

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 6826. A bill for the relief of the Lake States Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6827. A bill for the relief of Edith Mathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6828. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Scavone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 6829. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fazio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 6830. A bill for the relief of Martha Farah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 6831. A bill for the relief of Francisco Albino-Martinha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6832. A bill for the relief of Irving Polonoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 6833. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nike Varga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6834. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6835. A bill for the relief of Nicholas M. Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6836. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mary Youn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

597. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Arthur L. Bliss, Washington, D. C., relative to a grievance involving illegal eviction, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, who art filled with compassion and tender mercy toward us, we thank Thee that each day is a new beginning. In its possibilities we revel, for its potential blessings we see the benefits of Thy hand. Throughout its hours may we think with diligence and act with dispatch that, whatever may come of bane or blessing, we may be qualified in spirit to meet it as men and triumph through it or over it as we serve our fellow men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 27, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 382) to provide for setting aside an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WILLIAMS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. KEM, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. KILGORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, yesterday evening when I made the motion to recess I offered to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] for 5 minutes, or a reasonable time. He evidently did not hear the "reasonable time." My reason for not yielding the floor at that time was that three Senators who were present were under the care of physicians. I knew that the motion to take a recess would be resisted, and that a vote would be necessary. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Missouri shall have the floor. I think he is entitled to the floor to make his speech. I wish to be fair at all times with Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Before the Senator from Missouri speaks, if he does not object, I should like to ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business, without debate.

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

PROPOSED GARRISON RESERVOIR ROAD RELOCATION—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WILLIAMS COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Williams County, Williston, N. Dak., favoring in principle the proposed Garrison Reservoir road-relocation plan.

I call attention to the fact that if the dam is left at the high level, it will mean that the city of Williston will have to be diked in order to keep it from being flooded.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has proposed a program of relocation of roads in the areas of Williams County to be affected by the operation of the reservoir of the Garrison Dam; and

Whereas a substantial portion of such program will be required by a maximum normal operating pool level of 1,830 feet above sea level; and

Whereas the proposed relocation program will be implemented by the Federal Government substantially without any cost whatever to Williams County, and such program is compatible with a maximum normal operating pool level of 1,830 feet above sea level; and

Whereas we have heretofore, on several occasions, expressed our steadfast opposition to the operation of the maximum normal pool level of such reservoir at an elevation higher than 1,830 feet above sea level; and

Whereas we stand firm in our conviction that a higher maximum normal pool level of such reservoir is wholly unnecessary and is detrimental to the interests of this area and should be vigorously opposed; and

Whereas we believe the proposed road-relocation program will materially improve the system of county highways in Williams County and thereby reduce road-building expense to Williams County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Williams County, N. Dak., That we do hereby approve in principle the Proposed Garrison Reservoir road-relocation plan submitted by the Corps of Engineers, but without obligation on the part of Williams County to contribute financially to the construction phases thereof, and without withdrawing our firm and unaltered opposition to the operation of the maximum normal pool level of such reservoir in excess of 1,830 feet above sea level; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of North Dakota and to the district office of the Corps of Engineers.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2760. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son; and

S. 2761. A bill for the relief of Norma J. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2762. A bill for the relief of Pedro Glocochea Bengoechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2763. A bill for the relief of Harry Ray Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2764. A bill for the relief of Ellenor Carola Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPENSATION FOR OVERTIME AND HOLIDAY EMPLOYMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 354) to amend Public Law 106, Seventy-ninth Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime and holiday employment; which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 382) to provide for setting aside an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. CAIN:

Address delivered by him before the Industrial Conference Board, Tacoma, Wash., on February 25, 1952.

By Mr. THYE:

Letter addressed to him by the general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association with respect to the importation of certain agricultural commodities.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Copy of letter written by Harold F. Hohly, rector of Christ Church, Bronx, N. Y., to Daniel E. Woodhull, Jr., on the subject of Americanism.

By Mr. WILEY:

Resolution of the Association of Wisconsin County Highway Commissioners relating to the use of structural steel in highway construction.

Booklet by E. J. Reid entitled "Why We Should Vote in All Elections."

PREVENTION OF ILLEGAL ENTRANCE OF ALIENS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, which were, on page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out "of the United States", and on page 3, line 15, strike out "issue his warrant" and insert "obtain a warrant under oath from any court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate later today.

Subsequently, the President pro tempore appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRICES OF EGGS AND FEED

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for some time I have been reading letters into the RECORD showing that the farmers in the Northwest are not getting adequate prices for their eggs. I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture to find out why the farmers were not getting at least parity for their eggs. I have received the following letter, under date of February 19:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 19, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reference to a letter from Mr. Edward Matzke, Marion, N. Dak., which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7. Mr. Matzke writes of low farm prices for eggs and high prices for feed.

During January prices of eggs in all parts of the country averaged 81 percent of parity which is about the same percentage of parity that existed in January 1951. In February or March farm prices generally reach their low point of the year. It is hoped that some improvement in farm prices will soon take place as the demand for eggs for storage purposes, in shell and frozen form, and for hatching purposes increases.

The low egg prices now being received are of particular concern to poultrymen because of the relatively high level of feed prices. It is unlikely that the price of feed will decline in the near future, perhaps not until after the harvest of 1952, and then only if the harvest is a plentiful one.

We are making a day-to-day study of trends in egg and feed prices. As yet, however, no decision has been made with respect to the removal of surplus eggs in 1952.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the distinguished Assistant Secretary is mistaken as to the price of eggs being low at this time of year. As a matter of fact, all over the Northwest farmers get more for their eggs in the winter time than they do in the summer. I wish particularly to call this letter to the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who stated the other day that he thought egg prices were about right.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. McFARLAND that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for

the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I understood that I was to have the floor today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. The Senator from Missouri will be recognized when the transaction of routine business has been concluded. Does the Senator from Missouri object to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KEM. Other Senators have made similar requests. I cannot accede to the request of my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, unless I similarly agree to yield to my friend, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I would prefer to proceed, and ask that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska follow me with his remarks.

PEACE OR MORE WAR

1. THE TYRANNY OF A MAJORITY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, Mr. Truman, on June 27, 1950, announced that he had ordered American forces into war in Korea. He had the power to do so, but he did not have the right.

Yesterday, February 27, 1952, 1 year and 8 months to the day after Mr. Truman's action, the majority leadership had the power to impose gag rule in the Senate Chamber, but it did not have the right.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] had made certain sarcastic observations pertaining to me. Fair play demanded that I be given an opportunity to answer. Yet immediately after the Senator from Connecticut had concluded, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] proceeded to choke off further debate. He had the power to do so, but not the right. Right and truth are greater than power. All power is limited by right.

Government by a chosen few—a palace guard from the ranks of the Senate—is an oligarchy. It is not a republic.

The beautiful monument to Thomas Jefferson on the shore of the Tidal Basin here in Washington is visited each year by thousands of our people. Engraved there in unperishable marble are the words:

I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

These words were spoken by Mr. Jefferson early in his career. How steadfastly he adhered to this concept is known by all who are interested in our history and our institutions.

It is of no importance that yesterday in the Senate I felt the whiplash of the tyranny of a majority. It is of great importance for the American people to know to what extent what was formerly the party of Mr. Jefferson has departed from his teachings, and the consideration for the rights of others, that so long characterized its leadership.

One hears that the shrine of the Democrat Party has recently been moved from Monticello to the Hermitage. If this is true, as an American I deeply regret it. I was taught in my youth to believe that Mr. Jefferson was one of the greatest men to be born on this continent. I still believe so, I still revere his teachings.

"Liberty is the only thing you cannot have," said William Allen White, "unless you are willing to give it to others."

The action of the astute majority leader in calling for a recess before I had an opportunity to reply to the sarcastic remarks of the Senator from Connecticut, calls to mind the story of the justice of the peace who adjourned court after hearing the plaintiff's case because, as he said, if he heard both sides he might be confused. The confusion which seems to characterize the present majority leadership in the Senate has often been remarked on. I shall be happy if what may be considered a discourtesy to me will contribute in any small measure to relieving the unfortunate confusion that may in the end work havoc to our beloved Nation.

2. CONSENT BY CERTAIN SENATORS IS NOT CONSENT BY THE SENATE

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut would make much of the fact that certain Members of the Senate and House—and only certain Members—attended a conference at the White House shortly before the President made known his views to the full Senate through the issuance of a press release.

Actually the President called this conference, not so much to consult but to inform. The decision to intervene with air and sea forces in Korea seems to have been made at the White House on Monday evening, July 26, 1950.

In testimony before the combined Senate Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, former Secretary of Defense, Louis A. Johnson, testified in part as follows—on June 14, 1951:

Many of us met the President at the airport on Sunday evening when he came in. Secretary Acheson and myself rode to the Blair House with the President. There was a period of time before dinner at 7:45, to which dinner there had been invited all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman thereof, and the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force, and myself, Secretary Acheson and several others of the State Department.

When we adjourned, the impression was that we would get together the next day, and there were conferences the next day, but that whole group, less a few but not less any of the military men I named, met again on Monday evening, and at that time the decision on motion of Secretary Acheson was made to send the Navy and the Air Force into the situation, the United Nations having met at 3:00 o'clock on the previous Sunday afternoon and declared North Korea an aggressor.

Members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as is well known, are selected on the basis of seniority. The State of Missouri has had no representative on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for several years. The

present Senators belong to the "Class of 1946" and the "Class of 1950" respectively. I am not persuaded that for this reason a Missouri Senator should not address himself to the grave questions of foreign policy, about which the people of our State are so deeply concerned.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution makes it mandatory for every Senator—not merely those on the Foreign Relations Committee—to take an interest in matters of foreign policy. Presidential ratification of treaties requires the "advice and consent of the Senate" and the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present. Under his constitutional duty in the field of international contractual obligations, every Senator is not merely entitled but is expected to possess "full and complete" information on these matters.

The Constitution further gives Congress the power to "declare war." It does not provide that a committee picked from the membership of the Senate or the House or both may speak for the entire Senate on such a question of awful moment. That is the duty and the responsibility of the full membership of both the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will readily agree that the primary purpose of our committees is to expedite the Senate's business. Their existence in no way lessens the solemn responsibility of every Member of the Senate in matters pertaining to our foreign policy.

As I have said before, I have great respect for the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. They have rendered valiant service to their country. I am confident they will continue to do so.

The Constitution makes no provision for congressional committees. In fact, the Congress managed to get along without them for a number of years after the Constitution went into effect. It was not until 1816 that a Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was established. Previous to that time questions relating to foreign affairs either were dealt with directly on the floor of the Senate or were referred to a select temporary committee appointed to consider a particular subject.

Senators from 12 States presently comprise the membership of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The people of 36, or three-fourths of the States, have no representative on that committee. The people of the 12 States represented on the committee make up 24 percent of the population of the United States. More than 75 percent of the American people are without representation on the committee.

Mr. President, I submit that the representatives in the Senate of the 75 percent of the American people who have no representation on the committee are entitled to be heard on the question of whether or not the sons of the fathers and mothers in the respective States are to be called on to fight and die 7,000 miles from home.

3. THE SENATE IS NOT BOUND BY THE VIEWS EXPRESSED BY SOME OF ITS MEMBERS, NO MATTER HOW DISTINGUISHED

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] made reference to statements by certain members of the minority, including the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] at the time when the President ordered American forces into war in Korea. I think the statement of the Senator from California was made on the same day the announcement was made, namely, June 27, 1950, and the statement of the Senator from Ohio was made on the following day.

Mr. President, my duty here is to represent the people of Missouri. I do not consider myself bound by the views expressed by Senators from other States—Senators of either the majority or minority party.

I have always had, and still have, great respect for the thinking of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from California. On many issues I have found myself in agreement with them. Occasionally, we have disagreed.

But my first obligation is to the people of Missouri.

It cannot be said that any one of the Senators referred to by the Senator from Connecticut, has been chosen by a process of representative government to make decisions for the people of Missouri on such an important question as that of war or peace.

I was convinced on June 27, 1950, as I am now, that the people of Missouri firmly believe and desire that before American boys are sent to die in distant foreign lands, the elected Representatives of the people in Congress shall by majority action approve an act of war. I was convinced then, as I am now, that the people of Missouri are fed up with government by haphazard guess and fickle intuition.

4. WHY WAS THE SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT CHOSEN TO ANSWER?

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that there arose to answer my observations, not the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], but, instead, a relatively new member of the committee, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], who, incidentally, does not have to answer to the people of his State for some time to come.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, the Senator from Missouri is aware of the fact that I answered to the people of my State in 1950, and the Senator is also aware of the fact that he will answer to his people this year.

Mr. KEM. Yes, I am prepared to do that.

Mr. McMAHON. When the Senator from Missouri returns here again, after that, I will be more willing to listen to him.

Mr. KEM. I recall that the Senator from Connecticut recently entered the State of Illinois, which adjoins my State, as a candidate in the presidential primary. I think perhaps that was the shortest presidential campaign on record; he got in and got out quicker than any other presidential candidate in history. The State of Missouri has no presidential primary. However, if the Senator from Connecticut would like to know what the people of the Midwest think of his ideas, I suggest that he re-enter the presidential primary in Illinois, and he will learn quickly and completely.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield again to me?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator from Missouri will find out in Missouri this year, when he consults the people of Missouri. I imagine that the candidate against the Senator from Missouri may in good part hold some of the views which I hold, and that may furnish a good test in the Senator's State of Missouri as to the differing viewpoints as between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. KEM. Perhaps the Senator from Connecticut would take time off during the campaign to come into Missouri and instruct the people of Missouri as to what they should do. Our people are hospitable, and he will be given an attentive hearing.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is sometimes eloquent. He is always articulate. On June 27, 1950, the Senator from Texas was an ardent defender of the Truman-Acheson foreign policy in the Far East. He advised against any criticism of the policies being followed by Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson.

What now accounts for the eloquent silence of the Senator from Texas?

5. SHOULD A RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED?

Yesterday the Senator from Connecticut repeatedly referred to the fact that at the time when Mr. Truman plunged the Nation into war in Korea, I did not offer a resolution which would have repudiated the President's stand on that occasion.

Mr. President, I have learned the hard way, from long bitter experience, how idle it is to offer a resolution which is referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Time and again, I and other Senators have submitted resolutions pertaining to matters of grave import to the Nation, only to see them bottled up, pigeonholed, by the majority members of that Committee.

On December 6, 1950, at the time Prime Minister Attlee held his secret conference with Mr. Truman, I submitted on behalf of myself and 23 other Senators, a resolution to obtain a full report from the President on the results of the conference and to prevent the President from making agreements with Mr. Attlee affecting in any important way the course of action of this country, except by treaty entered into with the advice and consent of the Senate, as provided by the constitution.

That resolution was pigeonholed in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

On January 14, 1952, I joined the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and a number of other Senators in sponsoring a resolution calling for full publicity on the hush-hush Truman-Churchill conferences. That resolution is now gathering dust in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. No action has been scheduled on it.

On January 16, 1952, I submitted in the Senate a resolution calling for a sweeping investigation of the State Department. Among other matters, my resolution called for a probe of the extent to which our allies are diverting critical materials to the enemy. That resolution is resting quietly in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Last week, the House voted 189 to 143 to demand from Acheson all data on troop commitments. Did the House vote, in effect, say to the Senate, "This was your baby but you abandoned it?" Does this mean that the constitutional functions of the Senate in connection with foreign affairs are being lost through disuse?

It is too much to hope that the Administration leadership of that committee will retrieve these resolutions from their dusty receptacles in the cemetery section of the committee's files. The distinguished chairman of that committee seems quite content to let them rest in peace. I am sure that his fellow Democrats on that committee who acted as pallbearers feel likewise.

A Kem resolution repudiating the one-man war making in Korea would have shared a similar fate. There is no disposition on the part of the President or his congressional Democrats to assume responsibility for their tragic blunders in the Far East.

Mr. President, let the Senate have an opportunity to repudiate the President's unconstitutional war making in Korea. I challenge the Senate leadership to permit such a resolution to reach the Senate floor. We shall then see who is for peace and who is for war.

I will submit such a resolution immediately, if the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] will give assurance that they will give it prompt clearance, so that the Senate may go on record for or against this misadventure in Korea.

But does the senior Senator from Texas take the position that it is right for President Truman and Secretary Acheson to send American troops into battle, to bleed the taxpayers without mercy, to make world-wide commitments to Mr. Churchill, but that this all will be kept secret, and that he, the senior Senator from Texas, will eagerly collaborate with the Executive in this conspiracy of suppression?

The Senator from Connecticut yesterday assured the Senate that—

If a vote had been taken on a resolution supporting the stand that was taken in Korea, there would not have been 15 votes cast in opposition.

And yet, a few minutes later, we find the Senator from Connecticut chiding me for not offering such a resolution, and saying, referring to the senior Senator from Missouri:

I cannot judge his motives. It is unfortunate that he did not take that course of action.

I am sure that the Senator from Connecticut has not been so long away from the practice in the courts of justice that he has forgotten the maxim, "Equity does not require one to do an idle and futile thing." If the Senator was so sure of the action which would be taken on such a resolution, why does he think it unfortunate that I did not offer it? It would undoubtedly have reached a convenient pigeonhole in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The trouble with the argument of the Senator from Connecticut is that it proves too much. He says that a resolution repudiating the President's action in sending our troops into Korea without the consent of Congress would not have gotten anywhere. At the same time, he solemnly assures the Senate it is unfortunate that I did not offer it.

During the congressional debate on Senate Resolution 8, relative to the implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty, an amazing document appeared on the desks of the Members in this Chamber. It was entitled "Powers of the President To Send the Armed Forces Outside the United States." It was introduced by a foreword signed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who presented the document as a careful review and analysis of the President's power from the executive point of view.

This document, after conceding that the powers of Congress which have a bearing on this subject are the power to declare war—Constitution, article I, section 8, clause 11; the power to raise and support armies—clause 12; the power to provide and maintain a navy—clause 13; and the power to make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces—clause 14; finally, on the last page, reaches the amazing conclusion that the use of the congressional power to declare war has fallen into abeyance because wars are no longer declared in advance.

Since when has this power of Congress been in abeyance? And how long will the period of abeyance continue? How long, Mr. President, will the foundations of our constitutional liberty be subjected to mining and sapping by such theories and such theorists?

The greatest dangers to liberty—

Said Mr. Justice Brandeis—

lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning, but without understanding.

Mr. President, yesterday, during a colloquy with the Senator from Connecticut, I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I had made on June 27, 1950, immediately preceding the reading in the Senate of the statement of the President that he had ordered our Armed Forces into Korea. At

that time, the Senator from Connecticut objected to my introducing any further portions of the RECORD, suggesting that I might do so in my own time. At the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Connecticut, the Senate was precipitately recessed on a motion by the Senator from Arizona, the majority leader. I should now like to read into the RECORD the colloquy between the then majority leader, former Senator Lucas, of Illinois, and myself, which immediately followed the reading of the statement of the President in the Senate, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 7, at page 9228, as follows:

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

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I notice that in the President's statement he says, "I have ordered the fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa." Does that mean that he has arrogated to himself the authority of declaring war?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri will have to place his own interpretation upon the President's statement.

Mr. KEM. Can the Senator from Illinois, as leader of the President's party on the floor of the Senate, elucidate that statement?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care to debate that question with the Senator from Missouri. I do not believe that it means war, but the Senator can place his own interpretation on it.

Mr. KEM. I am not asking the Senator to debate it; I am asking for information.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not debate it with the Senator. I repeat he can place his own interpretation upon it. Obviously, it is a very firm commitment in respect to Formosa. It is in line with suggestions made a number of times in the past by Senators on the Republican side of the aisle.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Of course, it is true that the Constitution places in the Congress the authority to declare war; is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEM. Can the Senator tell me under what authority of the Constitution the President of the United States has authorized the fleet to make an armed attack?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator that the President has authorized the fleet to make an attack, but I can assure him that history will show that on more than 100 occasions in the life of this Republic the President, as Commander in Chief, has ordered the fleet or the troops to do certain things which involved the risk of war. I shall not be drawn into a long debate on the point. A little later the Senator can exercise his own right on the floor of the Senate and debate it as long as he desires.

So, Mr. President, the record is clear:

First, the President ordered the Armed Forces of the United States into Korea to take part in hostilities between the forces of North Korea and South Korea.

Second, the President did not ask or obtain the authority of the Congress of the United States to do so.

Third, the Constitution gives to the Congress the power to declare war.

So, Mr. President, I shall continue to object to the action taken by the President of the United States, as a result of which the Armed Forces of the United States are today engaged in an unconstitutional, undeclared war in Korea. This war has become one of the bitterest, bloodiest wars in history.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, last night, at the time of taking the vote on the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] that the Senate stand in recess until today, I was present in my office, but was not in the Senate Chamber itself, and did not reach the Chamber in time to vote on that question.

I simply wish to let the Senate know that I was in my office, but did not vote for the reason that I did not reach the Chamber in time to participate in the vote.

TAX CASE OF JACOB (JACK) UDELL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I shall discuss another tax case which was handled by the law firm of Joseph D. Nunan and John P. Wenchel; namely, the case of Jacob (Jack) Udell—address: New York City; Frankford, Del.; and Miami Beach, Fla.

This is another case which had been pending in the Treasury Department during the employment of Mr. Nunan and Mr. Wenchel.

The proposed deficiencies including penalties against Jacob Udell for the years 1942 to 1945, inclusive, were \$792,094.

