious broadcasts and have come to the conclusion that they are doing a good job. It has been explained to me that the policy behind these broadcasts is threefold.

First, to feed these spiritually hungry people through messages from religious leaders and through special services on religious holidays.

Second, to spread the doctrine of freedom of worship.

Third, to emphasize the fundamental challenge of the world today, the issue of spirituality versus materialism.

There are many ways in which they have carried out their efforts. For instance, the Voice has given full news coverage to the persecution of religious leaders in the various satellite countries. For example, the true story of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty has been told not only to the people of Hungary but to the people of the world. Throughout the period of the cardinal's arrest and trial the story was given a major play in all VOA broadcasts. These broadcasts were effective. Minister Chapin cabled the VOA at the time:

> Hungarians were brought to tears by the programs * * * listened on their knees, praying for the cardinal. This is an indication of the accomplishment of our fundamental objective, namely to make them feel they are not alone and abandoned but are still part of a spiritual community with the west.

The fury of the Hungarian Communist regime over the broadcasts was, in itself, a tribute to the programs. Through the controlled press and radio the VOA was bitterly attacked for making a martyr of the cardinal.

The case of the Hungarian Lutheran clergyman, Bishop Ordass, the arrest of 15 Protestant pastors in Bulgaria, the persecution of Archbishop Beran in Czechoslovakia, were given similar treatment.

The Voice does not, of course, confine itself to this type of broadcast. I understand that there are weekly programs, both in English and foreign languages, devoted to religious subjects. The various religious holidays and events of religious importance are given special attention. This spring, VOA invited representatives of the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant faiths to become members of a religious advisory panel which meets regularly with Edward Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, to discuss and arrange programs.

Commenting on these programs an article in Presbyterian Life, April 14, 1951, says:

> The Voice of America has become the champion of religious freedom in the iron-curtain countries.

The joy these programs bring to the listeners is told in stacks of letters received from practically every country penetrated by the Voice. A woman from Berlin, for example, wrote:

> Your Easter program was the best yet. This was an unforgettably festive hour for me and my husband. This full measure of love and kindness brought tears to our eyes. It is a great consolation to know that the American people remember us.

This is the spiritual bridge the VOA is building. In my opinion, it is a bridge we should expand and strengthen to the limit of our resources.

So, in conclusion I think, instead of trying to snipe at the program we have before us, we ought to be doing everything we can by appearing before the committees and coming down here in the well of the House and conferring with the Secretary of State and in every other way doing what we can to strengthen the program, and not destroying it and our country as well. Where the Department needs our assistance, I think we should give it every bit of assistance we can; and we can do it by strengthening the Voice of America and the State Department at the same time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad if the debate were to close upon the high moral note just sounded by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. And I would not take even these few minutes except that something that was said in general debate requires a comment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT] did not have time to conclude his remarks in criticism of Mr. Raymond Swing, but since I know Mr. Swing, I feel impelled to make this statement in his defense. I am sure the Voice of America should not be criticized for employing such a distinguished broadcaster. Mr. Swing's broadcasts during the war were sponsored by the Socony-Vacuum Co. He has received recognition in such periodicals as Reader's Digest, and the Saturday Evening Post, and as an acknowledgement of his great service to our country, honorary degrees from Harvard University, Oberlin, Lafayette, Williams, Muhlenberg, Olivet, and other colleges. These institutions certainly would not honor one whose loyalty could be questioned.

Whether one agreed with Mr. Swing or not with reference to his hopes for disarmament, one must recognize that he has vigorously opposed any disarmament by our country until the dangers that are here have vanished.

The article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlain, I believe, which criticizes Mr. Swing, was based upon an article which Mr. Swing wrote in 1945. It was based upon the possibility of a general disarmament. And since that time, of course, it is apparent that Russia is determined to continue a policy of aggression. There is no question in my mind about Mr. Swing's loyalty and his patriotism nor the soundness of his view that disarmament cannot take place as long as Russia's present policies prevail. He has repeatedly made clear his conviction that the United States must not disarm under these conditions.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6 on page 1.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST) having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, 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. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF DETROIT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebration of

the founding of Detroit. In observation of that event, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Miracle in Michigan" which appeared in the February issue of Town and Country magazine. It is written by one of the country's ablest writers, Mr. John C. Manning, editor of the Detroit Times.

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

There was no objection.

ONE WORLD—ONE FLAG

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that a great majority of the American people were astonished this morning when one of the local papers carried the news that General Eisenhower is advocating one army in Europe under his command, with one flag and one kind of uniform for all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization troops. I am wondering by what authority General Eisenhower assumes unto himself the right to make any such recommendation. Has it the approval of the President of the United States?

Here again we see a rather subtle effort being made toward one world, one government, all over again.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that if the press report is true, and is not denied by General Eisenhower, he has definitely taken himself out as a Presidential candidate.