During the years involved Mr. Udell, who formerly resided in New York City, was operating a poultry processing plant at Frankford, Del. His residence is now Miami Beach, Fla.

On July 23, 1948, about 1 year after his retirement, John P. Wenchel, former Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, applied for a waiver to represent this taxpayer. On August 8, 1948, the waiver was approved.

On November 17, 1948, powers of attorney were filed by Warren Canaday and Joseph D. Nunan, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

I can find no record of Mr. Nunan's having been granted a waiver to represent this taxpayer whose case had been pending during his term of office. The waiver is in the name of John P. Wenchel while Mr. Nunan filed the power of attorney in his name.

I might add that in a discussion this morning I was given to understand that when a waiver is extended to one member of a firm, it covers the entire membership of the firm.

On December 31, 1948, this case was sent to the Tax Division of the Department of Justice with recommendations for criminal prosecution. At that time the Chief of the Tax Division was Lamar Caudle.

On January 7, 1949, 6 weeks after Mr. Nunan filed his power of attorney, Charles Oliphant, who succeeded Mr. Wenchel as Chief Counsel of the Bureau

of Internal Revenue, telephoned the Justice Department and requested the return of the case to his office.

On March 22, 1949, upon the request of the Treasury Department, Jacob Udell was given a medical examination by Dr. W. L. Pierce of the United States Public Health Service, Miami, Fla.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a copy of the medical report dated March 23, 1949, signed by Dr. W. L. Pierce. In this medical report Dr. Pierce points out that the outstanding feature of Mr. Udell's illness is his anxiety.

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

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES PUBLIC
HEALTH SERVICE,
OUTPATIENT CLINIC,

Miami, Fla., March 23, 1949.

In re Jacob Udell,

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Internal Revenue Service,

Miami, Fla.

(Attention Mr. George H. Smith,
special agent.)

DEAR SIR: This patient was examined in our office March 22, 1949. He gives a history of stomach trouble for 8 years characterized by epigastric and lower chest pain before meals. These pains are squeezing in character. About 5 or 6 years ago he began having substernal chest pain, aching in character, radiating to the left shoulder and arm. These attacks are of short duration and are aggravated by walking and excitement. He also states that the pains in his stomach are aggravated by excitement.

When asked about his occupation he says he goes to his office but does no work. He states further that his son takes care of the business for him.

He brings with him copies of letters from Leonard H. Jacobson, M. D., Miami Beach, Fla., who saw him on March 21, 1949, and Julius R. Pearson, M. D., Miami Beach, Fla., who saw him on January 7, 1949. According to the laboratory work done in their offices he has an anomaly of the stomach and deformity of the duodenal bulb indicating an ulcer.

Electrocardiograms done in Dr. Jacobson's office revealed nonspecific changes but his impression was that the patient was suffering from marked coronary artery disease. Both of these physicians are of the opinion that any severe excitement, sustained emotional or physical activity could easily lead to a coronary occlusion or perforation of the ulcer.

Physical examination in this office revealed: Blood pressure 140/96; the heart sounds were normal and the chest was clear. There is acute tenderness in the epigastrium. No other abnormalities were noted.

Diagnoses: (1) Duodenal ulcer, (2) spastic gastrointestinal tract, (3) anginal syndrome, (4) anxiety state.

Discussion: The most outstanding feature of this man's illness is his anxiety. According to his history he has a severe type of coronary artery disease. The symptoms are typical. It is not necessary in every case of this type for the electrocardiographic tracings to be markedly abnormal. Also most of his symptoms are probably due to his anxiety. The important thing is that he has typical symptoms of heart disease, therefore it is my opinion that criminal prosecution in court would endanger this man's life.

Very truly yours,

W. L. PIERCE
(For the medical officer in charge).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on May 26, 1949, about 10 months after Mr. Wenchel and Mr. Nunan had entered the picture, the Udell case, accompanied by the medical report, was resubmitted to the Department of Justice by Charles Oliphant, chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

This time, however, Mr. Oliphant, speaking for the Treasury Department, suggested to Mr. Caudle that their previous recommendations for criminal prosecution against Mr. Udell be dropped.

Thus we find that less than 1 year after Mr. Nunan and Mr. Wenchel entered this case the Treasury Department had recalled the tax case from the Department of Justice, a doctor's certificate had been obtained, and then the case was resubmitted minus the recommendations for criminal prosecution.

It is my understanding that the customary procedure is that after a case has been submitted to the Department of Justice with recommendations for criminal prosecution, the Department of Justice—not the Treasury Department—explores any question of health.

On December 14, 1949, the Department of Justice confirmed to the Treasury Department their concurrence in the decision that prosecution of Jacob Udell could not in good conscience be undertaken because of the report of the precarious condition of his health, and accordingly, the case was returned to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, where for the past 3 years it has been allowed to gather dust. Criminal prosecution for Mr. Udell's evasion of taxes has been barred by the statute of limitations.

The \$792,094 proposed tax deficiency still remains unpaid, and chances of its collection at this late date are rather slim.

As in previous cases I am not passing on the merits or demerits of the tax claims by the Government. But if, since their assessments, the Treasury Department has decided that in this or in any of the other cases they were in error, then they should amend or withdraw their claim.

On the other hand we must never overlook the fact that the taxpayer always has the right under the law to contest any proposed assessment. The mere recommendation of criminal prosecution or the recommendation of assessment of proposed deficiencies does not mean that the Government's claim is infallible.

Ours is a Government of laws and not of men, and while we may criticize the manner in which certain tax cases are handled, we must be careful that we do not jeopardize the right of the American taxpayer, who feels that the assessment is in error, to protest the Government's claim through the normal channels of law.

But while we are safeguarding those rights, at the same time we have a responsibility to see that our tax laws are enforced impartially.

Whenever any taxpayer carries his case to conference or to courts, that case must be considered on its merits and not on the basis of whom the taxpayer knows or who he employs as his attorney.

This is the sixth case handled by Mr. Nunan and his associates to which attention has been called, and in each instance recommendations for criminal prosecution have been ignored, and proposed taxes totaling over \$3,500,000 remain uncollected.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a letter to the editor as appearing in yesterday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Two Sides of the Story."

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

TWO SIDES OF THE STORY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

Internal Revenue Commissioner John Dunlap claims the Government has not lost a cent of tax money in spite of the scandals uncovered in the tax bureau.

How dumb does the man think we are? Senator WILLIAMS has reported that an Indianapolis brewery was permitted to settle a \$638,000 tax claim for a measly \$4,500 after a former tax official was given special permission to represent the company.

V. ROGAN.

RECESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I promised the distinguished minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES] that there would not be any votes taken in the Senate until after 2:15 p. m. I feel obligated to carry out that promise. For that reason, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was desirous of obtaining the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. He is not now in the Chamber. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2:30 p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The recess having expired, the Senate is now in session, and will come to order.

Let the Chair state the pending question: The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, the so-called submerged lands measure, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

HOW TO KEEP OUR LIBERTY—BOOK BY RAYMOND MOLEY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not wish to seem to attempt to develop in this body too literary an atmosphere. However, since it is incumbent upon us, as part of our function, to serve in some measure to educate the American people in regard to the issues, it has also seemed to me to be necessary to recognize the various organs of opinion which are moving in that direction.

Some time ago I took occasion to point out what seemed to me the impact upon public opinion of so great a journal of opinion as the New York Times in its book reviews. I went into a rather detailed discussion of the book reviews in the magazine section of the New York Times over a considerable period of years, which, it seemed to me, had not been entirely calculated correctly to inform the people or to give them an accurate picture of the contents of the books discussed in those reviews. That involved me in considerable controversy with the editor of the book-review section of the New York Times, but I felt that in the long run it served a useful purpose.

Since that time I have indulged in one other venture of this character, namely, that in connection with a book by Miss Freda Utley on the China question. At that time I pointed out how her book seemed calculated to correct many misapprehensions about the China problem and to give what seemed to me, at least, to be a somewhat more accurate account of how all our tragic situation in the Orient came to pass.

This afternoon I wish to discuss for a few minutes a somewhat related problem which is concerned with the general problem. I wish to speak for a few minutes in regard to a new book, just issued, which it seems to me may well invite the attention of all thoughtful students of the American republican form of government which is guaranteed under our Constitution, and to which I wish to address myself, contrary to the attempts to persuade our people that this is a democracy.

This book is by a very distinguished citizen. In recent days we have had a good many reformed Communists educate us. Now I have a reformed New Dealer, Mr. Raymond Moley, who was one of the early architects of the policies of the New Deal, and for some 6 years was very intimately associated with all its activities as that vast experiment unfolded before our eyes.

About 1938, at which time Maine and Vermont stood all alone in the country in opposition to the New Deal, Mr. Moley had a change of heart. I like to think that perhaps the example of Maine had an impact upon him; and he became converted to what, of course, seems to us in Maine a somewhat better way of life.

Mr. Moley has been inveighing against the errors of the New Deal, for some of which I think he must confess he was responsible, ever since that time, as editor or associate editor of the Newsweek magazine, with which I do not always agree.

Now Mr. Moley has finally compressed his philosophy out of his experiences of the past 20 years into a book entitled "How To Keep Our Liberty." I think the subject is one which will invite very general attention. While we sometimes are told that our liberty is not being restricted, yet I think that when the Government takes between 35 and 40 percent of all the earnings of everyone in the country, almost without exception, it must be considered that our liberty is restricted at least to that degree.

In his book Mr. Moley presents a program for political action, and I find myself rather heartily in accord with his conclusions in that regard.

I believe that the early part of his book may also stimulate interest; and certainly it is time that we stimulated some interest, because in 1948 there were 45,000,000 Americans who were not sufficiently interested in the New Deal or the Fair Deal or the Dewey Deal to turn out and vote. That was 49 percent of the eligible electorate—the largest percentage of the potential voters, I think, to fail to vote in the entire history of our country; only 51 percent of the eligible voters participated in that election.

I see in the Chamber at this time my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who I believe was a student of Mr. Raymond Moley; and I assume that accounts for some of the brilliance which our distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon frequently exhibits in debate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. If I have ever made a constructive contribution in the Senate, I am perfectly willing to give credit for it to Mr. Raymond Moley. However, I do not want to have him charged with what some persons might consider to be my mistakes.

I have not read the book which the distinguished former Columbia University professor has written. However, if the Senator from Maine will permit me to do so, I should like to suggest a modification of a statement he made when he said that Raymond Moley wrote for the New Deal. I think I correctly understood the Senator from Maine when he placed on Dr. Moley's shoulders certain responsibilities for some of the early proposals of the New Deal. In fairness to Dr. Moley, I think it should be said that in the early stages of the New Deal he was primarily concerned with foreign-policy matters, particularly in the field of relationship between economic problems at home and better economic conditions abroad.

However, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator further, except to say that I always found Dr. Moley to be a very keen student of the Constitution; and I shall be very surprised if in his book there is not found a strong defense of what I have been pleased to call, on so many occasions, sound constitutional liberalism.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think the Senator's analysis is prophetic; the Senator from Oregon has made it even before he has read the book.

Let me quote one sentence from the book which warrants the statement the Senator from Oregon has made in regard to Mr. Moley's early attitudes. On page 79 of his book, under the title "The Perversion of the New Deal," Mr. Moley says:

The early New Deal measures, with the exception of the Tennessee Valley Authority plan—

This is Mr. Moley's own statement—were fairly mild reforms. They came from many sources.

Mr. Moley develops that point somewhat further, in referring to the various measures relative to farm and industrial activity. Then he goes on to say that—

After 2 or 3 years some of these measures were extended, not to say perverted, by Roosevelt into a trend that is the source for much of our present danger. . . . The relief program and the carrying on of public works on a modest scale were perverted into a great spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect Government agency.

In other words, Mr. Moley conceives that it gradually evolved into the Frankenstein which he fears now may spell our doom.

However, I was addressing myself to the fact that in the 1948 election, 45,000,000 Americans, constituting 49 percent of the eligible electorate, did not vote. I cannot conceive that any thoughtful student of government on either side of this aisle or in this country does not realize that if that trend continues—namely, the decline of popular participation in elections—we shall rapidly approach the day which now has dawned in Russia, where some 3,000,000 Communists are dominating not only 175,000,000 people in Russia but also some 700,000,000 people elsewhere in the world.

That is the road toward which we started.

It is interesting to note that in Italy, when an important election was held 2 or 3 years ago, with communism from across the Adriatic, breathing down the necks of the Italians, with 89 percent of the potential vote being cast—an unprecedented turn-out—the Italians repelled communism. That was the significant effect and conclusion.

It is intimated that if we got more voters out, they would not vote so satisfactorily from our standpoint. Well, if we are Americans, we are prepared to take the judgment of the majority of our people. But we have at present an administration in power with scarcely 25 percent of the potential vote, which is nothing for us on this side of the aisle to be proud of, because we had only 23 percent; so we did not do our job any better than our friends on the other side of the aisle did theirs. That is why I feel that Mr. Moley has done a very great work, perhaps the greatest piece of work to date, in analyzing the cause of the decline in political interest and the measures by which we may hope to see public and popular interest revived.

I am going to ask that certain passages from the book shall be incorporated in connection with my remarks. I shall read only brief excerpts from them, if I may have the unanimous consent.

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

There being no objection, the passages from the book *How To Keep Our Liberty* by Raymond Moley, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAYMOND MOLEY

Roosevelt sent for Moley on January 1932, as he seemed to think that he would be useful.

"I believed that Roosevelt would be elected President in 1932. I had no political ambitions. But I did want to see and know intimately what went on at the heart of politics, which had been the absorbing interest in my life. It had dictated my choice of courses in the small college from which I graduated. The next year, 1907, it led me to take on a successful campaign for village clerk in my Ohio town. It moved me to the inevitable study of law, under difficulties at night in Cleveland; to the decision to study and teach politics, after a 2-year siege of tuberculosis in New Mexico had blasted my law studies, to a brief return to the field of local politics as mayor of an Ohio town when I was able to complete my return to the East; to graduate studies in politics at Columbia; to a teaching job on the Mark Hanna foundation in Western Reserve University; to the directorship of Americanization activities under Governor Cox during the war; to a return to New York and Columbia; up to 10 years of intensive professional investigation of the seamy sides of criminal law administration in Ohio, Missouri, New York, and numerous other places; to the writing of three books and many articles on the relationships of politics and criminal justice."

Moley was the founder of the brain trust, the brains behind the head, Roosevelt, directing him in all of his policies.

Moley broke with Roosevelt after the London Conference at which time he was the Assistant Secretary of State. He foresaw that the new deal was becoming perverted and wanted no part of the beast which was slowly being hatched.

Moley also fought and opposed the trend set up by Roosevelt and his partners. He wrote against their methods and tried to warn the American people in his articles in *Newsweek* magazine, of which he is a contributing editor.

"I had rendered service to the chief in office between March 1932 and September 1933, but I assumed the field of professional journalism in September 1933, and believed in the essential virtue of independence" (p. 343, *After Seven Years*).

Words from Roosevelt's acceptance speech of 1936 "economic royalists, new dynasties, thirsting for power, economic tyranny, the resolute enemy within our gates, the Revolution, the Minute Men, et cetera." All these things at which he was crying out against were being solidly established by his own planning and economic royalists were making a great headway in the Government. (Senator's words.)

EXCERPTS FROM *HOW TO KEEP OUR LIBERTY*
(By Raymond Moley)

THE PERVERSION OF THE NEW DEAL (P. 79)

The early New Deal measures, with the exception of the Tennessee Valley Authority plan, were fairly mild reforms. They came from many sources.

In general the early or, as I would designate it, the first New Deal measures were merely an extension of the 1912 Progressive Party platform. It seemed in 1932 that we had merely picked up the trail abandoned two decades before. The famous National Recovery Act was an adaptation of the Progressive idea of a cooperative effort of competitors in an industry for wholesome common purposes under the mediating but not the controlling influ-

ence of the government. The farm program was created by organized farm movements in the Middle West. The idea of regulating the issue and exchange of securities for the protection of investors was taken from the "blue sky" laws of several States and from century-old British legislation. The Tennessee Valley plan, the socialistic potentialities of which were not widely realized at the time, came largely from the public-ownership ideas of Senator George Norris. The fiscal policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt were largely hit-or-miss improvisations mixed with plenty of the old inflationary ideas of Bryan and others. Social security plans later were derived from those of some of the States and Britain.

After 2 or 3 years some of these measures were extended, not to say perverted, by Roosevelt into a trend that is the source for much of our present danger. After the NRA, there was enacted the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which threw the power of government on the side of labor in industrial disputes and authorized government intervention in organizing labor. The relief program and the carrying on of public works on a modest scale were perverted into a great spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect government agency. The farm program, which Roosevelt originally said would not be a burden on the Treasury, developed into an immense structure of subsidies, supports, and guaranties. The TVA excited the imagination of the planners and led to the present effort to create such authorities on a Nation-wide scale. And the acceptance of deficits, first regarded as a necessary evil, finally, under the influence of the new economics, was regarded as an unmitigated good. Meanwhile, bureaucracy and Federal power grew apace at the expense of the taxpayers and the States.

AMONG THE BUREAUCRATS (P. 81)

In the early days of the New Deal, I was in a position to see clearly and in detail the great migration of those who came to Washington seeking, and for the most part finding, Government employment. The accession of Roosevelt was regarded by them as a political, almost a social revolution. As in all such upheavals, thousands were inspired to participate, either in response to a wholly idealistic impulse to help, or as a means of slaking a thirst for adventure, or for the more prosaic purpose of getting gainful employment after years of more or less impoverished dedication to opposition to things as they were.

These people were a variegated lot. Non-conformity is infinitely diversified. There might be some uniformity in a belief that the country is sick, but prognosis and treatment in politics depend upon personal predilection and character. It is unnecessary to suggest the kinds of remedies and nostrums that were advocated. The point is that nearly everybody who applied for employment sooner or later found it. There was little sifting or investigation, far too little adaptation of the employee to the job. Those who made the selections, even some Cabinet members, were themselves new to public service. Allegiance to the policies and personality of the President was a test. But this was a poor test, because the Roosevelt policies were themselves an amalgam of many philosophies.

One test was fairly well observed, and the President himself regarded it as important. People were not to be put in charge of matters in which they had lived their lives and acquired their habits of thought and action. Thus, it was believed, private interests would be kept from places of privilege and power. One Cabinet member, in seeking to fill a responsible place in his department, told me that he wanted only college professors, for only in them could he find "intellectual honesty." Skills were at a discount. Ideological sympathy was at a premium.

To anyone of even mildly conservative instincts, it was deeply disturbing to witness at first hand the activities of some of these innovators. The possession of power spurred them to new schemes for Government action. An abundance of leisure, permitted by the lax discipline of bureaucracy, offered them time for the exercise of fervent imagination.

It was no secret that a great number of these reformers were admirers of the "great Soviet experiment." And some, we now know, were secret agents of communism.

In my opinion there is a greater danger in collectivists than in the betrayal of our secrets to foreign powers. The danger lies in what can be done to a nation by public officials who do not believe in a free economy. In Roosevelt's day there were many people working for the Government who regarded his reforms as a mere prelude to revolution. "He is only a Kerensky," they were in the habit of saying.

THE CAPTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY (P. 86)

There is little likeness between the Democratic Party of 1932 and the Democratic Party of 1951. The personnel of its leadership and the nature of its policies have undergone a profound change.

When Roosevelt was nominated, the party stood for a series of traditional principles—the constitutional rights and powers of the States, economical government, reduction of the bureaucracy, and justice in industrial relations. It has gradually been transformed into a Federalist party, a collaborator with labor unions, with an unprecedented bureaucracy, an unbalanced budget as a first principle, and a welfare state as an objective.

An intense struggle within the party has accompanied this change. In the early Roosevelt years the more conservative northern leaders broke away from the party leadership. Southern conservatives remained nominally Democratic, but carried on their dissent in Congress.

The change in policy and strategy by Roosevelt and others was calculated. Labor-union leaders, particularly those of the new CIO, abandoned the traditional detachment of the Gompers era and moved bag and baggage into the party. A whole battalion of socialistic planners moved into positions of political power in the Government. City machines and bosses, little concerned with principle and aware of the vast patronage involved in the Government's new policies, learned the jargon of the welfare state and went along. Persistent preference in appointments by Roosevelt raised the more radical partisans to high places.

The most vivid demonstration of the power of the statists was in the Democratic convention of 1948, when over the opposition of traditional Democrats and despite the plans of the nominal leaders of that convention a resolution on civil rights was jammed through.

The party that began with Jeffersonian distrust of government has become a powerful instrument of statism through Federal power.

THE FORGOTTEN MAN (P. 65)

It is one of the great ironies of American history that at the very outset of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal the phrase "Forgotten Man" became a major slogan and rallying cry. It so happened that I provided him with the phrase and wove it into an early pre-campaign speech. I took it from a great, perhaps immortal essay by William Graham Sumner, written in 1883. It is well to recall that it was meant to apply by its author, by me, and, I believed, by Roosevelt to the members of a large and substantial group in society, which, incidentally, included all self-dependent farmers and wage earners, as well as many others. I may add, further, that it represented exactly the people I thought the New Deal was going to benefit and exactly the group I am writing about in this chapter. "Now, who," wrote Sumner, "is the forgotten man?"

Sumner defined him as the man who earned his living by productive work, who paid taxes, who accumulated a little capital, who was neither the object of help from government nor the beneficiary of artificial or politically bestowed advantage, who lived up to his contracts, and never asked for favor.

The forgotten man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide. He works, he votes, generally he prays—but he always pays—yes; above all he pays. He keeps production going on. He is strongly patriotic. He gives no trouble. He excites no admiration. He is not in any way a hero or a problem nor notorious nor an object of sentiment nor a burden nor the object of a job nor one over whom sentimental economists and statesmen can parade their fine sentiments. Therefore he is forgotten.¹

It was for him that the New Deal was originally conceived. Later, because of political expediency, Roosevelt shifted his appeal to a congeries of small segments of the voting population. The early New Deal ended in an alliance of minorities.

THE AMERICAN MIDDLE INTERESTS

The Marxists' hatred for and fear of what they call the middle class can easily be understood when we consider the nature and distribution of wealth among Americans, as well as the interests, economic and otherwise, and the ideals of those who are neither rich or poor. For not only does the preponderant part of the Nation's wealth lie with this middle group, but the preservation of national well-being utterly depends on the maintenance of individual liberty and the limitation of the power of Government. Moreover, the nature and size of interests of this group make it the appropriate trustee and defender of the interests and ideals of the Nation itself (p. 38).

The most common bases for defining distinctions are either income or property ownership. If we adopt those criteria we find a graduation from very small to very large individual or family income or ownership. The broad picture of our society is a small fringe at either end, with the vast mass in the middle. The superficial impression is that of great, almost monolithic stability.

But the real situation is not so simple. Many hired workers have high incomes and many own property. Many employers and property owners have low incomes. The earnings of many small businessmen come in part from their own personal labor and in part as return from capital invested, with no clear distinction between these two sources. The bulk of American families have annual incomes between two and five thousand dollars. They form a fluid mass, constantly fed from above and below, and constantly losing members in both directions. Nearly every working American has passed through this group some time in his life: young men starting from scratch work up; old men reaching the age of retirement come down; men in the prime of life enter or leave the middle group according to their business fortunes" (p. 38).

WHO OWNS WHAT?

Figures arranged by income groups, on income groups and property ownership by the able economist, Rufus S. Tucker, are very interesting and worthy of study. His statistics show that "4 out of 10 families have assets worth \$5,000 or more. One out of ten have assets worth \$25,000 or more."

¹ William Graham Sumner: *The Forgotten Man and Other Essays* (New Haven, Yale University Press; 1918).

Only 1 in 10 have debts greater than assets. And strange though it may seem, red ink is more common among people in higher-income groups.

The ownership of automobiles is very general. It ranges from 24 percent in the lower groups to 89 percent in the highest. The relatively low percentage in the lower group must be partly accounted for by the presence in those groups of many elderly retired people. But in the groups with incomes from \$1,000 to \$3,999, automobile ownership from 1949 to 1950 made a spectacular increase.

One-half of all nonfarm families, or approximately 21,000,000, owned their own homes. Members of all groups had considerable holdings of real estate other than their own homes.

Nine percent of the lowest income group and 15 percent in the group between \$2,000 and \$5,000, owned other real estate.

WAGE EARNERS AND MIDDLE INTERESTS

In 1950 there were 40,930,000 full-time employees in private industries. An estimated 15,000,000 of these workers were members of labor unions of various kinds.

When we measure the economic and social status of the people who used to be identified as the middle classes and compare it with the present status of wage earners in the more fortunate ranges of their group, striking similarities appear. Millions of workers, both union and nonunion, are now receiving incomes that compare favorably with those received by small independent business, professional and so-called white-collar workers. The status as property owners is favorable by comparison.

That being true, their sympathies, their associations, their standard of intelligence and culture and those of their children are merging with those who in earlier days were regarded as more fortunate. Their political outlook is rapidly approaching that of the other middle (interest) groups. They can no longer confidently be expected to vote as a labor group. This changed status should be thoroughly grasped by the conservative political leaders. In fact, by tradition a large proportion of union members have never voted as their leaders and others have expected and hoped they would.

In a day when their status was much less fortunate than it is now, Theodore Roosevelt said the Republican Party could expect to receive about a third of union members. John L. Lewis before one election rather bitterly remarked that while he could tell his people how to vote there was no assurance that they would do so.

The political shift was clearly shown in the results of the 1950 senatorial election in Ohio. In the face of stupendous efforts by the United Labor League of Ohio, which was composed of the political arms of the AFL, the CIO, the railway brotherhoods, and labor organizations, Senator Taft carried his appeal to the workers themselves. He carefully avoided the implication that there was any issue at all between him and wage-earners. He avoided identifying "labor" with the leader who opposed him. In fact, he clearly made a differentiation between the workers, including union members, and the official heads of the unions. He carried every industrial county.

(Mr. Moley points out in his statistics that the statement "that a third of our people are ill-fed and ill-housed and ill-clothed" is a gross misstatement that has served to divide our people in the interests of political objectives. The falseness of such a statement is revealed in the figures of the very Government whose political head pronounced that judgment.)

Even those figures showing the large number of people receiving incomes of, say, \$2,000 or less to "prove" that such people are unable to obtain a decent living standard are engaged in statistical chicanery. For

the Federal Reserve figure on incomes and assets make clear that a great many of those people own considerable property. The percentage of people in the lowest-income group—"under \$1,000—who own their own home is 50, which is higher than the three groups above them, and nearly equal to the \$4,000-\$4,999 group. These home owners have the benefit of relatively free rent, not counted as income. Considerable percentages of this low-income group own other types of property, especially 'liquid assets.' The fallacy in assuming that this group is in dire need lies in failing to recognize that many of them are retired and living on self-made means of security, and others do not care to work, either because they do not need to or because they are willing to forego earnings for the joy of a lazy life. The latter, as any American knows, are numerous."

ESSENTIAL POLITICAL WEAKNESSES OF THE MIDDLE GROUP

The essential political weakness of the middle-interest group lies in several circumstances. It has had a tendency to split the two parties. This has been especially true since there has been a Solid South. The shopkeeper in Memphis votes for Truman. A shopkeeper in Indianapolis, with exactly the same economic concerns and social outlooks, votes for Dewey. A machine member in Chicago and a pensioner in Los Angeles count more than both shopkeepers.

Another factor contributing to the political weakness of the middle group has been the complex, almost indefinable nature of its economic concerns. Politics requires interpretation of these shared concerns in broad, easily understandable terms. It is easy to describe and activate the interests of cattle raisers or cotton growers. But it is not easy to describe the interwoven common concerns and economic kinship of cotton and cattle growers with New England shopkeepers or with skilled workmen in a watch factory in Lancaster, Pa. Politicians have fished in cloudy waters and have profited by complex relationships.

Since this has been true, the tactic of self-seeking politics has been to split the middle group by appeals and promises to specific minorities. Two of these minorities have been farmers and wage earners. The means for achieving this division has been to stress the factors that set these minorities off from others, rather than the great ties that bind them to others. Demagogues, in appeals to farmers and wage earners portray their prospective adherents as the very salt of the earth, the foundations of economic life, and the only "indices, and plenty of infusion of the minority class-consciousness, the substantial middle group has been divided and rendered impotent to unite on the broad issues that might have provided unity and real political power" (pp. 64-65, *How to Keep Our Liberty*).

BLUEPRINT FOR POLITICAL ACTION—WHAT OBJECTIVES?

We are concerned here with militant political action, which means positive support of specific candidates and policies and opposition to other specific candidates and policies. I am not concerned here with vague and generalized efforts to teach good government, to clean up affairs in specific cities, counties, and communities, or to create and distribute educational and propaganda material. Such objectives are generally good and sound. But their consideration lies beyond the scope of this book.

The first decision that must be made by any group intent upon organizing militant political action is its objective.

1. Does it intend to keep itself independent of any legally constituted party organization but support the candidate or candidates of one of the other party? In short, will it cooperate with a party for the purpose of gaining party control?

2. Does it intend to work within the legal framework of a party for the purpose of gaining party control?

3. Does it intend to limit itself to a specific function, such as to get out the vote?

It is very important to make this decision. For to confuse the first and second of these possible objectives will result in misunderstanding, waste, and duplication of effort, and the ultimate weakening of both citizen activity and party responsibility. The ideal of all effective citizen action should be the creation of responsible party government of such a character as to win the active and devoted support of many citizens (p. 294).

(N. B.—Some of the suggested blueprints can be found on the following pages.)

SOME BLUEPRINTS, INDEPENDENT ORGANIZED POLITICAL ACTION

Page 295:

Preliminary organization: In an area of some size, such as a county, congressional district, city, or even a State, small groups of 20 to 30 carefully selected men and women should first be called together. Then the initiators can explain the need, purposes, and methods of action. Since members of such groups have many contacts and connections through their businesses, clubs, clients, and the like, further meetings can be held by the initial members. Such groups should later be called together in every strategic place in the area to be covered.²

Since the members of such groups are generally quite inexperienced in political activity, a process of education should begin with them. It is best to move slowly at first, until complete understanding has been reached on objectives, policies, and methods, and until adequate financing has been assured.

It is significant that some of the most successful citizens' organizations in this country have operated from the beginning without a specific name, without a letterhead, without any formal officers. Perhaps nothing more than some such unpretentious name as citizens' committee is needed. The purpose of anonymity has been to frustrate opposition attack.

In the preliminary movements of such a group it should be remembered that its strength will at first be overestimated by the opposition. Professional politicians are panicky people. They rush into hostile counteraction. This must be anticipated and effectively met with firm and rapid action by the citizens' group. A citizens' group must not start until it is.

Expert management: Those who initiate and control citizens' organizations should themselves serve without compensation, but they will find it essential to employ expert management. A businessman who started a highly successful movement says: "A political campaign is like a sales campaign. The candidate and his principles must be 'sold' by word of mouth and by advertising. 'Sales' managers and division managers direct routine 'salesmen' and hundreds of volunteers."

Page 297:

Finances: A citizens' organization should operate on sound budgetary principles. A yardstick should be established for contributions. The C.I.O.-P.A.C. has tried to get \$1 a member; the A.F.L. \$2, although both have fallen far short of their goals. Busi-

² Scott Wilson, the successful manager of a citizens' movement in New Orleans has this to say of the preliminary steps in setting up a citizens' group: "It is best to start with a small group first—say four business and professional men. Then have another meeting with the group enlarged to eight. Then 12. But if for the next meeting twice that number is invited, maybe only 15 will come. That may be because somebody is scaring off the early converts. It is best then to put the whole matter square on the line publicly and have a big meeting and get under way."

nessmen and professional men and women should contribute according to their means and importance. Paid solicitors are not suitable for collecting contributions and pledges. This should be done by businessmen and others in the original group who can talk plainly to their friends and business associates.

Too much money is just as dangerous as too little. The appearance of opulence may be deadly. In a citizens' group it antagonizes the political party that is the object of its help. The public, however, is quick to penetrate any phony demonstration of poverty. Tammany leaders have never lost the support of their followers by living well, dressing well, and assuming a reasonably dignified and forthright appearance of well-being. Perhaps the golden mean is an efficient, well-equipped organization that is neither wasteful nor parsimonious.

Getting good candidates: A primary task of a citizens' group is to use every legitimate means to get good candidates to run. That is not easy. To run for Congress and to remain there is a formidable matter for anyone who has a successful business or profession that needs attention. And most people suitable for an important office have such obligations.

Even if elected, a person in political life has financial and other obligations that are heavy. He must ordinarily depend on and get along with a political organization at home that may be sluggish, incompetent, indifferent, or worse. He gets little financial help in campaigns, poor publicity, tepid encouragement, and plenty of criticism. Moreover, there are always enemies and rivals at home working against him while he is struggling with his job in Washington.

Enlisting and training political workers: When groups of leaders have been strategically placed in the area from which activity should fan out, when some money is in hand and more is pledged, and when expert professional workers are employed, the preliminaries are completed.

The second step is to get volunteer workers to make direct contact with voters. This can be done first by carefully going over the ward, precinct, town, and township election returns to see where work should be concentrated. It is important to recognize that the greatest need and opportunity for citizen action are in the spots where there has been the highest proportion of stay-at-homes in recent elections.

Publicity and advertising: Candidates usually know little about means of getting publicity or about the nature of good publicity. Expert service is needed.

Here the citizens' group can find and pay the right person, perhaps on the advice of advertising agency men or editors. It is almost always possible to get a skilled newspaperman or a public-relations man.

A political campaign has many of the characteristics of a commercial sales effort. The candidate and his attributes and views need advertising. His name, his face, and his right hand should be everywhere. The impression of success must be put over. Campaign "literature," various forms of paid advertising, outdoor advertising, press, radio, and television should be expertly prepared. This function might, with the consent of the party, be taken over by the citizens' group.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think no one challenges the statement that Dr. Moley was one of the keymen in what was called the original Brain Trust, which evolved many of the so-called New Deal ideas. He broke with President Roosevelt after the London Conference, to which the Senator from Oregon referred, over fiscal matters and

international controls. It was a rather curious thing that President Roosevelt, who believed so strongly in our international missions, should have been the one to be responsible, apparently, for upsetting the London Economic Conference in 1934, from which subsequently flowed so many of our ills. It is a curious commentary upon the extent to which he had evolved his concepts at that time.

In later passages of his book Dr. Moley goes on to speak about the words of the acceptance speech of 1936, which was the point where Dr. Moley finally broke. The language which President Roosevelt used on that occasion will be remembered, "economic royalists," "new dynasties," "thirsting for power," "economic tyranny," "the resolute enemy within our gates," "the revolution," and "the minute men"; and I believe it was there that he used the familiar expression that "we have created an instrument of power which, in the hands of other men, might be very dangerous to the welfare of the state." Apparently, Dr. Moley felt that if that were the situation, it was perhaps time to call a halt.

All these innovations for which President Roosevelt was crying out at that time were being established by his own planning, and the "economic royalists," as we are now, all too late, beginning to learn, were making very great headway in the Government.

I have referred to this perversion of the New Deal, and have read certain passages from it, which I shall pass over until we reach the concluding sentence. The program was gradually developed into the acceptance of deficits, first regarded as a necessary evil, which finally, under the influence of the new economics, came to be regarded as an unmitigated good; and meanwhile bureaucracy and Federal power grew apace, at the expense of the taxpayers and the States.

He then speaks about the bureaucrats, and of how they flooded into Washington; and he speaks with a rather kindly and generous voice about them. I should like to read the passage. He says:

In the early days of the New Deal, I was in a position to see clearly and in detail the great migration of those who came to Washington seeking, and for the most part finding, Government employment.

I think I should interpolate that the horrible crime record of Washington did not begin with the coming of these out-of-employment Democrats to Washington, but it certainly was not mitigated by their arrival. I do not place any more responsibility upon them than upon their predecessors. I continue:

The accession of Roosevelt was regarded by them as a political, almost a social revolution. As in all such upheavals, thousands were inspired to participate, either in response to a wholly idealistic impulse to help, or as a means of slaking a thirst for adventure, or for the more prosaic purpose of getting gainful employment after years of more or less impoverished dedication to opposition to things as they were.

These people were a variegated lot. Non-conformity is infinitely diversified. There might be some uniformity in a belief that the country is sick, but prognosis and treatment in politics depend upon personal predilection and character. It is unnecessary to suggest the kinds of remedies and nostrums

that were advocated. The point is that nearly everybody who applied for employment sooner or later found it. There was little sifting or investigation, far too little adaptation of the employee to the job. Those who made the selections, even some Cabinet members, were themselves new to public service. Allegiance to the policies and personality of the President was a test. But this was a poor test, because the Roosevelt policies were themselves an amalgam of many philosophies.

One test was fairly well observed, and the President himself regarded it as important.

This is very interesting.

People were not to be put in charge of matters in which they had lived their lives and acquired their habits of thought and action. Thus, it was believed, private interests would be kept from places of privilege and power. One Cabinet member, in seeking to fill a responsible place in his department, told me that he wanted only college professors, for only in them could he find intellectual honesty.

I should like to commend to the disciples of that doctrine the testimony of Professor Jessup, to whom, as a member of a subcommittee, I listened for about 2 weeks. What I found to be to me most missing in him was intellectual honesty. I could not discover it in the devious way in which he sought to explain the many difficulties which were found in his past record.

I do not condemn college professors as a class. I sat under them. I am looking at one, now, a very distinguished one, and I know there are others in the Senate. I think probably their average of honesty runs about as high as that of anyone else, no better and no worse. I hope the distinguished former dean of the University of Oregon will agree with me, perhaps, in that statement.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Maine wants my testimony, I may say I completely agree with him that college professors, like Members of Congress, are pretty much a fair cross section of the American populace.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is, they are good and bad.

Mr. MORSE. Included among them are some sophists, and some intellectually dishonest persons; but I think they are decidedly in the minority, just as I think, among Members of Congress, the overwhelming majority are a fair cross-section of the honest elements of the American populace. As a lawyer, it is always a matter of regret to me when I find a shyster developing in the legal profession. There are a few, comparatively speaking; but, by and large, that profession, too, is a fair cross-section. I think, of the general morality of the American people, mostly good, a few bad.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that is very true, because there is a tendency to find a few miscreants. This is also true in government. We have millions of Government employees. I think the growing impression in the country that there is a very large percentage of dishonesty is not justified. We know it

is not true. We know that the vast majority of Government officials and employees are quite as honest as other people. It was David Harum, a very wise observer, who spoke of a phase of life where sometimes some men may be suspected, referring to the fact that there is dishonesty even in horse racing. He said there would never be an honest horse race until there was an honest human race. That is perfectly true. So let us not be surprised when we find some college professors who do not measure up to the standards of intellectual honesty which should prevail in the Senate; but let us not on that account condemn them all.

He goes on to say that it was no secret that a great number of these reformers were admirers of the great Soviet experiment.

I do not know that I should say there was a great number, but he says a great number of these reformers at that time, in 1934 to 1936, were admirers of the great Soviet experiment, and some we now know were secret agents of communism, he says.

He goes on to say:

In my opinion, there is a greater danger in collectivists and in the betrayal of our secrets to foreign powers.

Undoubtedly, that is true.

Then he discusses the transformation and capture of the Democratic Party by groups who were certainly at variance with the fundamental concept of Thomas Jefferson of the least governed being the best governed. The transformation of the party of Jefferson into the centralized bureaucracy of today as far closer to the federalist concepts of Hamilton is one of the most interesting discussions of modern times.

Then he comes to the most stimulating passage, with reference to the forgotten man. He says, at page 65:

It is one of the great ironies of American history that at the very outset of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal the phrase "Forgotten Man" became a major slogan and rallying cry. It so happened that I provided him with the phrase and wove it into an early pre-campaign speech. I took it from a great, perhaps immortal essay by William Graham Sumner, written in 1883. It is well to recall that it was meant to apply by its author, by me, and, I believe, by Roosevelt to the members of a large and substantial group in society, which, incidentally, included all self-dependent farmers and wage earners, as well as many others. I may add, further, that it represented exactly the people I thought the New Deal was going to benefit and exactly the group I am writing about in this chapter. "Now, who," wrote Sumner, "is the Forgotten Man?"

Sumner defined him as the man who earned his living by productive work, who paid taxes, who accumulated a little capital, who was neither the object of help from Government nor the beneficiary of artificial or politically bestowed advantage, who lived up to his contracts, and never asked for favor.

The Forgotten Man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide. He works, he votes, generally he prays—but he always pays—yes; above all he pays. He keeps production go-

ing on. He is strongly patriotic. He gives no trouble. He excites no admiration. He is not in any way a hero or a problem nor notorious nor an object of sentiment nor a burden nor the object of a job nor one over whom sentimental economists and statesmen can parade their fine sentiments. Therefore he is forgotten.

It was for him that the New Deal was originally conceived. Later, because of political expediency, Roosevelt shifted his appeal to a congeries of small segments of the voting population. The early New Deal ended in an alliance of minorities.

He then discusses the American middle interests and goes into detail about the wage earners, about the statement that one-third of America was ill fed, ill housed, and ill clothed, which he very vehemently denies, and he demonstrates the fallacy of the statement, as he undertakes to show. He reaches conclusions as to what we are going to do about it; and that, I think, is what concerns us all.

He does not deny the importance of political parties. In fact, he believes in political parties and wishes to see them continued, but he points out that in the last three presidential elections the Republican Party had 22,000,000 votes, no more, no less. Our Democratic friends across the aisle have been losing votes. They have gone from 27,000,000 down to 24,000,000 votes. In the 1950 election they went off approximately 3,000,000 votes, while the Republican Party went off only 1,000,000 votes. We conducted a vigorous campaign and attacked vigorously, and apparently were rewarded by stirring up more interest, and gained five Senate seats.

Mr. Moley concludes that if America is to be saved in our generation it will be the result of our taking more serious individual interest. The party organizations are fine. We want to see them improved and stimulated and become more active, but in the final analysis, in this horrible trend of lack of interest sufficient to vote, when half of our population is not interested enough to vote after all the sacrifices of the last century, very serious measures are required. Mr. Moley believes that salvation is to be found in individual acts, just like we called the minute men out at Concord and Lexington, who grabbed their muskets and got down to the stone wall and started shooting at the enemy nearest to them. He suggests that all the people who write us letters, all the people who inveigh against things as they are and against corruption in high places, expressing their discontent with Government as it is, instead of seeking to move in at the top and take over the political parties and tell them how to run our affairs, they should start out to get ten of their neighbors to take enough interest to vote. If one person out of ten of those who voted Republican in each of the last three presidential elections would just get one out of ten of the 45,000,000 persons who did not vote—they do not have to persuade any Democrats; leave them alone with their own discontented lot—

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator from Maine mean to say that he is thinking about someone else with a discontented lot? Is he not a little bit—

Mr. BREWSTER. I might accept the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina that we on this side of the aisle are a little disunited, but that is our problem, and I was leaving the Senator to handle his own problem.