Mr. Speaker, the American soldier fights for one flag only, and that is the Stars and Stripes of the United States of America. The recommendations by General Eisenhower, if true, is a disservice to our great country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an editorial from the Dallas Times-Herald.

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. GOSSETT.

Mr. HALE and to include an article on the Defense of the Dollar.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho and to include an article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include an article by David Lawrence mourning the death of Admiral Sherman.

Mr. DONDERO.

Mr. BURDICK and to include a table on the falling of farm prices.

Mr. GOLDEN and to include an article.

Mr. BEAMER and to include a news letter.

Mr. JENISON.

Mr. LARCADE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TABER to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include three letters from the State Department, and a memorandum and certain newspaper clippings.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a letter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include tables.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. STEFAN) and to include a letter.

Mr. PHILLIPS (at the request of Mr. STEFAN).

Mr. SCUDDER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include a newspaper article.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend the various remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOSONE.

Mr. GRANGER and to include a broadcast by Charles Collingwood.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

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

S. 76. An act for the relief of Herbert H. Heller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 83. An act for the relief of First Lt. James E. Wilcox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 100. An act to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 121. An act for the relief of Tryntje Bierema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 269. An act for the relief of Nicholas Papaeconomou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 302. An act to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 426. An act for the relief of Teruko Okuaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 462. An act for the relief of Rosita Anita Navarro and Ramona Alicia Navarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 509. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; U. S. C. 718d), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 537. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 810. An act for the relief of Howard I. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 880. An act for the relief of Ann Lamplugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 950. An act to amend the act authorizing the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of such tribes under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1028. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lou Wong Shong Ngon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1133. An act for the relief of Sophie Strauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1146. An act to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1166. An act to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Davis Min Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1349. An act to establish a Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1365. An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1390. An act to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1403. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property at Shumaker, Arkansas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1474. An act for the relief of E. C. Browder and Charles Keylon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1562. An act for the relief of Harvey Marden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1704. An act to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 25, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

630. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of Displaced Persons, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

631. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

632. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the

act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

633. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Horatio Nelson Verchilds, file No. [redacted] CR 31090, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

634. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, approved July 1, 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

635. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

636. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a reconnaissance report on the potential development of water resources in the Territory of Alaska, pursuant to a provision of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 197); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

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. CANNON: Committee of conference. 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 (Rept. No. 753). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2821. A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4924. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the transfer to the Administrator of General Services of functions relating to the acquisition and assignment of passenger-carrying motor vehicles and to the control of office furniture and equipment; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 4925. A bill to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 4926. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to make husbands eligible for survivor benefits under sections 5 and 6, regardless of the status of dependency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4927. A bill to remove all restrictions on the use of certain land which was conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky., by the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4928. A bill to provide that the interest of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Res. 352. Resolution favoring certain action against the Government of Czechoslovakia unless Associated Press reporter William N. Oatis is released from custody; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4929. A bill for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4930. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Craft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4931. A bill for the relief of Lewyt Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4932. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and wife, Tecla Voltin, and daughters, Mrs. Paula J. Voltin Sansom, and Miss Jacqueline Voltin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4933. A bill for the relief of L. F. Osterberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn H. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4935. A bill for the relief of Miss Carol King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4936. A bill for the relief of Dr. R. L. Jacobs and wife, Claudia Jacobs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4937. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie T. Haile and Mrs. Evelyn Peyton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4938. A bill for the relief of John George Nicholaros alias John Nickols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4939. A bill for the relief of Pasquale (Charles) Bommarito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4940. A bill for the relief of Suzie Ballard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4941. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Dos Santos Grilo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4942. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Wilhelmus Nieuwhof; 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:

359. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Daughters of America of the State of Michigan adopted at the twenty-third State convention, calling upon Congress and the President of the United States to outlaw the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

360. Also, resolution of the Daughters of America of the State of Michigan adopted at the twenty-third State convention, urging the revision of immigration and naturalization laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 25, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, July 24, 1951)

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

Rev. John C. Millian, D. D., district superintendent, Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Holy and eternal God, who dost grant us as limited beings vision and power, Thou who art powerful but kind, all-demanding but forgiving, most righteous but redeeming, hear us this morning as we bow in humble submission to Thy divine will.

Open our eyes and minds to sense the spiritual power by which we are encompassed. May this awareness of the presence of a power greater than our own make us stronger to meet the appalling needs facing us, more courageous in pursuit of truth, more unselfish in our efforts to secure freedom for all mankind, and more Christ-like in our desire for moral integrity and social justice.

Help us to be true to the trust placed in us that together we may build Thy kingdom on the earth. This we ask in Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 24, 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 clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 367) for the relief of Kay Adel Snedeker.

The message returned to the Senate in compliance with its request the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1146. An act to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; and

S. 1166. An act to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto.

The message also anounced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

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

S. 260. An act to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia;

S. 261. An act to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the govern-