If the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I can come somewhere near agreeing, then we have made a great advance. When we go to the theater, when we go to church, when we walk on the street, the fellow on the right or on the left of us did not vote. Thirty-five percent of the wives did not vote, and they are supposed to be even better citizens than are the men.

Mr. Moley undertakes to make a suggestion about the individual American. He addresses his suggestion to the 45,000,000 uninterested persons who do a lot of talking. I am sure it will be found that of the 45,000,000 persons who did not vote, very many of them are willing to tell us what all the trouble is about. We find them giving very strong ideas. But on election day something happens. They are mesmerized. They stay at home.

Mr. Moley shows in his book how all interested Americans, both inside and outside party organizations, can make themselves effective and how they can do something to recapture for America the priceless privilege of a self-governing republic, by which alone we may hope to make America secure.

Mr. President, I end as I began, by saying that the Constitution guarantees a republican form of government. That is what it says—a republican form of government. I hope my great constitutional friends on the other side of the aisle will occasionally remind themselves of that. I do not say that means the Republican Party, although that was the party of Thomas Jefferson. He called himself a Republican, and it was his idea that there was to be very little government—the less government, the better.

I think we have to correct the notion that America will ever be a pure democracy. Certainly with a population of more than 150,000,000, it is impossible. But I do commend to the people of this country consideration of this matter, and I hope that as time goes on we too may give a little more of a literary flavor to the deliberations of this body by occasionally calling attention to the fact that we have to have a certain modicum of intellectual life.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad the Senator from Maine has taken time on the floor today to call attention to the latest writing, the latest book, by one of the teachers who exercised a tremendous influence on my political thinking, especially in relation to the importance of constitutional guaranties.

The outline or synopsis of the book the Senator from Maine has given us

falls very definitely into the pattern of teaching which it was my privilege to enjoy as I sat at the feet of Dr. Moley at Columbia University.

I feel certain that the Senator from Maine will be interested to know that Dr. Moley is a very keen student of political movements which during our history have had a tremendous appeal to independent voters. I remember very vividly Dr. Moley's discussions of the Bull Moose movement. He was a keen student of the political movement that gave rise to the power of the elder LaFollette in Wisconsin.

As I recall many of Dr. Moley's lectures, he always stressed the importance of the parties strengthening themselves by reducing the number of independent voters. He said that if there continued to be an increase in the number of independent voters, the parties had better look to themselves to find the reason. Parties will usually find the answer within themselves if they will closely scrutinize their programs, policies, and procedures, particularly their election procedures, and their failure to bring about reforms in election laws that will give to the people a true freedom of choice in the selection of their candidates, as, for example, in State primaries.

Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the Senator from Maine has called our attention to this book, because I surmise that both parties, including my own, will find in it some very valuable food for thought as to what can be done within their own party organizations in respect to programs and improvements in party procedure which will really reduce the size of the independent vote. Thereby, I trust that more and more independent voters will be brought back into our party, in support of what I shall continue to insist is its real objective, that is, to put into legislative practice what I have so frequently called the property and human rights guaranties of the Constitution, which is merely another name for constitutional liberalism.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the comments made by the Senator from Oregon, and I appreciate them.

I believe that today we should be very much more excited and concerned about nonvoters than independent voters. I believe that distinction should be clearly kept in mind. To know that there are 45,000,000 nonvoters really gets me quite excited. I hope that in this campaign year, during the next few months, as a result of good, stimulating discussion, we may arouse a great number of such people from their torpor and apathy and awaken them to the opportunity which is presented to them to record themselves at the polls.

PURCHASING POWER OF THE AMERICAN DOLLAR

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, during the past 12 or 15 years, the value of our money has declined to the point where each dollar is worth only 53 cents, compared with its value during the period just before the outbreak of

World War II. That is, each dollar today will buy only 53 cents worth of food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities, compared with what it would buy during the prewar period.

This collapse in the value of our money has created a desperately serious problem for millions of people who have saved up to buy Government bonds or other bonds, who have savings accounts, and who have bought life insurance for themselves and their families. It has caused great hardship for millions who must live on pensions, annuities, and retirement funds. They find that the income they counted on to support them is no longer sufficient to buy even the bare necessities. A man who has attempted to make provision for his family through life insurance finds that the policies on which he has paid premiums are no longer adequate to take care of their needs in the event of his death.

What is the cause of this destruction of the value of our money? Who has stolen away almost half the buying power of our savings?

There is only one answer. It is due to the excessive spending and borrowing of this administration. History gives us numerous examples of nations which have destroyed their money by overspending and inflating the currency. For example, Germany, following World War I, spent so recklessly that finally it took a whole bushel of paper currency to buy a loaf of bread.

In many European countries during the last few years, the same thing has happened. As governments have spent and spent, the value of their money has gone down and down. The French franc, which was worth 20 cents 40 years ago, is now worth only a small fraction of a penny. In our own country during the period of the Revolutionary War, the Continental Congress spent money it did not have. The currency soon became worthless, and that is where we get our phrase "not worth a continental."

In the field of government finance, as in our personal lives, there are basic moral laws that control our actions, whether we like it or not. For a short time it may seem easier to borrow and spend than to balance the budget and pay our just debts, but there is always a day of reckoning. Eventually we find that by this policy, the savings of our people have been destroyed.

I do not believe we can afford to go through the wringer of inflation. Too many millions of people are dependent on a fixed weekly salary or wage, or a pension, an annuity, or the receipts from a life insurance policy taken out many years ago when the dollar was worth a hundred cents. In Germany, the destruction of all savings by the inflation of the 1920's created such desperation that it paved the way directly for the advent of Hitler. We must not let such conditions come into existence here.

To keep our Government strong, we must keep our money sound. As long as I am in the Senate, I intend to continue to work and vote against the spending and waste which is destroying the buying power of our dollars.

USE OF UNITED STATES MAILS FOR CIRCULATING COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate, and to place in the body of the RECORD, several communications which I have received relative to the use by the Soviet Union and its agencies of the American postal system for circulating Communist propaganda in this country. I think Members of the Senate will find the correspondence of interest.

The first item is a letter dated November 19, 1951, addressed to Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General of the United States, Washington, D. C., and signed by Alexander J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools of Los Angeles, in which he says:

DEAR MR. DONALDSON: Our attention has been called to the fact that a booklet entitled "U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin," which is evidently a communistic propaganda publication, is being circulated through the United States mail free of charge to public-school libraries. The purpose of this letter is to inquire whether there is anything in our postal regulations that would prevent the circulation of this kind of material through the mail. Any information that you can give me on this subject would be deeply appreciated.

Yours respectfully,

ALEXANDER J. STODDARD,
Superintendent of Schools.

The next is a letter dated January 7, 1952, addressed to me by Mr. Bruce A. Findlay, associate superintendent of the Los Angeles schools, calling attention to the letter which had previously been written to the Postmaster General.

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

LOS ANGELES CITY
BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 7, 1952.
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: On October 29, 1951, Superintendent Stoddard of the Los Angeles City Schools presented to the board of education a statement in which he directed the attention of the board to the fact that the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin was being mailed to the libraries and to some of our school people without their consent. Superintendent Stoddard wrote to the honorable Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General of the United States, under date of November 19, 1951. Copy of this letter is enclosed. No reply as of this date has been received from Postmaster General Donaldson.

Last week, a repetition of the same incident occurred. Some individuals in libraries received additional copies of Russian propaganda.

At the meeting of the board of education held January 3, 1952, President Burke introduced a resolution which was unanimously carried. The resolution states:

"The board of education direct a communication to Senators KNOWLAND and NIXON and to our Representatives protesting the bombardment of the public-school system with communistic and subversive propagandistic material; that the elected Representatives in Congress be requested to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress of the United States with the view of taking appropriate action to prevent abuse of the United States mail; and that our Senators and Representatives be informed that a letter on this subject was written to the

Postmaster General weeks ago but has not yet been acknowledged or answered."

The board of education and the superintendent of schools of Los Angeles city would be grateful to you for any suggested steps that you might take to conform with the spirit of the resolution.

Very truly yours,

BRUCE A. FINDLAY,
Associate Superintendent,
Office of Board Services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The next is a letter which I have received from Mr. F. M. Chase, Jr., district superintendent of the Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High School District, of California, calling attention to the fact that the same thing was being done in his area of California.

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

OCEANSIDE-CARLSBAD UNION
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Oceanside, Calif., January 9, 1952.
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KNOWLAND: The board of trustees of the Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High School and Junior College District has noted with deep concern the numerous publications of the U. S. S. R. and its satellites which are being sent through the mails to our high school and junior college offices, to our district office, and to the school library. These papers, pamphlets, and booklets are, in general, printed by the embassies of these Communist countries. They are direct propaganda favoring the Communist form of government, and slanted to influence American thinking in favor of the Communists. Our board feels that the public schools are one of the vital organs in the development and functioning of the Government of the United States and they resent this open and continued effort at discrediting that way of life.

The board furthermore feels that since we are virtually at war with the proponents of this Communist ideology, that steps should be taken to minimize, at least, their efforts within our own borders even though such measures in normal times might be contrary to one of the basic tenets of the United States Government which we seek to protect. The board, therefore, respectfully urges that you seriously consider means of barring from the United States mail Communist propaganda emanating from the U. S. S. R. and its satellites.

Respectfully,

F. M. CHASE, Jr.,
District Superintendent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The next is a letter which I addressed to Mr. Findlay, associate superintendent of the Los Angeles City Schools.

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

JANUARY 24, 1952.
Mr. BRUCE A. FINDLAY,
Associate Superintendent, Los Angeles
City Board of Education,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. FINDLAY: Thank you for your letter and enclosure concerning certain publications which are being mailed to the libraries and schools.

I appreciate your bringing this matter to my attention, and will request the Post Office to investigate the situation.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The next item is a letter which I received from Mr. Roy

C. Frank, Solicitor of the Post Office Department, dated January 30, 1952, in which he says:

DEAR SENATOR: This will acknowledge your communication of January 24, 1952, addressed to the Postmaster General, transmitting a letter from Mr. Bruce A. Findlay, Los Angeles associate superintendent of schools, wherein inquiry is made concerning a communication from Mr. Alexander J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools of that city. You also enclose a letter addressed to you by Mr. F. M. Chase, Jr., district superintendent, Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High School District, Oceanside, Calif.

There is transmitted herewith a copy of a letter sent to Mr. Stoddard on January 7, 1952. If you desire any further information, I shall be pleased to supply it upon request.

The enclosures which accompanied your communication are also herewith.

Sincerely yours,

ROY C. FRANK,
Solicitor.

The next is a letter which the Solicitor of the Post Office Department sent to Mr. Stoddard, and which reads as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1952.

Mr. ALEXANDER J. STODDARD,
Superintendent, Los Angeles City
Schools, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. STODDARD: This will acknowledge your letter of November 19, 1951, addressed to the Postmaster General, relative to a publication entitled "U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin," which you state is being circulated through the United States mails free of charge.

Several issues of this bulletin have heretofore been examined in this office. There is no authority under existing law for the Post Office Department to exclude such material from the mails.

Foreign propaganda literature may be treated as nonmailable if sent by one subject to and not registered in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. However, the provisions of this act are not applicable to a duly accredited diplomatic officer of a foreign government or any member of his staff. The magazine in question is published by the embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Washington, D. C.

This publication is not distributed without payment of postage. Examination of the copies in our files shows that the postage was paid on them at the third-class rate.

It is regretted that the volume of correspondence received in this office delayed the sending of an earlier reply to your letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROY C. FRANK,
Solicitor.

More recently I received a letter from a private citizen calling my attention to another device being used by the Soviet Union. He says:

DEAR SENATOR: In reference to the enclosed. My first magazine came today, and was sent back marked "refused."

I don't like the decorations on the stationery; I don't know who "Sam" may be; and I don't see why the Soviet Embassy is allowed to publish this stuff and send it through the mails.

Respectfully,

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.
RALPH D. KNOWLES.

The device which was used was a holiday greeting addressed to him. This carried postage. It says:

HOLIDAY GREETINGS

The U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin (published by Soviet Embassy in Washington) is

being sent to you for 1 year as the gift of Sam.

No last name is given. Apparently it is a dodge or blind, because the man who wrote to me stated that he had no information as to who the donor of this gift might be.

The next item is a letter which I addressed to Mr. Ralph D. Knowles in response to his request.

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

FEBRUARY 1, 1952.

Mr. RALPH D. KNOWLES,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. KNOWLES: This will acknowledge with thanks your letter of January 21, together with the attached notice that a 1-year subscription to the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin would be forwarded as a gift. I appreciate your calling this matter to my attention.

I have taken the matter up with the Post Office Department and you may be assured the subject will receive my very careful attention.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to do any further research on this matter. I merely wish to call it to the attention of the Senate. I do not know whether this barrage of Soviet propaganda is being sent through the United States mails aimed only at Californians, or whether other Senators may also have had the matter called to their attention.

I submit the material for the information of the Senate and for the information of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in order to ascertain what, if anything, can be done with respect to this matter. I have very grave doubt in my own mind, if the United States wanted to circulate from its Embassy in Moscow a United States Information Bulletin through the mails to Soviet citizens of its own choice, whether in the first place it would be allowed to do so, and, secondly, what might happen to the Soviet citizens who received such bulletins from the United States Embassy.

I have felt for a long period of time that the sooner we get on a quid pro quo basis with the Soviet Union the more respect we will command at home and abroad.

Assuming that we would not be permitted to use the Soviet mails for such a purpose I doubt very much the wisdom of permitting the Soviet Embassy and the Soviet Government to use the United States mails to distribute communistic propaganda.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, when I ran for reelection in 1946, I predicted that by the end of my second term the REA would bring electric power to practically every farmer in Nebraska who wanted it, where physically feasible to do so. That seemed like a rather risky prediction to make at the time and it was received with skepticism. Less than one-third of the farmers had electricity at that time, and it had taken

a good many years to bring electrification even up to that point.

My second term will run not quite another year, but I am pleased to announce that my prediction is already nearly fulfilled. Of the 107,000 farms in Nebraska, about 96,000 had central station electric service on last November 30. As of that same date, loans had been approved to bring electricity to an additional 9,500 rural consumers, including a few in villages. Putting those figures together, 98 or 99 percent of the farms and ranches in the State already either have electricity, or are on the schedule for approved construction.

When we consider it, this program of REA construction represents one of the most tremendous achievements in Nebraska history. For most Nebraska farmers, it has made more of a change in their daily lives than any other single thing during this past 6 years.

I have felt a special obligation to help the REA locals with their construction programs in every way possible. Most of the construction job, of course, was a matter of plain hard work and sound financing—plus adequate Government loan funds. But there were times when the farmers needed help from their Senators and Representatives. Times without number I have been called on to help an REA local secure a loan, or help in some other manner, and I have always been glad to do it.

For example, there has been a constant problem of securing materials. The shortage of materials was at its worst in 1949, when orders for aluminum were back-logged 18 months.

I and other Members of Congress went to work for aluminum allocations, for more power for aluminum production, for imports. We stirred up enough fuss to secure diversion of considerable tonnages of aluminum production to fill the construction need.

We had another problem last year, when it appeared that controls on aluminum and copper might be placed in hands unfriendly to the REA program. I personally worked very hard and successfully to have these controls transferred into the sympathetic hands of the Rural Electrification Administration itself.

Through it all, the program has been kept on a sound financial basis. Rural electrification has been financed by loans, not gifts. These loans are being repaid, with interest. Of the 36 REA borrowers in Nebraska, not one is delinquent in its repayments, and almost two-thirds of them have made payments in advance. The whole program has been conducted without any graft, without influence peddlers or 5 percenters, without loss to the Government. I wish the same could be said for other Government agencies.

Now that the construction job is nearly finished, it is gratifying to look back on what has been accomplished. I know that farmers are grateful for the tremendous convenience of electricity. For my part, it has been a real source of gratification to reflect on the contribution I have been able to make toward the success of this great development.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SENATOR RUSSELL'S CANDIDACY FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am honored to be privileged to read into the Record at this time an announcement just made by one of our distinguished and esteemed colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. It is, I believe, of great interest to very citizen of this Nation. I quote the statement of our distinguished colleague, issued to the press this afternoon:

The people of my native State have never failed to make generous response to every request I have ever made of them. In the same spirit, I can do no less than to comply with the unanimous requests of the General Assembly and the State Democratic Executive Committee of Georgia that I permit my name to be presented as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency.

The real issues facing the American people today, are those which rightfully should unite men rather than divide them. If there be one universal yearning in the minds and hearts of the American people, it is the desire to avoid the calamity of a third world war. Insofar as our international relations are concerned, the strength which must come from unity is the only way to peace.

Whatever sacrifice may be entailed, we must maintain a defense system adequate to our needs.

We cannot escape the responsibilities of world leadership, but in dealing with the problems of today's troubled world, we should ever be mindful of the limitations of the economic system which is the basic source of our greatness and the foundation upon which our precious way of life is erected. If we are to survive, it must be conserved and protected. National spending, including our assistance to other free people, must be carefully weighed against our ability to pay and produce.

No honest candidate for public office in these times can consider the tempting prospects of promising "all things to all men." Our future security depends upon our self-restraint and ability to cooperate with one another. Our cherished liberties were not easily won. In today's troubled world they will not be easily held. Our hopes for salvation can only be realized through willingness to serve and sacrifice.

The very foundation stone of popular government is the confidence of the people in their public servants. Fraud, corruption, and divided loyalties cannot be tolerated in positions of trust and confidence.

Among the dangers to our continued freedom is any unchecked trend toward the concentration of all of the powers of Government in the National Capital. The founding fathers, who had suffered the tyrannies of overcentralized government, wisely sought to define and limit the Federal power.

I am a Jeffersonian Democrat who believes in the greatest practicable degree of local self-government. The maintenance of the rights of the States in an indissoluble union is our protection against that loss of individual rights and liberties which has always followed undue centralization of authority.

In accepting this call I welcome the support of all American citizens who have faith in the democratic system of government and willingness to work for its preservation.

Mr. President, that is one of the most profound declarations of views and principles that it has been my privilege to read, or to have heard, since I have been a Member of this body. I am sure this announcement will strike a sympathetic interest and an enthusiastic response in

the hearts of our people. In my opinion, it will and should command the support of millions of Americans who today have begun to wonder about some of the policies which our Government is pursuing and about the ultimate destiny of our Nation.

This solemn declaration of principles comes from one whom we personally know and who is admired and esteemed by all of his colleagues and by millions of his fellow citizens. It will give encouragement to many who have become discouraged. It will offer some hope to those who have despaired. It will hearten many who have been disillusioned. It is a declaration of principles to which all good Americans can repair with complete faith and trust, and with full confidence in the capacity, integrity, and character of its author.

His candidacy offers to our people an opportunity to select for the Presidency a man of stature and possessing those qualities of leadership that are so sorely needed at home and abroad in this era of grave world crisis.

Mr. President, I am happy indeed to make these brief remarks and comments for the Record.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brewster	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	Nixon
Cain	Jenner	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kerr	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Schaeffer
Cordon	Knowland	Seaton
Douglas	Langer	Smathers
Duff	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Long	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ellender	Malone	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Thye
Flanders	Maybank	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young
Hayden	McMahon	
Hendrickson		

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] are absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Idaho

[Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is recognized.

COORDINATOR OF FEDERAL AGENCIES IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, last week on the Senate floor I called attention to the fact that the Interior Department had ignored a law enacted in 1947 which created the position of Coordinator of Federal Agencies in Puerto Rico. At that time, I read into the RECORD a letter I had written to Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman asking for an explanation in the matter and I stated that I would put his reply in the RECORD when I received it.

I have here the reply of the Interior Department, signed by Dale Doty, Assistant Secretary, acting for Mr. Chapman who was away from his office.

That letter reads as follows:

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: This will acknowledge your letter of February 11, 1952, regarding the position of coordinator of Federal agencies in Puerto Rico.

The position of Coordinator of Federal Activities was created by an amendment to the organic act of Puerto Rico made by the Eightieth Congress. The provision relating to the position was added by a Senate amendment to H. R. 3309, which authorized the people of Puerto Rico to elect their Governor beginning with the 1948 election, the Governor's term to begin on February 2, 1949. The position of coordinator was devised to provide for a position filled by appointment of the President after the time when the governor's position became elective. The position was suggested by Senator TAFT. No such provision appeared in the House bill or in the bill reported on by the Department of the Interior. The Department had no opportunity to comment on this provision of the bill.

The position as originally created carried a salary of \$7,500 to be paid by Federal appropriation. It appeared unlikely that any person of competence could be found to fill the position at that salary, and Senator BURLER accordingly introduced a bill in April 1948 to raise the salary of the position from \$7,500 to \$10,000. The salary increase was enacted on June 24, 1948, effective 30 days from that date. It had the Department's endorsement.

As stated, it was not intended that the position would be filled until there was an elected governor in 1949. No supplemental estimate was submitted by the Department during 1949 to take care of the position because of the policy of the Bureau of the Budget that it would not consider supplemental estimates unless due to circumstances not foreseeable at the time the annual estimates were submitted or to subsequent action by the Congress.

However, an estimate was included in the Interior Department submission for 1950, covering a salary for the coordinator of \$10,330, the salary of a stenographer, and travel, communications, and other expenses, totaling in all \$15,000. The Director of the Of-

fice of Territories appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee to justify the estimate. The Appropriations Committee, however, refused to approve the request. The committee's report (H. Rept. No. 324, 81st Cong., 1st sess.) states, on page 25:

"The 1950 budget requests \$15,000 for establishing a coordinator of Federal agencies in Puerto Rico. The request is not approved by the committee and no funds for this purpose are contained in the bill. The coordination of Federal activities in Puerto Rico can be effected through firm and administrative directives to agencies having programs in this area. The establishment of a coordinator would merely palliate the conditions sought to be controlled or prevented."

The matter was discussed with various interested Senators who agreed with the view expressed in the House report. No funds were made available by the Senate.

The Department did not resubmit the item for the fiscal year 1950, because there was pending before the Congress the bill which was enacted on July 3, 1950, the constitution bill for Puerto Rico, which authorized the people of Puerto Rico to adopt their constitution and provide that upon approval of the constitution by the Congress, many of the provisions of the organic act, including the one relating to the coordinator, would automatically be repealed. For that reason, it appeared unnecessary and undesirable to request funds for the position which has been left in abeyance for possible activation if any developments in Puerto Rico should make such action desirable. Happily, under the administration of Governor Muñoz-Marin, Federal relations with Puerto Rico and the internal affairs of the island have been better than at any previous period. The Puerto Rican government under full democratic controls has demonstrated in a fashion which has attracted world-wide attention and approval the ability of the people of Puerto Rico to meet their very difficult economic and social problems. It is the view of this Department that in this effort they deserve the understanding and support of this Government in all its branches.

Sincerely yours,

DALE DOTY,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, that letter seems to beg the question. It is an alibi for not having complied with a statute which is crystal clear in its requirements and meaning.

Close examination of Mr. Doty's letter reveals that it is largely an apology for the government of Puerto Rico. This raises another question. Where is the primary loyalty of the Interior Department? To the government of Puerto Rico or to the people of the United States whose taxes support the Interior Department?

Mr. President, let us examine just what kind of a government it is which Mr. Doty and the Interior Department defend for the major part of their long letter to me.

At the end of my remarks I shall insert in the RECORD an item from *El Mundo*, which has been described as the leading Spanish-language newspaper in Puerto Rico. This item is dated December 3, 1950, and it is very damaging to the Puerto Rican Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marin. One statement in this item interests me very much, just as I am sure it will interest every other loyal American. The item, among other things, states that Governor Muñoz, in 1936, refused to mount the speakers' platform at a political meeting of the Liberal Party

in Caguas until the United States flag—our flag—was removed from the platform.

I do not know whether that statement is based on fact, Mr. President, but I say that if it is, it is a very serious matter, which should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress.

What manner of man is this who is being kept in power by the Interior Department? If he has insulted our flag, is it not an outrage to pour millions of American tax dollars into the hands of an anti-American demagog?

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the distinguished Senator from South Carolina question the fact that the present Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marin, was elected by the people of Puerto Rico at a free election, by an overwhelming majority?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not questioning his being elected by the people; but even though he were elected by 90 percent of the people, if it is true that he said, "Down with the American flag," I am one who would say, "Down with the Governor of Puerto Rico."

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If it is a fact that Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin was elected by an overwhelming vote of the people of Puerto Rico at a free election, how can the distinguished Senator from South Carolina claim that he is being kept in office or has been kept in office by the Department of the Interior?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am saying that the facts ought to be brought out, and that the coordinator should be appointed to look into the spending of our money and how it is used in Puerto Rico. If it is being used by political parties, then I think it is time for us to wake up.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has just read a statement which showed that an appropriation for a coordinator which was asked for was eliminated by the House in an appropriation bill, and that there was no appropriation made to pay the salary or expenses of a coordinator. Under those circumstances, how could a coordinator have been selected?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator, if he has been listening, heard me read also that the Department of the Interior did not thereafter ask for the appropriation.

Mr. LEHMAN. How would the distinguished Senator from South Carolina propose to pay the salary of a coordinator, if an appropriation was not made by Congress? I know of no way.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When Congress passes legislation providing that there be a coordinator, I think it is the duty of the Department of

the Interior to go before the committee year in and year out and ask for necessary appropriations to carry out the direction until the law is repealed.

Has Mr. Dale Doty the effrontery to plead before us in the interest of a government which is headed by a man who has demonstrated extreme contempt and disloyalty for our great Nation? If these statements are true, then they should be investigated.

Can we, as the elected representatives of the American people, countenance a deplorable situation of this kind? How must we appear in the eyes of the world when we pay homage to a man who has so grossly insulted our national dignity if what this newspaper says is true?

These are questions which demand answers.

After a series of excuses for the earlier years, all of which added up to the fact that a law has been sidestepped, the Department of the Interior states as its reason for not complying in 1950, that the statute would be automatically repealed if the new Constitution of Puerto Rico were adopted in Puerto Rico and ratified by the Congress.

Mr. President, we are now in 1952, and that constitution is still not a reality. I understand that it will come before Congress for discussion and approval or rejection within a few weeks, but it might be a very long time before that constitution becomes a valid instrument which automatically repeals anything whatsoever.

It would seem to be rather strange reasoning on the part of the Department of the Interior when they argue that there was no compliance with this law, because it would be repealed by Public Law 600 when the latter became operative. If we are to follow this line of reasoning, we might as well abandon the collection of taxes under existing tax laws, for the reason that amendments to those tax laws have been introduced in Congress. In other words, Mr. President, a law is a law the moment it is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, and any failure to comply with the law by a Federal agency is a violation of the intent of Congress. It is hardly valid for a Federal agency to claim the right to ignore a law because it might be repealed in the future. My statement is borne out in this particular instance by the fact that the statute calling for a coordinator in Puerto Rico was enacted in 1948, and we are now in 1952, with no repeal having been effected, and with no assurance that it will be in the foreseeable future.

If there is any question as to the intent of the Congress in enacting the statute to which I refer, let me cite the Senate report on the measure, which gives the following explanation of why it was enacted:

Section 7 provides for the position of Coordinator of Federal Agencies in Puerto Rico. At the present time, there are at least 58 Federal agencies with field offices or branches operating in the island. Many of them are engaged in giving aid to Puerto Rico on bases that seem to be at times conflicting and contradictory. Based on a recent inspection trip by several members of the committee, there seemed to be a need to bring the ac-

tivities of all these agencies into focus and eliminate unnecessary duplication and waste.

In some cases, the committee feels that Federal laws and systems of regulation, drafted with an eye to conditions in the 48 States, may have been extended too fast and in too far reaching a manner into an island with cultural traditions and economic methods dissimilar from those on the mainland. The establishment of the position of coordinator will permit a continuing study of the application of such Federal statutes and of the operation of these Federal agencies to the life of the island. The coordinator will have power to recommend measures of coordination among them or even the elimination of those which duplicate or conflict with each other or with activities of the island government. He will have no power except to make recommendations. It is felt that such recommendations can be of tremendous benefit to the Congress and the President in placing the functioning of our Federal agencies on a sounder and more efficient basis in Puerto Rico.

There seems always to have been a cloak of secrecy about the office of coordinator. In the printed House hearings on the Department of the Interior appropriations bill in 1950 the following appears:

Mr. NORRELL (Representative from Arkansas). What will he do?

Mr. DAVIS. His functions are in general to observe the operations of Federal agencies in Puerto Rico and report them to the President.

(Discussion off the record.)

It appears according to the record, that there was discussion off the record. Why should a discussion of this important question be off the record?

It would seem that the Interior Department has very cleverly postponed for one reason or another the appointment of a Federal coordinator, as required by law, thus defeating the intention of the Congress to have a watchdog in Puerto Rico to protect the interests of the American taxpayer.

Regardless of whether or not the Puerto Rican Constitution is approved in Congress, the Interior Department still stands guilty of noncompliance with a directive of the Congress. I repeat my statement of last week that the Department nurtures an atmosphere in which dictatorship in Puerto Rico can flourish, and at the same time use American dollars.

Mr. President, it is time to get on with an investigation of the present regime in Puerto Rico.

Several of us have said on the floor that charges of un-American conduct have been made against the Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marín. Among examples of such charges there has come to my attention one which I should like to insert in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks. It is contained in an article from the Puerto Rican daily newspaper *El Mundo* of December 3, 1950. I ask unanimous consent to have this newspaper article printed in the body of the Record as a part of my remarks.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question or two before the article is placed in the Record.

Who is the publisher of this newspaper?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know, but it is one of the leading newspapers in Puerto Rico.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator know that it is a very biased newspaper, owned by the big capitalists of Puerto Rico who have been fighting this governor for many years? Does not the Senator know that when the governor tried to help the poor people of Puerto Rico so that the little man could buy a small piece of land, that newspaper fought every attempt on the part of the United States Government to hold down the large sized ranches and farms?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that the United States has been the agency which has built houses in Puerto Rico. It has been the United States that has paid for them. Our money has been used there. That is one reason why I want a coordinator to look into the subject and see just what has been done, and who should get credit for it.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator know that only a few houses have been built when many thousands were needed? Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt went to Puerto Rico and made a personal investigation, which showed that the housing which has been built is so far out in the country that a poor man cannot afford to live there. By the time he pays his fare into town and back again, the small amount of money which he receives makes it impossible to live in one of those houses.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So the Senator from North Dakota acknowledges that much of the building that has been done on the island by the Government of the United States has probably been located in the wrong place.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There should be a coordinator to look into the building program. That is what I want.

Mr. LANGER. I want to tell my distinguished friend the Senator from South Carolina that some of those buildings are a little too far out of town. They are almost at the city limits. Conditions are so horrible and the slums are so terrible as absolutely to beggar description.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not disagreeing with the Senator from North Dakota concerning the conditions there. My information agrees with his, that conditions in Puerto Rico are terrible.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator agree further that the man who has done the most to alleviate those conditions is the present Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marín, who has done an outstanding job after being elected by the people, in trying to remedy conditions, and that he has had strong opposition all the time from the newspaper *El Mundo*?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I must disagree with the Senator from

North Dakota. The United States itself has done a large part of the building in Puerto Rico.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to my distinguished friend from South Carolina that we have not begun to do one one-hundredth of what should be done in the way of building to take care of the poor, desperate people of Puerto Rico. I believe that the Governor, instead of being criticized by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, should be complimented for the job he is doing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator agree that there should be an investigation which would prove that Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín has been a good Governor, if that is a fact?

Mr. LANGER. We have had a great many investigations—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I want to know the facts.

Mr. LANGER. I have sat and listened to committees upon their return from Puerto Rico. When we read their reports, what do we find? We find description after description of poverty, want, suffering, and starvation. I would rather see an investigation made, not with respect to the coordinator, but with respect to the reason why the United States Government, which is today trying to tell everyone else in the world how to live, has not made a success of Puerto Rico, with its 2,000,000 inhabitants.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Perhaps we have not been advised as we should have been. We probably need a coordinator to advise us.

Mr. LANGER. We have sent committee after committee to the island. I have no objection to the article being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the admission of the article—and I do not intend to object—I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina whether or not he knows that this newspaper is an extremely biased publication, antagonistic to the present governor. I believe that it took the side of certain contractors in their fight with the Governor of Puerto Rico. These contractors claimed certain tax exemptions, which the Governor refused to grant. The claims for tax exemption were then taken to the courts of Puerto Rico, and I believe to the Federal court in this country, and were rejected. I think it would be interesting for the distinguished Senator from South Carolina to look into the cause, for the opposition of this newspaper to the Governor. The newspaper has been opposed to the Governor of Puerto Rico, Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, for a number of years. It has fought him tooth and nail.

When the Senator from South Carolina suggests that we investigate the regime of the Governor of Puerto Rico, it seems to me that he is enunciating a very unusual doctrine. The Governor was elected by the people under authority given to Puerto Rico by the Congress of the United States. Certainly we are not going to investigate a governor who has been elected by the people, whether it be the people of a State or of a Territory. He was not appointed by the President of the United States

or by the Congress. He was elected by the people of Puerto Rico in a free election, by a great majority. The vote was a thoroughly well invested expression of confidence in a man who has long been a fine public servant.

With respect to the Constitution, which the Senator from South Carolina has discussed, and of which he is critical, I wish to point out that the proposal to hold an election, leading to a constitutional convention, was favorably reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, and was passed by the Congress. The people voted for it. The Constitution is now completed, and will be referred to the people for approval at an election on March 3. I do not know what greater or finer demonstration of democratic government we could have than in just what has happened in Puerto Rico.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Has the Senator been in Puerto Rico recently?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have been there, but I do not claim to be an expert on Puerto Rico.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator does not claim to be an expert?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; but I know a great many Puerto Ricans. There is a large population of Puerto Ricans in my State. They are good citizens—hard working and thrifty.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand that they are leaving Puerto Rico by the thousands and going to New York at the present time. They are pouring into New York, are they not?

Mr. LEHMAN. A great many are coming in and we welcome them, but I think that bears out what the Senator from North Dakota has been saying. We have never done enough for Puerto Rico, and we should do more. Puerto Ricans are receiving only a pittance in the form of aid or social security and they have great difficulty in finding gainful employment at home.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from New York realizes that at the present time we are pouring millions of dollars into Puerto Rico. We certainly should watch how we are spending those millions of dollars there, as well as our expenditures in the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly we should and I believe we are doing that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It makes no difference where we spend the money, it is the Senator's duty and mine to look into the question and see whether we are spending it in the right places and in the right amounts.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no objection to the article referred to being printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

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

BEHIND THE SCENES

(By J. M. Garcia Calderon)

Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín—one-time champion of the cause of independence for Puerto Rico—is conducting superhuman efforts to

convince our fellow citizens in the United States that the only person responsible for the propaganda being circulated from Mexico to Argentina and which presents our Nation as a cruel and inhuman and imperialist people who tyrannize and exploit the Puerto Rican unmercifully is Mr. Pedro Albizu Campos, the Nationalist leader who inspired the Nationalist uprising during the thirties and last October's insurrection.

Without any doubt, Mr. Albizu Campos shares the responsibility for the existence of this black story which is now being used by the agents of Moscow, and those countries south of the Rio Grande, to poison the feelings of those people toward the United States, and to sow prejudice and suspicion against the United States.

It is very, very true that part of the responsibility for the existence of this absurd story is Mr. Albizu Campos. But another part of the responsibility hangs on the very same leaders of the present government of Puerto Rico who contributed and cooperated in the sad mission of discrediting and defaming the United States.

YANKEE IMPERIALISM

The ink is still fresh which was used to print pamphlets and propaganda articles by the leaders of the present insular government denouncing "the Yankee imperialism in Puerto Rico." In many libraries—and amongst them my modest one—there are pamphlets written by leaders of the Insular Government accusing the United States of maintaining in Puerto Rico a regime of inhuman exploitation and loaded with falsehoods which would detract from the prestige of the United States.

The systematic campaign of discredit against the United States is not the work of Mr. Albizu Campos exclusively. In that unjust campaign can be seen the brain, the hand, and the name of Mr. Luis Muñoz-Marín.

Because its occurrence was fairly recent, many people must remember that Mr. Muñoz-Marín demanded in the year 1936 that the United States flag be removed from the speaker's platform in a meeting of the liberal party in Caguas before he would enter that platform.

POINT TO SIMILARITY

Such a conduct demonstrates nothing but hostility against the United States, and furnishes material for the black legend which was being woven to discredit the United States.

What was done by Mr. Muñoz-Marín in Caguas in 1936 was very similar to the preachings of Albizu Campos, about whom the one who is now Governor of Puerto Rico (Muñoz-Marín) then called the greatest thing that has happened in this country.

And it should also be remembered that about 13 or 14 years ago, when the Nationalists were fighting against Governor Blanton Winship, and other American and Puerto Rican officials, and were kicking and ripping the American flag in the university and in the central high school in Santurce, leaders of the present government of Puerto Rico (of Muñoz-Marín) applauded until their hands burned and expressed their support of the aggressors and offenders against the law.

Proof of this assertion and proof that leaders of the present Muñoz government of Puerto Rico tolerated the violence which was advised by Albizu Campos in the year 1936, and proof also that those leaders contributed and cooperated to the creation of the black legend which still discredits the United States, is contained in these declarations which Mr. Luis Muñoz-Marín made for the press on March 19, 1936. Regarding the Nationalists' violence, Mr. Muñoz-Marín then stated:

THEY ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE

"I only want to state today that, in any event that may occur, no Puerto Rican Gov-

ernment official who respects himself should fire on any student or against any other Puerto Rican. I state this with a full feeling of responsibility, and because I know that we Puerto Ricans are not responsible, but rather it is due to the incapacity of the Government of the United States that we face the situation prevailing in Puerto Rico, and which stimulates such collective tragedies."

Such words of Mr. Muñoz-Marín, as well as the words of Mr. Albizu Campos—more sharp but more, more serious than those of Mr. Muñoz-Marín—did not remain in the insular atmosphere; they expanded, flew, and circulated throughout the world, carrying a false but terrible accusation against the United States, which gave rise to suspicions that the Puerto Ricans were being burned alive, or that they were being shot in the streets by the Americans.

During those same days—the year 1936—while Mr. Albizu Campos advised the overthrow of the Government of the United States in Puerto Rico, and Mr. Muñoz-Marín preached the abstinence of the "active and militant" voters, the late boss of the Liberal Party, Don Antonio Barcelo, denounced from the papers that "Albizu Campos was the instrument of someone in a conspiracy against holding the elections."

Who was the conspirator? Whose instrument was Albizu Campos in a conspiracy to avoid the holding of the elections? However, in spite of all of this damning coup, the leaders of the present [Muñoz] government of Puerto Rico still pretend to convince American citizens on the continent that they have always been traditionally loyal to the American citizenship and that the only evil and enemy of the United States, and slanderer of the United States, and poisoner of consciences against the United States, is Mr. Albizu Campos.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO TAKE A RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, several Senators are ill and under the care of their doctors. There is before the Senate the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

That motion is being resisted.

If the motion were voted upon today or tomorrow it would require at least three Senators to leave their sick beds, contrary to doctors' orders, and come to the Senate to cast their votes.

The question is important, but it is not that important.

I have talked to Senators who are interested in the subject, and I understand that a motion may be made to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the motion to recommit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the Alaska statehood bill. Such a motion could be made and acted upon on Monday as well as today or tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. President, in order that Senators may know what the situation is I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks which the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson] is about to make the Senate

take a recess until Monday, March 3, 1952.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would have to object to such a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. My only object in presenting the unanimous-consent request was for the purpose of not making it necessary to keep Senators in the Chamber who are not physically able to be present. There seems to be some kind of bug going around other than the presidential bug.

MATERIAL SHORTAGES — UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE AUTOMOBILE AND OTHER INDUSTRIES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, new developments in the unemployment situation in Detroit, throughout Michigan, and other parts of the Nation have taken place in the past day or two, and I believe the Senate should be advised of them and their implications.

First, however, I would like to review the situation, as it was the latter part of January when I first addressed the Senate on the Michigan unemployment problem. On January 31 I pointed out that the newspapers were making much, and properly so, of the serious unemployment situation which has been created in the automobile-production centers by administration policies of curtailing the production of motor vehicles. From a level of 1,900,000 passenger cars produced in the third quarter of 1950, production has been progressively reduced through restrictions of material to not over 1,000,000 passenger cars for the first quarter of 1952, but with copper for only 930,000 cars. Employment has been correspondingly reduced by more than 150,000 workmen, and working hours have also fallen about 3 hours a week for those still employed.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. It is true, is it not, that most of the men who have been laid off are those who were last employed by the automobile corporations, which means that invariably it is American veterans who are being laid off? Is that not correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. In many cases that is the situation.

Mr. THYE. Invariably it is the youngest men on the payroll who are laid off. Quite often it means that it is the veteran who is laid off, because he is the man who got his job after he returned to civilian life. It has been my observation and understanding, from the information which has come to me, that very often the first one to be laid off is the young veteran who is in the process of accumulating what might be termed his little nest egg. It is he who is being discharged in many cases. When he loses his job, his unemployment compensation is usually not sufficient to meet his obligations, either for furniture or household equipment or in the purchase of a new home for which

he has contracted. It is a very serious situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very serious. That is the way it works. In fact, although I have not made a complete survey of the subject, particularly with respect to the length of service of the men who are being laid off, it is reasonable to assume that the newer or junior workers are always laid off first.

On January 31, I said the worst, it seemed, was still to come. The action of the Administration guaranteed that another 65,000 workmen in the automobile industry alone would be laid off beginning with the second quarter, for the National Production Authority had released only enough copper in the second quarter of 1952 to build 800,000 automobiles.

To illustrate how figures are juggled, while production was being reduced to 1,000,000 passenger cars in the first quarter of 1952, sufficient copper was released for only 930,000 cars. In the second quarter, however, only sufficient copper was released to build 800,000 cars. That cut production by 130,000 cars below the available steel, yet saved only 3,000 tons of copper. Sixty-five thousand automobile workers were to be laid off during April, May, and June, which is the second quarter, because the National Production Authority could not find 3,000 tons of copper to keep the workmen employed. Their wage loss will be in excess of \$60,000,000. The unemployment compensation during this period of unemployment will be more than \$20,000,000.

Controlled materials plan tickets are issued for materials, but the Defense Production Administration acknowledges that there is an error of from 5 to 15 percent on the allocations because the tickets which would allow the manufacture of considerably more than 100,000 automobiles are not being cashed. This production of automobiles represents only one-tenth of 1 percent of the available copper. Yet there is a variation of from 5 to 15 percent in the allocations actually used throughout the Nation.

That was the situation in Detroit and in other parts of Michigan. The same situation existed in many other areas, as evidenced by an official Labor Department report on 174 major labor markets.

I have used the automobile industry to point up this subject because in certain automobile factories it can be demonstrated that for every 100,000 cars not manufactured in each quarter approximately 50,000 men are laid off. In scarcely any other business is it possible to make such an accurate survey as in the automobile business. That is why I have used the automobile industry to demonstrate what is happening.

Ninety-three of these areas were experiencing some unemployment toward the end of 1951 because of material shortages. These areas were widely spread across the Nation.

Mr. President, I should like to give a few examples: At Los Angeles, Calif., the losses in fabricated metals and autos as a result of materials restrictions nearly offset other manufacturing gains. At

Denver, Colo., materials restrictions check construction. At Waterbury, Conn., the decline in the important brass industry as a result of the copper, zinc, and scrap shortage and the short work weeks continues. Further cuts are likely at Wilmington, Del., because of the cut-back in automobile production; and at Atlanta, Ga., because of a construction lay-off caused by the materials shortage.

I could go on at length, but I do not want to take the time of the Senate to list all 93 of these areas.

The critical situation with respect to copper was further highlighted on February 6 at a press conference by officers of the Defense Production Administration. At that time reporters asked whether it was true that a proposed restriction on new home construction would save only 300 tons of copper. The official answer was that despite this small saving the order was receiving serious consideration because every pound of copper was regarded as vital to the defense effort. Apparently every pound of copper was allocated for the second quarter of 1952.

Early this year, even the Defense Mobilizer said that copper and aluminum shortages threaten defense and civilian production quotas. He forecast "no help in the copper shortage situation until at least 1954." Think of it, Mr. President. At that time we were told there would be no help in connection with the copper shortage until at least 1954; so we were faced with the prospect of having our civilian economy limp along for another 2 years with severely reduced supplies of copper.

Let me refer to lead and zinc. By December 1951 the lead picture was so bad that the President authorized the transfer of 30,000 tons from the strategic stockpile in order to alleviate what appeared to be extreme shortages.

Mr. President, in connection with this record I have shown that these shortages are caused by the action of the International Materials Conference in allotting these materials to all the countries in the world outside the iron curtain, regardless of whether such countries are participating in the war effort or the defense build-up.

Furthermore, on February 1, 1952, the President authorized the withdrawal of 29,000 tons of zinc from the stockpile. Failure of zinc imports to reach normal volume was given as the reason for diversion of the metal.

It will be recalled that I showed that import price ceilings had been imposed on both lead and zinc. From the official statement of the Office of Defense Mobilization I read the statement that these ceilings would "reduce the pressure of United States demand on free world supplies, ease the problems of friendly consuming countries, and make any international allocation arrangement more effective."

That statement shows what is going on. Our officials fix a price on zinc which makes it impossible for zinc to be purchased in the open market. That is done in order that we may aid friendly consuming countries, and to make the international allocation arrangement

more effective; in other words, to enforce the arrangements of the International Materials Conference, a cartel among the nations, a cartel of which the United States is the chief sponsor. Such arrangements applied to copper, zinc, and lead; but they do not apply to materials of which some of the participating countries already have control, for instance, tin. Tin was not acted on by the conference, although the United States has been short of tin. However, the conference created what is known as a study group, another kind of cartel, by which the conference hopes to exercise further control. So it is that the United States of America suffers because of the action taken by these international cartels.

The directive of the Defense Mobilizer also said:

The establishment of a ceiling which is somewhat below current world prices involves the calculated risk of some decrease of imports.

Mr. President, why would not that be the case? Will foreign producers sell their goods to us if we will not pay the current price in the world market?

Why were we taking that step? We were doing so in order to enable the other countries to obtain lead and zinc, although at the same time United States industries would not be able to obtain those materials. Thus there would be a shutdown among United States industries which require lead and zinc, and a resultant curtailment in United States production for war purposes. Apparently the risk was not calculated very well because, as I showed a few moments ago, the zinc did not come into this country.

This was the situation, as presented by the defense officials, until early in February. Lead had to be removed from the stockpile in December. Zinc was removed from the stockpile on February 1.

Yet on February 6, Defense Production Administration officials at their press conference said, "We are getting adequate supplies of zinc."

Mr. President, if American industries wish to operate, apparently they must attend all the press conferences of the defense production agencies and of the other boards, in order to be able to know what is going on and to operate their businesses.

I wonder whether there is any connection between my remarks on the International Materials Conference of January 31 and February 4, and the February 6 statement that there is plenty of zinc, which sharply contrasts with the Government's action in removing zinc from the stockpile only 5 days before, only the day before my first speech exposing the International Materials Conference.

I am sure that no new zinc supplies were found during those 5 days, and I am equally sure that the military and defense situation did not change that much in less than a week. The procurement and allocation agencies simply did a somersault. Now, within a month of my first speech on this floor on the international allocation of materials by the

International Materials Conference, we are seeing some more somersaults.

However, Mr. President, those in charge are not yet willing to acknowledge their mistakes. They are not yet willing to acknowledge that they are participating in a cartel which has control of the raw materials of the world. Until they reach the point where they are willing to acknowledge generally, particularly to the people of the United States, what is being done, we shall have no relief, or at least we shall not have the amount of relief we should have. Of course, it is true that some steps of a remedial character are being taken.

First, let us examine the acrobatics in the lead situation. Withdrawals from the stockpile were made in December. Orders controlling the use of lead in automobile storage batteries, issued as recently as December 19, are now about to be revoked by the National Production Authority, and the lead allocations will be made on a quarterly basis, instead of monthly, as a result of improved supplies of the material.

Second, we are about to witness a turnabout in the copper situation. In my previous speeches I have contended that copper is available in both the domestic and international markets. Previously I referred to a telegram which I received from a New York firm which offered to sell copper in the world market. Now the National Production Authority apparently has discovered the same thing.

We now learn that the National Production Authority is considering allocating sufficient copper to prevent the predicted lay-off of 65,000 additional automobile workers in the second quarter of 1952. Of course, that should be done; and copper should also be available for use in connection with the construction of homes and other buildings and for other civilian uses. But, remember that on January 31 it was said there was only sufficient copper to produce 800,000 cars in the second quarter, and I am wondering where the additional copper really came from.

I said then, and I now repeat, that there is only one quick way to raise employment in the automotive centers to a tolerable level, namely, to increase the allowable passenger-car production to 1,100,000 cars per quarter and the allowable truck production to 275,000 per quarter, the rate allowed during the fourth quarter of 1952.

If production of automobiles in the United States is limited to 3,900,000 in the entire year, in view of the fact that at the present time 4,000,000 automobiles are being taken off the roads each year, the result would be a decrease to the extent of 100,000 in the number of automobiles in operation.

Mr. President, the authorities have classified automobiles with toys and jewelry, not as necessities.

I point to the people who will not have automobiles when their old cars are taken off the road. How will they get to work? How will they be provided with the necessary transportation? Railroads and other means of transportation are treated as necessary for defense, but, up

to this time, that is not true of automobiles. The rate allowed during the fourth quarter of 1951 is, as I said, 1,100,000 cars per quarter, and 250,000 trucks. This will require so little additional scarce materials in comparison to the cost of the unemployment itself that there can be no justification for permitting a further continuation of this unjustifiable situation.

I called this situation to the attention of the defense mobilization and production agencies on February 21 in a letter to Mr. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and Mr. Fleischmann, Administrator of the Defense Production Agency. My letter reads:

FEBRUARY 21, 1952.

CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

MANLY FLEISCHMANN,
Administrator, Defense Production
Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIRS: May I strongly urge that allocations of steel, copper, and aluminum for the automobile industry in the second quarter of 1952 be immediately increased to permit the production of 1,000,000 cars and 275,000 trucks.

The immediate unemployment and the unemployment forecast for the second and third quarter which Detroit and other parts of Michigan now face can only be corrected through increased allocations for civilian production.

An increase in the allocations of steel, copper, and aluminum for the automobile industry in the second quarter will prevent the unemployment of an additional 65,000 men on April 1 and bring about the reemployment of additional thousands.

Steel and aluminum are in surplus and are available. Copper, the most critical of the three materials, is available in the international and the domestic market. Such an increase in allocations will have no adverse effect on the defense effort.

I am one of those who are advocating that we should first take care of the defense requirements; but, Mr. President, I do not want to see materials accumulated merely for the reason that the Defense Department has the dollars with which to buy them, although it may not have the factories within which to manufacture the needed defense items. That is what we have to watch, and that is what is taking place. I continue:

In fact, by maintaining a strong national economy, this increase in allocations will assist the defense effort.

I sincerely hope that you will immediately increase the quotas of these materials and cancel the present second quarter cut-back in the number of cars and trucks which may be manufactured. Delay will only cause further unemployment and dislocations because the production cannot be increased overnight.

I signed that letter.

I predict that by the third quarter of 1952, as the election draws near, the National Production Authority will discover enough copper to permit the production of at least 1,100,000 passenger cars and 275,000 trucks as demanded in my letter of February 21.

I am sure that in the fourth quarter we will again be operating at this level. Mr. President, I wonder if the fact that the election falls in the fourth quarter has any bearing on these increased allo-

cations, particularly in view of the statement of the Defense Mobilizer that the copper shortage will last until at least 1954.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether there has been an accelerated demand on the part of the Defense Department for additional trucks to be manufactured by the automobile companies.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; there has been an increase in the number of trucks.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. If the Senator will yield further, has this cut-back order affected any of the truck quotas?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not understand that it affects military trucks.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. As I understand from what the distinguished Senator has said, the greatest bottleneck is in copper allocations.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. There is even a surplus of steel. We have all heard it said that steel could not be obtained for schools, hospitals, and so forth; but we are now discovering that some blast furnaces have to be closed down because there is more steel than can be used. That is what I am complaining about. An effort is being made to hold up on steel, on the theory that, if it is needed, the dollars are available with which to buy it; and, by the way, there was available on January 1 \$80,000,000,000, with which material for defense could be purchased. The Congress has appropriated so much money, more money than can possibly be used. But the material is being held up, and tickets are being issued on the theory that the money is available with which to buy it, therefore it can be obtained.

But it is impossible to use it, and that accounts for the surplus of steel at the present time. As I have said, blast furnaces are being shut down. It is still necessary to consult the Defense Department, before steel can be obtained to meet the demands of schools and municipalities. For example, in a town in Michigan very recently steel was needed for the erection of a jail; but it has been impossible to obtain an allotment of steel, though we now discover that steel mills are closing down as the result of a lack of orders.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Referring to his remarks about schools and jails, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, that the senior Senator from Kansas has been trying to be of assistance to certain communities in the State of Kansas procuring necessary materials. I have been informed that the steel is not available. Yet there is a plentiful supply, and I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I think his comments are very pertinent. I am unable to understand why, all at once, there is a surplus. I do not wish to be critical. I am able to understand why cut-backs may become necessary in some instances, as in the case of certain criti-

cal types of material, such as copper. We have encountered serious bottlenecks in connection with obtaining steel necessary for hospitals, schools, and churches, although, as the Senator from Michigan says, blast furnaces are closing down at this time because of a lack of orders. To me that presents an inconceivable situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Kansas.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

THE MASTER MINDS OF THE WASHINGTON SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT—FOREIGN NATIONS OUTBID US WITH OUR MONEY

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator from Michigan understand that with the money we have furnished European countries they are outbidding us for copper and other strategic materials on the open market, and that the price of copper in European countries is now running as high as 50 and 60 cents a pound compared to a ceiling on our domestic copper of 24½ cents per pound and 27½ cents per pound that we can pay for foreign copper?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; we have found that to be so in the case of copper and also in the case of lead and zinc. Our Government places a price on lead and zinc and on copper, then, in order that they may be bought by other countries in the open market, and in order that the market may not be flooded, our Government sees to it that other countries are financed so as to be able to buy copper, zinc, and lead at the higher prices.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, there is no top price and there is no limit to what the foreign countries may buy with our money on the foreign markets.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. We have a ceiling price of our own, a ceiling on what we may pay for our own copper and also for foreign copper, and also on lead and zinc. Is that not true?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. The price of foreign copper is 3½ cents a pound more than in the local market, which is 24 cents.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. The socialistic free trade administration last year, when there was a great argument in the Senate in favor of free trade in copper, as the junior Senator from Nevada recalls, he called attention to the fact that that very condition would result if we removed the tariff or duty. I now understand that the same thing is happening in connection with lead and zinc; the foreign trading price is running 10 to 15 cents more than the domestic ceiling price.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. All three of these metals were forced through the free trade wringer a few weeks ago, on the Senate floor. An effort was recently made to force through free trade on tungsten, a strategic mineral, but the effort was abandoned when objection was made.

Does the distinguished Senator from Michigan believe that the great master

minds have outmasterminded themselves on the question of price control and allocations in a peacetime market?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think what has happened is the result of the action of a few people in Washington. I am giving full credit to Mr. Wilson as an able industrialist; the job is too big for the minds of some other officials. That is my honest opinion. They will not do necessary things at the time they ought to be done.

The difficulty in Washington is that people acquire a vested interest in error, and once a politician acquires a vested interest in an error, we cannot change his mind. He continues to carry on. That is the difficulty in this whole question.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS A VESTED RIGHT TO THEIR OWN MISTAKES

Mr. MALONE. It seems to me that the junior Senator from Nevada made a speech 6 or 7 months ago in which he stated that they had a vested right in their own mistakes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not mean to take the honor of having used that expression away from the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. But is not that what is the matter? In other words, there are master minds in Washington who know all, see all, and judge all, when, as a matter of fact, no human and no small group of human beings can do that, and everyone knows it except a Socialist. Yet that is what we have in the White House and what we have operating the Government. They do not know enough about the business of this Nation to realize that they do not know—and that is the most colossal ignorance on earth.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are many men in our Government who are not collectivists or Socialists, but I say that there are enough of them so that when the others obtain the facts from those who have collectivist minds, big Government minds, big bureaucracy minds, their opinion is colored in such a way that the true facts cannot be obtained. Some of them are honest in their opinions. I do not say that a Socialist is not honest in his opinion when he says everything ought to be run by the Government, that we ought to have one world so far as raw materials are concerned; that we ought to say to the American people, "Why worry about 65,000 workers in Detroit when we can put people to work in India or some other country? Should we not be willing to share unemployment?"

They think that is right. In their own mind, as humanitarians, they believe that is the way it should be done, that we should not consider the United States as a whole, but should consider the world, and as we are now having a real war with certain countries of the world, we will exclude those areas.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Of course they do not admit that there is a real war, do they? They say it is simply a police action, do they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I know the soldiers consider it to be a real war.

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICE ACTION

Mr. MALONE. The veterans of other wars think it is a real war, too. But the Socialists in this administration say it is a police action; and they say that we are going to have similar police actions in Egypt, the Malay States, and Indochina.

I am glad the Senator has brought out the fact that it is possible to so surround a man of the caliber of Mr. Wilson so he also becomes one of them. He is surrounded by Socialists, and even though he himself is not a Socialist he is following their lead.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think Mr. Wilson would be the first to admit that he must rely upon some persons who have collectivist minds. It is impossible to do the job perfectly alone. That is why there is an error of 5 to 15 percent in estimates for material.

DESTROY THE INCENTIVE TO PRODUCE

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that most of those in the key subordinate positions have either failed in business or have never been in business? They are planted in the Government. They can write very convincing books about business, but in reality they know nothing about it, so that in the long run they simply destroy the incentive to produce.

Pressing down on the price without producing more goods is like putting their fingers on the snout of the teakettle to hold in the escaping steam without pulling the fire—everybody gets hurt.

Mr. FERGUSON. The more the Government comes in to take care of the situation.

Mr. MALONE. Finally the whole thing blows up, but then it is too late.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator realizes that while I cannot agree that all these "tops" are Socialists—

AVERAGE OUR LIVING STANDARDS WITH EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. They go along with the Socialists who believe in a one economic world.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that in some places in the Government there are those who, in their own minds, honestly believe in collectivism or socialism.

Mr. MALONE. Therein lies our danger. The State Department has continually recommended that we make up Europe's trade balance deficit in dollars—Marshall plan—each year until such time as we could divide our markets with them through free trade—reciprocal trade—to the point that there would be no trade balance deficits—the living standards would be averaged.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is the province of the Senate and of the House to understand what is being done. It is stated in a letter from the State Department that the International Materials Conference is a good thing; that materials should be divided up with the world, regardless of whether this country is actually endeavoring to mobilize and produce materials for the war effort; that we ought to seek to bring about harmony in the world, even to the extent of giving up our high standard of living, for it is not fair for

a nation like America to have such a high standard of living.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator has put his finger right on the crucial point for the first time. That is exactly the objective of the entire foreign-policy program of the administration—to destroy our economic system and average the living standards of America, Europe, and Asia. Does the Senator agree with that theory?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. That is why I am on the floor today.

Mr. MALONE. Then let us fight it from here out and make it an issue in the campaign this coming fall—the Socialist administration's four horsemen of disaster—free trade, deficit financing, progressive taxation, and progressive education.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is not free trade. They get around that. They advocate free trade out of one side of their mouth, but they institute quotas and price controls. So it is not a question of free trade. This international cartel deals in quotas. Copper can be bought outside the United States today, but people cannot use it when they bring it into this country.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Since March 4, 1948, the junior Senator from Nevada has been standing at this desk emphasizing that free—reciprocal—trade as practiced by the Secretary of State cannot work for the very reason that the foreign countries practice the quota system, embargoes, specifications, and the manipulation of their money systems for trade advantage.

The whole sterling-bloc system, for example, is set up as a form of piracy to rob other nations, and to pull down our standard of living. European nations even claim a dollar shortage, which is caused by fixing the price of their currency in dollars higher than the market price, and, of course, no one will pay dollars for it, except an ignorant Congress. A wonderful idea, and it was sold to a trusting American public through the so-called bipartisan group on the Senate floor.

The American public will not continue falling for this kind of tommyrot much longer.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not blame the people of other countries.

Mr. MALONE. Neither do I blame them for getting away with it if they can, but I blame the Senators on this Senate floor for voting for it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think they are looking out for their own interests.

Mr. MALONE. The American people are catching up with the so-called bipartisan group which continually pushed through free trade—deficit financing, progressive taxation, and progressive education, and I believe that November 5 will see the last of it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, automobile workmen are not the only ones

who are victims of this administration's global economic planning. Thousands of workmen in other industries are suffering from the same mistaken actions.

The construction industry is one of the groups I have in mind. We now learn that relaxation of controls on construction is viewed by Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer as one of the signs of an accelerating pattern of decontrol in the months ahead, and the National Production Authority is giving the green light to certain construction projects previously banned.

I have contended for some time that many Government officials seem to believe in control for the sake of controls, and not for the sake of the defense effort. We have granted sweeping powers to the administration to defend the free world, and we did so with the assurance that no control would be retained longer than it was needed. About a year ago, the National Production Authority banned the manufacture of white sidewall tires in order to conserve natural rubber. The rubber industry raised no protest, as the Government was building its stockpile of natural rubber, and everyone wished to cooperate. Today the National Production Authority is amending the rubber order so that private contracts for the purchase of natural rubber may be made, as the stockpile has apparently reached safe levels. However, we find that the National Production Authority plans to remove the year-old ban on the output of white sidewall tires by July. They are holding it until July. Why cannot that ban be lifted now, since its only justification was a shortage of natural rubber? White sidewall tires are coming into the United States today from Canada and other countries and are being sold at black-market prices because of these restrictions. Employment in our own rubber centers is again being adversely effected. Perhaps the lifting of the white sidewall ban by July may be connected with administration efforts to extend the Defense Production Act. They may wish to show how ready they are to decontrol when they are asking for more controls.

The continuation of this or any other unnecessary control is a very expensive proposition for the taxpayers of the United States, when one considers the cost of maintaining the controls and enforcing them, not to mention the loss in employment and tax revenue caused by restricted production. There is also a tremendous burden of paper work for every producer caused by the red tape incident to controls.

The additional materials now being released to industry will swell employment and payrolls during the period immediately preceding November. These companies probably have crews of men merely to read press releases about what is going on in Washington with respect to price controls.

So long as the provisions of the Defense Production Act may be used to implement international allocations we have no assurance that after November more somersaults will not be in order. Perhaps then we may find that materials have again become scarce and unem-

ployment rampant as a necessary part of our world planning.

I shall continue to bring these matters before the Senate until we have taken the necessary action to prevent the provisions of the Defense Production Act from being usurped for unauthorized and socialistic purposes.

RECESS TO MONDAY—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Arizona if he would not be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that by 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon we might have a vote on his motion that the tidelands bill be made the unfinished business before the Senate.

The Democratic Party has control of the Senate, and the majority leader has made a motion to bring before the Senate a piece of proposed legislation. We on this side of the aisle wish to be cooperative in getting a vote on the bill. All we ask is that instead of prolonged discussion without a vote, we be allowed to vote the Senator's motion either up or down. It seems to me that is perfectly fair. It does not seem to be unreasonable.

The motion was made by the Senator last night. We would have been glad to vote upon it last night. We have been here all day today without having had an opportunity to vote on the motion of the Senator from Arizona. We are perfectly willing to cooperate in agreeing to take a recess until Monday, but it seems to me there should not be any hesitation on the part of the majority leader to agreeing that after 4 hours of discussion on Monday there might be a vote upon his own motion. That is all we ask.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from California that it has not been my hesitation that has prevented a vote by the Senate. If we were to have a quorum call, which we should do where the interested parties have not been consulted, I am informed that some Senator would object to a unanimous-consent agreement.

I am willing to do my best to work out a plan on Monday to reach an agreement. However, knowing the temperament of the Senate this afternoon, I feel that nothing can be accomplished by trying to arrange a unanimous-consent agreement at this time.

I may say also that I know there are Senators present on the floor who left sick beds to come here. One Senator in particular, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], came here from his sickbed because of his interest in the tidelands oil bill. I do not think it is fair to jeopardize the health of Senators by seeking to do what I believe would be a useless thing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say most respectfully to the able majority

leader that all we are asking is that we be allowed to vote on his motion. I may say very frankly that I shall oppose his motion when it is laid before the Senate, because I think there was a commitment that the two statehood bills would be the first bills taken up, namely, the bill granting statehood to Alaska, which the Senate voted to recommit to the committee, and following that the bill granting statehood to Hawaii.

I think not only Senators, but also the people of Hawaii, are entitled to have the issue clearly raised, so that the sentiment of a majority of the Senate on the question of statehood for Hawaii may be made plain.

The Senator has mentioned the fact that Members of the Senate are tired, and that some of them are ill. I have no doubt that there are 500,000 people in Hawaii who are somewhat sick today by reason of the action which was taken yesterday with respect to Alaska, and that probably 128,000 people in Alaska are a little sick because after 80 years of waiting, they were barred at the door and their hopes for statehood were sent back to committee.

If the Senator from Arizona is not willing to agree that there be a vote on Monday, would he be willing to agree to have a vote on Tuesday?

This is such an unusual situation, since it involves a motion by the majority leader himself, that I should like to have some assurance about when there will be a vote on his motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is not within my power to work out a unanimous-consent agreement at this time. I know that there is objection to unanimous-consent agreements being made now, and there is nothing to be gained by making such a request. When Monday arrives, I will see what can be done. But the Senator should not speak to me about what I am willing to do. I do not govern in these matters. It is the desire of the Senate which governs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since it is necessary to have a quorum call to see whether a unanimous-consent agreement can be reached, I wonder if the Senator would be willing that we have a quorum call now and determine whether we could get a unanimous-consent agreement. If Monday is too early for a vote on the Senator's motion, I shall not press for a vote at that time, but it would be satisfactory if we could have a vote at 2 or 3 o'clock Tuesday afternoon, so that the Senate will not be placed in the ridiculous position of not being able to get even a preliminary vote on the question of whether the tidelands measure shall be taken up. Until that is disposed of, a motion cannot be made to take up the statehood-for-Hawaii bill. I am merely trying to expedite the business of the Senate.

I quite agree with the Senator from Arizona that the tidelands bill is an important legislative proposal. I am sure there is no State in the Union that has greater interest in this subject than has the State of California, and if it were not for the fact that I believe we have a firm

commitment to the people of Hawaii that the Hawaii statehood bill shall be considered, I would be joining with the Senator in asking that the tidelands bill be proceeded with. But I believe we have a commitment to the people of Hawaii, and all I am trying to do is to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, before the request of the Senator from California could be acted on it would be necessary to call for a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under the circumstances we should consult the interested parties or call a quorum. It would not be necessary to call for a quorum on a request to set a time for a vote on a motion to take up a measure. That rule applies only to final vote on a measure. It would not be necessary to have a quorum call before entering into an agreement on a time to vote on a motion to take up.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can a unanimous consent request for a final vote on a motion to take up a measure be made without a previous quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that a quorum call is not necessary in the case of a unanimous-consent request to take up a measure, but an agreement to vote on final passage cannot be made without a quorum call first being had.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is a motion pending to take up a joint resolution. I am referring to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on a motion to take up a measure. What I am inquiring is whether such a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on a motion to take up a measure at a certain time can be made without a quorum having first been called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that in such case a quorum call is not necessary, but that an agreement to vote on the final passage of a bill cannot be entered into without a previous quorum call.

Mr. McFARLAND. I so understood.

So far as I personally am concerned, I should certainly be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at any time. However, as majority leader, I feel that I would have to consult with other Senators who are interested and I would do so whether the Senators interested happened to be on this side of the aisle or on the other. I have never yet proposed a unanimous-consent agreement without first consulting with the interested Senators.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The only reason I made the parliamentary inquiry was to make sure it is not necessary to call for a quorum to determine whether unani-

mous consent shall be given this afternoon.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope some arrangement can be arrived at by Monday. I have no objection, in the meantime, to trying to arrive at an agreement. I know that a good many Senators are absent at the moment. Some have gone home because of illness. I should certainly object if the request were made without calling for a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator will have that privilege, when I make my motion to recess. The Senator from Arkansas has just stated that he would object to any unanimous-consent agreement being made without a quorum call. The question now is whether or not the Senate is to take a recess until Monday. We can in the meantime try to reach an agreement. I can see nothing to be gained by colloquies or speeches on one side or the other. I am trying to be fair to all Senators. I see nothing to be gained by a quorum call, but if the Senator from California wants it he is entitled to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the acting minority leader I am merely exploring the situation to see if there is any reasonable basis for conducting the business of the Senate, so that we can have some assurance of a vote on Tuesday, if not on Monday. The able Senator from Arkansas has indicated that he would object to an agreement for a vote on Monday. It is his right, as a Member of this body, to do so. I was trying to explore the situation to see whether he would have the same objection to an agreement for a vote on Tuesday.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Arkansas will object to any agreement being made this afternoon for a vote until further progress is made toward working out a satisfactory arrangement. The Senator from California can call for a quorum if he so desires. It will not inconvenience me. It will simply inconvenience other Senators.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Before I ask for a quorum call, if the Senator from Arizona does not mind, I should like to have the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] express his view.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon thinks this is the most fantastic situation he has ever seen on the floor of the Senate. Yesterday the majority leader took the position that the critical need of this country for oil was such that we must get to work on the tidelands bill without delay. If he wants to get to work on it, why does he not do something toward that end? Why does he not get at it? What is the reason why we stand idle today, and face idleness tomorrow? What is the answer?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will give the Senator the answer.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to have it.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator well knows that the discussion is not getting us anywhere, and will not get us anywhere.

Mr. CORDON. I am afraid that is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know the temper of the Senate. I know that I cannot get a vote on my motion this evening, and I will not be able to get a vote on it tomorrow. If we continue to make plays, one side against the other, we shall get nowhere. I am trying to find a solution for our difficulties. I think perhaps we can agree upon a time for a vote, but I know that it cannot be done this evening.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator try it tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not going to try it tomorrow. I am going to make a motion that the Senate take a recess until Monday. The Senator can resist that motion if he so desires, and the Senate can resist it if it so desires. I know what is taking place, and the Senator from Oregon knows.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon certainly thinks he knows, and he does not like it.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Will the distinguished majority leader tell us why, in his opinion, it would not be wise to have a session of the Senate tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. I believe that the only result would be a great deal of talk. As I have said previously, one Senator got out of his bed to come here and be on the floor of the Senate, against the orders of his physician. And three other Senators are ill. Some of those Senators will probably vote against my motion, but they would have to get out of their sick beds and come here to do so.

I know what is going to take place. I know that until we can fix a time when Senators can be present and have a fair vote, we are not going to be able to get an agreement to vote.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is a situation which the Senate will always face. If we postpone action for 3 days, 3 other Senators may be unable to be present, or 10 other Senators may be compelled to be out of the city. All we are asking for is a vote on the pending motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator knows how to get it, I am perfectly willing to yield to him to do so.

There is no need to point the finger of accusation at me because the Senator cannot get a vote. The Senator knows he cannot get it, just as well as I do and all this opposition to my motion to recess is just horseplay for the benefit of the newspapers.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is mistaken. There are some of us who feel just as strongly that the horseplay which is taking place is at the expense of 500,000 people of Hawaii and 128,000

people of the Territory of Alaska who were promised faithfully in the Democratic national platform that they would be granted immediate statehood, and who were promised in the Republican platform that they would be granted eventual statehood. We feel that there is a commitment and a covenant with the people of both those Territories, as well as with the people of the United States. The Senate should not be placed in the ridiculous position of not being able even to reach a vote on the motion of the majority leader. I think I know why we cannot reach a vote. It is because the majority leader of the Senate knows that he has not the votes to sidetrack the bill providing statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; the Senator may go ahead and talk and talk and talk if he so desires. Let him conjecture and speculate as to what he thinks the majority leader has or has not. However, I know the practical situation and we are not going to be able to reach a vote this evening. I have asked Senators to quit talking in order that the Senate may take a recess until Monday, because nothing can be accomplished today. I have worked out unanimous-consent agreements in the past, and I think I know something about what is required for such an agreement as is now contemplated. I know that this kind of horseplay does not result in an agreement.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I always consult interested Senators on both sides of the aisle. I have always tried to extend the utmost courtesy to Senators on both sides of the aisle. I know that this kind of talk does not do anyone any good. It does not do the people of Hawaii any good. We cannot arrive at an agreement by stirring up dissension, or by agitation which produces more talk.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. As the majority leader knows, all of us are interested in saving time. If there were to be a session of the Senate tomorrow, would it not be reasonable to assume that the majority leader could conveniently, between now and the session tomorrow, confer with absent Senators, in order that perhaps tomorrow a decision might be reached as to when a vote could be had on the pending motion?

Mr. McFARLAND. I consulted the distinguished minority leader before he left the floor. I do not wish to speak for him, but certainly I would not have suggested a unanimous-consent agreement to recess after the senior Senator from Michigan concluded his remarks if I had not felt it was agreeable to the distinguished minority leader. I consulted the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I consulted the Senators who are interested in the subject. It was thought advisable, in view of the situation as it exists, to have the matter go over until Monday, so that Senators would have time to think it through.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say, as acting majority leader, that I shall not suggest the absence of a quorum in view of what has taken place on the floor of the Senate, and the statement of the Senator from Arizona that there are a number of Senators who should not be on the floor because of illness. I regret that it is not possible for the Senate to meet tomorrow. I say that very sincerely, and not in any sense of horseplay, because I am as deeply interested in the bill as is any other Member on the floor, and have been for the 7 years I have been a Member of the Senate. Obviously we cannot get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote tomorrow, and we cannot get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Monday or Tuesday. Under the circumstances I do not see that any purpose can be served by bringing Senators to the floor at this late hour in the day.

Mr. McFARLAND. In behalf of the Senators who are ill I wish to express my appreciation. So far as I am concerned, it does not make any difference, because I am on the floor.

Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from California, that if I thought it would serve any purpose or accomplish anything to have a session of the Senate tomorrow, I certainly would be in favor of such a session. However, there comes a time when Senators must be given an opportunity to consider the situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make this inquiry: Suppose the Senate adjourns until Monday, would a motion to reconsider be in order on Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would be in order on Monday. I made that statement a little earlier in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states it would be in order to make such a motion on Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. That was another reason why we thought it was advisable to go over until Monday. By doing so Senators would have two additional days before making a motion to reconsider and would make it possible for them to be present.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senate has been in session for almost 2 months. The Senator from Idaho comes from a State which is far removed from Washington. It is impossible for him to spend every week end or 2 or 3 days a week in his home bailiwick. The Senator from Idaho would like to know when the Senate will begin to undertake seriously the consideration of a program which will enable Senators to complete their work prior to next Christmas.

I recall that in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress I was in complete accord with the efforts of the dis-

tinguished majority leader in his appeal for cooperation from the Members of this body, so that the work of the Senate could be expedited.

Just recently a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into on a Wednesday for the taking of a vote on the succeeding Wednesday. It meant that in the intervening week there was virtually no business transacted in the Senate, and Members were free to leave Washington.

I should like to know when it will be possible to get down to a workable program. Otherwise, I believe that Senators from States in the far West and in the Rocky Mountain region are entitled to take 3 or 4 days off each week, or probably a whole week, and perhaps arrange for some additional mileage, so that they can return home every week or perhaps every other week. In that way the Senate probably would be in session throughout the 12 months of the year.

The Senator from Arizona knows how difficult it is to continue with sessions of the Senate for only 2 or 3 days a week. I am sure that he likewise would like to see some program of accelerated action adopted by this body. We are frequently subjected to criticism by the public because we allegedly do not get something done, particularly this year, the possibility being that we probably will not accomplish very much other than the passage of appropriation bills.

Can the distinguished majority leader give us any definite and specific information as to what we may expect, so that we may plan accordingly?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Idaho, that he is, of course, asking the \$64 question. If I could have my own way about it, I would proceed very rapidly with quite a number of matters. I had hoped yesterday that we could take up the consideration of the tidelands joint resolution and that we could debate it today and tomorrow, and probably get a vote on it on Monday or Tuesday of next week. That would have given Senators who are interested in the statehood bills time to consider what course of action they wanted to take. However, I did not get my way. Several Senators resisted my effort in that direction. Therefore, I find that I must do the best I can.

I hope that we shall be able to get an agreement. I concur very heartily in what the Senator from Idaho has said, namely, that we cannot afford to work merely 2 or 3 days a week. Actually, we have worked 5 days a week most of the time. We took some time off to enable Senators on the other side to make the Lincoln Day addresses. It has been customary to do that, and in yielding to the request that that be done I did not yield to anything that had not been done during previous years. I hope that we shall be able to make more progress in the future.

My only reason for making the motion to recess until Monday, I may say to my good friend from Idaho, is that in my opinion nothing could be gained by being in session tomorrow. I know that neither side will allow a vote until they

feel they have a good representation on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia would like to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] to the fact, which he would realize if he were a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that the committee has been making hay while the sun has been shining for Senators who have not been in Washington. Time has not been lost, by any means. The most important legislation which we will consider at this session is a bill which could wreck the Government financially, and that bill, when it reaches the floor, will occupy the Senate fully. That is the kind of essential legislation which we will have to consider at this session.

So far as the Senator from Virginia is concerned, in recent years he has had more complaint about what we have done than about what we have not done. I do not feel that the majority leader is properly subject to criticism if committees are spending time in preparing the essential legislation the Senate must consider.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho in no way intended to be critical of the majority leader. He merely wished to point out that we have fallen into the dubious practice of reaching unanimous-consent agreements to vote in a week or 2 weeks from the time the agreement is entered into, with very little being accomplished during the intervening time.

The Senator from Virginia stated that the Committee on Appropriations is functioning. All committees, I assume, are functioning; but, regardless of what is being accomplished by committees, a certain amount of work must be done on the floor of the Senate. If we defer indefinitely from one week to another, we will be here all summer and all fall.

If the Senator from Arizona will yield further, I should like to point out that I know that some concessions were made for the convenience of Lincoln Day speakers during one week. However, I am sure that we cannot go on justifying a delay in the legislative program merely because during one week several Republican Senators engaged in Lincoln Day speeches. I am sure that within a very short time members of the majority party will be making speeches at Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners. That cannot be used as justification for deferring indefinitely the transaction of business by this body.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend I merely wanted to make it plain that in consenting to that arrangement I did not think I should be criticized, because it had been done in the past and was customary.

I realize that the Senator from Idaho is anxious to proceed. During the last

session he was very cooperative in helping to reach votes on proposed legislation. He was one of those on his side of the aisle who was very helpful in that respect; I say "one of those" because from his side of the aisle we had a great deal of cooperation with respect to expediting action on the business before the Senate. Certainly I am not claiming the credit for myself or saying that some of us on this side of the aisle were the only ones who tried to expedite consideration of and action upon various measures. Senators on both sides of the aisle were most helpful in that respect.

However, when we come to a situation that does not permit of action we may as well recognize it. That is what I meant to convey. I only resented being attacked for the situation existing on the floor of the Senate, for which I am not responsible.

I am not to blame if Senators differ in their views or if they have different ideas regarding the best time to have various legislative proposals considered by the Senate or the best time for the taking of votes on them. Such differences of opinion occur among Senators on both sides of the aisle. I realize that every Senator wishes to have the vote on any measure taken at a time when he believes there will be fair representation on the floor of the Senate.

Let me say now that I do not like to have unanimous-consent agreements objected to for the reason that some Senator is to be out of the city.

On the other hand, I know that some Senators are ill, and no one should be blamed for that.

RELEASE OF NONBATTLE CASUALTY FIGURES FOR THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I addressed to the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, Secretary of Defense, under date of February 23, 1952. The letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 1952.

HON. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Late on Thursday afternoon, February 21, I requested through a member of my staff, from the Department of Defense, the accumulated nonbattle casualty figures for Korea, since June 26, 1950. On Saturday, February 23, I received word that this information could be made available on my written request.

It would be very much appreciated if you would have one of your staff obtain the above information for me at the earliest possible moment.

With many thanks,
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. President, let me say that I expected to obtain the information requested in that letter, because during the so-called MacArthur hearings the Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff brought that information before the committees conducting those hearings.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and as a member of the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Appropriations Committee, I have never been so shocked as I was when I received from the Secretary of Defense a letter which gives me a rather polite brush-off in regard to this matter.

For the information of the Senate, because I shall make an issue of this matter before the Armed Services Committee and before the Appropriations Committee, I shall read into the RECORD at this time the letter I received in reply, from the Secretary of Defense:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 28, 1952.

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In response to your request for data on so-called nonbattle casualties, I have had the subject explored and am advised that Army regulations for some time have excluded from the casualty category any person not killed, missing, captured, interned, wounded, or injured in action. All of these categories are included in the Department of Defense weekly battle casualty releases and battle casualties totaled 105,992 for the period through February 22, 1952. The total of 151 battle casualties for the week ending February 22 is the lowest for any week since July 1950.

You will recall that in the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations last May, General Collins testified as to the lack of significance and unreliability of any so-called nonbattle casualty figures and told you that if a person goes, for instance, to ask for an aspirin tablet he is included as a nonbattle casualty. The general added that, "If he gets on sick call for any reason whatsoever, he is termed a 'nonbattle casualty.' Frankly, it is sheer doggerel in my opinion."

As a result of a study conducted by the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1, the Department of the Army has adopted new terminology to replace the term "nonbattle casualties," as being more descriptive and less subject to misinterpretation. The new terms, "nonbattle dead," "missing," "evacuated sick," and "injured," were developed and published in Army SR-600-400-5, September 28, 1951. In the interest of complete accuracy and accountability, totals of so-called nonbattle and noneffectives among the forces in Korea have not been released for many months.

You may be interested to learn that worldwide total deaths in all our uniformed services from the beginning of the Korean conflict through December 1951 were 26,689 including 17,754 battle deaths and 8,935 deaths from all other causes. The average total strength of these services for this same period was approximately 2,700,000. Of this worldwide total of 8,935 deaths from all other causes, only some 1,600 were in the Japan-Korea area.

The latest Army medical treatment facilities admissions data show that since the start of the Korean operation 94.3 percent of the world-wide total of those admitted for medical treatment for disease and nonbattle injury conditions have returned to active duty compared with 94.1 percent in the Japan-Korea area.

For your information and files, I am enclosing a copy of our latest Report of United States Casualties.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

The Secretary attached to his letter the report referred to; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this

point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The report shows the battle casualties.

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

Report of United States casualties—Summary No. 79

The Department of Defense today announced the following report of battle casualties in the Korean area, based on notifications to next of kin cumulated for the period through midnight, February 22, 1952:

	Total Department of Defense	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
1. Total casualties (sum of items 3, 4, and 5).....	105,992	86,852	1,232	16,868	1,040
2. Total deaths (sum of items 3, 4a, and 5a).....	18,384	15,478	243	2,298	365
3. Killed in action, total.....	16,463	13,995	182	1,938	348
4. Wounded in action, total.....	76,911	61,305	147	14,614	45
(a) Died of wounds.....	1,727	1,346	12	360	9
(b) Other (current wounded returned to duty, evacuated to the United States, etc.).....	75,184	59,959	135	14,254	36
5. Missing in action, total.....	12,618	11,552	103	316	647
(a) Died.....	194	137	49	0	8
(b) Returned to military control.....	1,389	1,327	2	20	40
(c) Current captured.....	999	996	0	0	3
(d) Current missing.....	110,036	19,092	52	296	595

¹ Reflects revisions of previously reported figures.

NOTE.—These figures represent cumulative casualties for which notification to next of kin was effected through midnight Friday, Feb. 22, 1952. They do not reflect all casualties which have occurred up to that time, because of the time lapse required to receive notifications of individual casualties from the Far East and to verify and process these notifications in the headquarters of each service. The data indicate the cumulative number of permanent and temporary losses from effective military strength as the result of enemy action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the information I requested is pertinent information which the Senate Armed Services Committee is entitled to have. Just last week I noticed that the Air Force released the figures on planes lost in combat, and also released the figures on planes lost as a result of bad take-offs or for other reasons not having to do with air combat or with anti-aircraft fire.

I assume that the argument might be made that to release the figures on battle casualties might result in permitting that information to reach the enemy. However, so far as I can remember, during World War I and during World War II, as a matter of public policy, the United States Government did release the casualty figures, and has been doing so during the Korean war.

The Congress of the United States and the congressional committees are entitled to obtain a frank answer to the question, How many nonbattle casualties have there been in Korea? That information was given to us during the MacArthur hearings.

I wish to say now, and to serve notice on the Defense Department, that the first of next week I intend to make this matter an issue before the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Congress of the United States, which under the Constitution is charged with raising and supporting armies, and which also has the constitutional power to declare war, cannot and should not be deprived of this information.

Mr. President, I think this issue is a basic one. It is one which will have to be fought out. I say with the deepest regret, because there is no public official in the Government of the United States for whom I have a higher regard than Secretary Lovett, that this is the first time in my long experience when we have been given a complete run-around by the Secretary of Defense; and I, for one,

do not sit complacently by when that is done.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me let me say that in sharing the regard and respect of the Senator from California for the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, in the first place it would be my impression—although obviously I could not prove it—that the Secretary did not write the letter the Senator from California has read to the Senate; and, in the second place, I would doubt whether the Secretary even saw the letter, because it is my view that the Secretary of Defense would give no such meaningless or doubtful answer to an inquiry made by a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I wish to ask my colleague from California a question. Does he know whether soldiers in Korea who have suffered seriously from frostbite or trench foot, and in consequence have been incapacitated and relieved of active duty, are carried on the rolls as wounded in action?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe they are not.

Mr. CAIN. Then can the Senator from California give an approximate figure regarding how many such nonbattle casualties may have been suffered in the Korean war up to this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I cannot do so, unless we use the rather devious device of taking the figures which were given to us by General Bradley and General Collins in April, May, and June of last year and totalling them, and then dividing the total figure by the number of months up to that time, and then multiplying the resulting figure by the number of months which have elapsed since then. However, I do not think that process would result in giving us an accurate figure, because in the intervening period there have been varying degrees of activity, sometimes more and sometimes less. Therefore, if we were to resort to that type of guessing, we might arrive

at figures which would be wholly unreliable.

I believe the Congress of the United States, as the elected representatives of the people of the United States, have the right to have accurate information. The officials of the Defense Department are not superior to the Congress of the United States. This is a coequal branch of the Government of the United States, and I think it high time that the Senate, and I would say the House of Representatives, should begin to bring home to those in the executive department the fact that we are, under the Constitution, a coequal branch.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California permit me to add a word?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I remember the information concerning noncombat casualties which we received during the far-eastern hearings, and how important that information was to those of us who have serious concern about the war in Korea. The Senator from Washington, for that reason, wishes to join most strongly with his friend from California in any possible proposal which may result in getting accurate information of this kind, in order that our Nation may be better informed concerning the size, scope, implications, and severity of the actions in Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would like to say to the Senator from Washington that I also received part of a letter written by one of the men who are fighting in Korea at the present time. I think the Senator, with his military background, might be interested in this extract from a letter:

Our tanks are set up on a ridge and have unlimited targets to shoot at, but they only give them a very limited supply of ammunition, so they fire their load for the day in about a half hour or 45 minutes, and then make secure for the day. The same for the artillery and air support. This country seems to want to fight a war on a budget. At the rate this war is going, it ought to last at least 20 years. I think the next step will be to take away the weapons and start throwing rocks. It will be cheaper that way.

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

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say one further word?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield further to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I have a reaction as an American to what the Senator from California has just read. Not too long ago a soldier in Korea in writing back to someone in this country said, "Death deserves a reason." My conscience tells me that too many Americans have died in Korea for too little reason.

That is how strongly I feel about what the Senator from California has read. Since the day when the United States, in concert with its allies, decided policy-wise to seek an armistice short of a military decision, my own Government has refused to give men a sufficient reason to die. I could not be more sad over

that revelation, in the young soldier's letter, which obviously speaks the truth, by pointing up the futility of a war which will wind up by proving nothing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator, as I said before, and as I shall repeat many times again, I do not believe that either the Government of the United States or the United Nations has a right to ask men to fight and die, while denying them the right to win. I think that is the very basic issue with which the American people are confronted. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say to the Senator from California, Mr. President, that I am very much interested in the work he is doing. I hope he will carry it on to an effective conclusion. I think there is good reason to believe that some of the men who are now running this Government think they have a blank check on the blood of the young men of America, that they can fill it out from day to day, and that the people generally will not even know the amounts for which it is filled out. That seems to be what is going on. I, myself, have recently had a little experience along that line. When the atrocities affecting the prisoners of war in Korea were disclosed, I sent Secretary Lovett a telegram asking him for more definite information about it, and particularly whether the facts in that connection had been known for some time. He sent me what was in effect a handout from the Department of Defense, which, in effect, said that the officer who had been responsible for disclosing the information in regard to the prisoner-of-war atrocities had been reprimanded; and that is all I have received. Apparently that is all that it is intended I shall receive.

If the Senator from California is successful in his efforts to obtain the information he is seeking, I think he would perform a great public service if he would take up the question of obtaining information in regard to the prisoner-of-war atrocities, to ascertain how many Americans have been killed in cold blood, how long the Department of Defense, or the administration, has known about that situation, and why the information has not been made public.

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. SMATHERS 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.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed today.

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

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 3, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Robert T. Bartley, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1951, vice Wayne Coy, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Horace Logan McBride, O4430, United States Army, for appointment as commander in chief, Caribbean, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr., O3102, commander in chief, Caribbean (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

Alfred R. Harris for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Kirby P. Ambler	Edward C.
Rex D. Andrews	Franzen, Jr.
Paul T. Armistead	James W. P.
Earl E. Bethke, Jr.	Gregory, Jr.
Closkey L. Blair, Jr.	Dale W. Johnson
Earl R. Blue	Jack E. Koslow
Charles H. Brewer, Jr.	Edwin F. Laak
Henry Bowers	Kenneth D. Lindquist
William C. Bostic III	Fred M. Lurie
Carl S. Crittenden	Benjamin G.
Daniel W. Davis	Mattox, Jr.
Wallace F. Flitter	"J" "H" Mohrman
Edward W. Fox	Vincent D. Morrison

Raymond A. Nelson	Norman L. Sothan
Wallace C. Palmer	George M. Starr
Robert G. Pipkin, Jr.	Raymond W. Stein
Sheldon J. Plager	George M.
William S. Pregnall	Stephens, Jr.
Tad T. Riley	James L. Whitney
Andrew T. Sheets	

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct name:

Wilbert M. Fiander
Lucio W. Hill

Guy J. Lookabaugh (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

James W. Firoved
Albert E. Morris

LIEUTENANT

Louis R. Krasno

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James E. Banta, Jr.
Franklyn C. Hill, Jr.
William C. E. Pfischner, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Richard V. Peterson

LIEUTENANTS

John F. Bucher	William A. Peterson
William A. Monroe, Jr.	Leon G. Suehs
Merlin E. Naylor	Simon W. Susewind

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Fred M. Amman	Raymond "W"
John R. Anderson	Millbourn
Charles W. Cogar	Charles "S" Scruggs
Frank J. Malone, Jr.	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Paul L. Austin
Elwin N. Sire

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Mary P. Beaulieu	Elvora J. McCarty
Mary A. Conley	Alice J. Miller
Beverly J. Denison	Mary I. Rignall
Irene C. Knapka	Ann Sefchok
Elizabeth V. Lurenz	Mary L. Steele
Frances A. McCann	Mary J. Wathen

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Alice M. Boogaerts
Ann O. Watson

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Henry C. Williams, Atmore, Ala., in place of J. G. Brown, resigned.
Roy L. Nolen, Jr., Montgomery, Ala., in place of R. L. Nolen, deceased.
Charles O. Mason, Jr., Pine Hill, Ala., in place of J. L. Slaughter, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Ernest M. Echols, Amity, Ark., in place of H. L. Lay, transferred.
Cora M. Wise, Thornton, Ark., in place of C. R. Wise, deceased.
Kenneth R. Bradley, Winslow, Ark., in place of Paul Stonesifer, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Francis V. DeDecker, Blythe, Calif., in place of O. A. Eddy, failed to qualify.
 Marion H. Moorehead, Modesto, Calif., in place of J. W. Moore, retired.
 John L. Murphy, Salinas, Calif., in place of J. P. Souza, retired.
 Grace A. Belardes, San Juan Capistrano, Calif., in place of C. A. Romer, transferred.
 Glenn H. Jamison, Willits, Calif., in place of J. V. Breen, resigned.

COLORADO

Virginia M. Gabriel, Frederick, Colo., in place of A. J. Eynon, deceased.

FLORIDA

Helen B. McWhitney, Lake Hamilton, Fla., in place of J. L. Justice, resigned.

GEORGIA

Mittie K. Carter, Lake Park, Ga., in place of Elliott Redding, transferred.
 Jack H. Bowman, Rock Spring, Ga., in place of A. F. McDaniel, transferred.
 Hugh W. Hudspeth, Temple, Ga., in place of W. F. Lambert, retired.
 Norment A. Barnes, Waycross, Ga., in place of G. L. Warren, deceased.

HAWAII

Bella Fung Puua, Pearl City, Hawaii, in place of E. Koi Leong Lau, deceased.

IDAHO

Richard D. Gibler, Kamiah, Idaho, in place of Hastings Brown, deceased.
 Arnold L. Runyon, Wendell, Idaho, in place of G. P. Smith, retired.

ILLINOIS

Mabel V. Vaughan, Cropsey, Ill., in place of E. A. Wagoner, resigned.
 Leona L. Schmidt, Fieldon, Ill., in place of C. L. Wedding, retired.
 Grace M. McKeon, Gifford, Ill., in place of G. R. Bunting, resigned.
 Robert W. Straus, Island Lake, Ill. Office established November 1, 1950.
 Leroy M. Moore, Lake Forest, Ill., in place of A. G. Lucas, retired.
 Carl V. Fellers, Pana, Ill., in place of Walter Hill, resigned.
 John F. Hora, Richmond, Ill., in place of M. D. Brown, resigned.
 Ralph E. Plappert, Sorento, Ill., in place of M. M. Wilber, resigned.
 Forest Wayne Neal, Tuscola, Ill., in place of G. A. Larimer, resigned.
 Ernest J. Bammann, Washburn, Ill., in place of W. W. Lesch, retired.
 William E. Maher, Waverly Ill., in place of G. M. Mader, retired.

INDIANA

Harold K. Nutty, Brookville, Ind., in place of J. R. McDonald, retired.
 Milton D. Freeman, Ellettsville, Ind., in place of J. E. Freeman, retired.
 John B. Hupp, New Castle, Ind., in place of M. C. Goodwin, retired.
 Edward T. Jansen, Osceola, Ind., in place of W. H. Menaugh, retired.

IOWA

Verlyn I. Gemberlin, Alburnett, Iowa, in place of R. C. Loes, resigned.
 James C. Jensen, Council Bluffs, Iowa, in place of F. H. Garrett, retired.
 Anton E. Rasmussen, Forest City, Iowa, in place of G. B. Chryst, retired.
 Herbert H. Wiebel, Lowden, Iowa, in place of E. J. Rutenbeck, retired.
 Luther R. Horn, Moulton, Iowa, in place of Forest Davis, retired.
 Cecil W. Campbell, Ollie, Iowa, in place of H. C. Campbell, deceased.

KANSAS

Hazel H. Stoehr, Murdock, Kans., in place of G. B. Viney, resigned.
 Florian L. Zeller, Paxico, Kans., in place of F. A. Glotzbach, deceased.
 Sara L. Becker, Vermillion, Kans., in place of M. A. Schafer, deceased.

Mary A. Mallams, Weir, Kans., in place of V. A. Miller, retired.

KENTUCKY

Lawrence L. Aylor, Florence, Ky., in place of F. L. Scott, retired.
 Irene G. Guiley, Sharpsburg, Ky., in place of Lula Sharp, retired.

LOUISIANA

Roxie E. Eeds, Cullen, La., in place of Elbert Matthews, resigned.
 Travis E. Albritton, Farmerville, La., in place of Henry Preaus, deceased.
 Ashton, J. Lafargue, Keithville, La., in place of A. I. McCord, resigned.
 Huey G. Ragus, Pioneer, La., in place of W. F. Derrick, retired.

MARYLAND

John F. Stevens, Annapolis, Md., in place of W. A. Strohman, retired.
 Edward J. McPartland, Lonaconing, Md., in place of J. F. Quinn, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Minnie E. Bateman, Dudley, Mass., in place of H. E. Bateman, resigned.
 William N. Sheehy, Middleboro, Mass., in place of J. F. McClusky, retired.
 Harold J. Cuff, South Deerfield, Mass., in place of E. J. Redmond, deceased.
 Fernand P. Como, Wheelwright, Mass., in place of A. O. Delaney, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Meta W. Huff, Belmont, Mich., in place of Daniel Koert, retired.
 Herold M. Stark, Cedar Springs, Mich., in place of D. D. Davis, retired.
 Peter H. Timmer, Charlevoix, Mich., in place of J. M. Foster, retired.
 Thomas V. Manor, Newport, Mich., in place of W. W. Francisco, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Mel Sheridan Dale Swanson, Argyle, Minn., in place of C. A. Hedquist, transferred.
 Martin H. Lindeman, Brownston, Minn., in place of P. L. Hakes, transferred.
 Vincent P. Fermoye, Graceville, Minn., in place of J. F. Fahey, retired.
 Beatrice M. Dumas, Long Lake, Minn., in place of E. N. Dumas, deceased.
 Leroy W. Rodgers, Minneiska, Minn., in place of R. E. Gentzkow, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

William P. Loper, Forest, Miss., in place of I. E. Ormond, retired.
 Marion A. Ousley, Goodman, Miss., in place of J. H. Boyette, transferred.
 James Cecil Young, Nettleton, Miss., in place of E. B. Young, resigned.

MISSOURI

Marion A. Mitchell, Aldrich, Mo., in place of E. L. Griffin, deceased.
 Jessie L. Coleman, Dalton, Mo., in place of W. P. Carskadon, retired.
 Alfred L. York, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. Office reestablished September 16, 1947.
 Gladys G. Simmons, Laclede, Mo., in place of C. T. Hoover, transferred.
 Charles J. Shaw, Oronogo, Mo., in place of M. B. Whitfield, deceased.

MONTANA

Helen M. McCollim, Cascade, Mont., in place of A. T. James, retired.
 Humphrey D. Howell, Hungry Horse, Mont. Office established May 16, 1948.

NEBRASKA

Glen L. Christensen, Newman Grove, Nebr., in place of P. V. Erickson, resigned.
 Harold J. Hoepfner, North Loup, Nebr., in place of Frank Johnson, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

David L. Jones, Bartlett, N. H., in place of E. L. Stillings, retired.
 Henry J. Proulx, Franklin, N. H., in place of G. F. Garneau, retired.
 John S. Gould, Hanover, N. H., in place of R. A. Lewin, retired.

Donald T. Bonnette, Hillsboro, N. H., in place of M. L. Doyle, retired.
 William F. Byrne, Winchester, N. H., in place of S. M. Tarbell, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Emanuel E. McBride, Berlin, N. J., in place of W. L. Mongan, resigned.
 Margaret H. Ardin, Chester, N. J., in place of A. W. Thompson, retired.
 Warren K. Lehr, Columbia, N. J., in place of L. R. Gunter, transferred.
 William Frank Carling, Gibbsboro, N. J., in place of L. M. McIntyre, resigned.
 Edward J. Wojcik, Great Meadows, N. J., in place of H. P. Topoleski, transferred.
 Harold J. Sadlock, Paramus, N. J. Office established June 1, 1950.
 Wilmer Johnson, Jr., Seaside Park, N. J., in place of M. J. Lippincott, retired.

NEW YORK

Bruce M. Austin, Attica, N. Y., in place of F. C. Timm, retired.
 Elizabeth C. Paga, Hannacroix, N. Y., in place of E. A. Spencer, retired.
 Herman J. Misner, Little Falls, N. Y., in place of W. H. McLaughlin, deceased.
 Grace L. Patch, Prattsburg, N. Y., in place of H. C. Olney, retired.
 Rita H. Wells, Schaghticoke, N. Y., in place of G. P. Dickinson, transferred.
 DeMaris Fishbaugh, Waterport, N. Y., in place of D. C. Brown, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Milton N. McLaughlin, Cleveland, N. C., in place of C. H. Roseboro, retired.
 James W. Nantz, Sr., Mount Holly, N. C., in place of O. L. Hoffman, retired.
 Annie P. Southerland, Willard, N. C., in place of A. J. Deese, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph A. Scholand, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of D. F. McMenamy, transferred.

OHIO

Paul D. Smith, De Graff, Ohio, in place of R. T. Smith, retired.
 Robert W. Schroeder, Elmore, Ohio, in place of F. J. Tank, retired.
 Lawrence D. Beardmore, Salem, Ohio, in place of A. E. Beardmore, deceased.
 Effie R. Miller, Terrace Park, Ohio, in place of L. M. Droscher, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Robert V. Jamison, Fort Supply, Okla., in place of M. L. Vaughan, deceased.
 Pearl A. Notley, Morrison, Okla., in place of G. M. Coffman, retired.
 Lela Estella Pate, Ravia, Okla., in place of J. F. Pate, retired.

OREGON

Bernice R. Reuterskiold, Bonneville, Oreg., in place of B. E. North, retired.
 Clifford V. Bride, Sheridan, Oreg., in place of C. W. Flynn, resigned.
 Lucille M. Schultz, Westfir, Oreg., in place of P. H. Ryman, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

William J. B. Reitz, Cairnbrook, Pa., in place of J. D. Houck, resigned.
 Ronald F. Hayman, Confluence, Pa., in place of M. M. Brooke, retired.
 Lionel D. Ritchey, Curryville, Pa., in place of G. H. Gartland, transferred.
 Paul M. Kulhamer, Fullerton, Pa., in place of H. P. Hartman, retired.
 Alice M. Springer, Glenmoore, Pa., in place of C. V. Snyder, resigned.
 Harry L. Smith, Mifflinburg, Pa., in place of W. L. Doebler, removed.
 Robert F. Oliver, New Milford, Pa., in place of C. W. Aldrich, deceased.
 Homer L. Budinger, Salladasburg, Pa., in place of C. K. Flook, retired.
 Henry C. Johnston, Smithton, Pa., in place of F. G. Christopher, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Junot Franco Soto, Sabana Grande, P. R.,
in place of M. A. Franco Soto, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Orin H. Garner, Jonesville, S. C., in place of
I. S. Littlejohn, retired.

TENNESSEE

Arthur C. Puckett, Jr., La Vergne, Tenn.,
in place of P. P. Howse, retired.
Francis E. Durrett, White House, Tenn., in
place of M. B. Baggett, retired.

TEXAS

Helen K. Humphries, Balmorhea, Tex., in
place of T. M. Delaney, retired.
Joel Parker Carroll, Bryan, Tex., in place
of Wilson Bradley, retired.
Gurley N. Sellers, Coolidge, Tex., in place
of T. L. Satterwhite, resigned.
Thomas L. Cheatham, Edgewood, Tex., in
place of A. B. Hobbs, deceased.
Floyd S. May, Iowa Park, Tex., in place of
E. E. Wallis, transferred.
Paul D. Cauley, Sr., Kingsville, Tex., in
place of J. D. Gibbs, deceased.
Almer D. Woods, Jr., Marquez, Tex., in
place of A. D. Woods, retired.
Roy L. McGuire, Seymour, Tex., in place of
Otis Avery, transferred.

VERMONT

Frederick R. Rousseau, North Hero, Vt., in
place of K. A. Tudhope, transferred.

VIRGINIA

Marion Irene Davenport, Lancaster, Va., in
place of G. P. Gresham, retired.
Robert E. Booker, Jr., Lottsburg, Va., in
place of G. C. Watkins, retired.
Rolla Wallace Rosen, Staunton, Va., in
place of R. E. Fifer, retired.

WASHINGTON

Elmer F. Pardee, Lake Stevens, Wash., in
place of E. A. Kinney, retired.
James S. Wise, Lebam, Wash., in place of
G. W. Adams, retired.
Velma I. Jennings, Spangle, Wash., in place
of F. I. Jennings, retired.
William C. Manly, Jr., White Salmon,
Wash., in place of B. B. Pollard, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Vernette M. Means, Rothschild, Wis., in
place of A. K. Means, retired.
Harry Gelb, White Lake, Wis., in place of
W. R. Collins, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by
the Senate February 28 (legislative day
of February 25), 1952:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for ap-
pointment in the Regular Corps of the Pub-
lic Health Service:

*To be senior assistant sanitary engineer,
effective date of acceptance*

Zadok D. Harrison

*To be senior assistant surgeons, effective date
of acceptance*

Norman B. Atkins	Allan B. Carter
Edward L. Burwell	Harry Y. Spence
Mitchell R. Zavon	John P. Fort, Jr.
Mario Stefanini	Charles L. Hoffman
John T. Gentry	John L. Grow
Harvey A. Itano	George L. Gee, Jr.
Alexis I. Shelokov	Lance S. Wright
Seymour M. Perry	Robert K. Williams
Calvin R. MacKay	Alfred S. Ketcham
David M. Fried	George W. West
Robert W. Summers	Nicholas C. Leone
David S. Howell	Walter P. Scott
William J. Browne	

*To be assistant surgeons, effective date of
acceptance*

Laurens P. White	Walter T. Snow
Alan S. Rabson	Marlin D. Greenhalgh

Hugh A. Storrow	Carson R. Jones
Clarence T. McGraw	Donald L. Toker

*To be senior assistant dental surgeons,
effective date of acceptance*

Lewis V. Lortz, Jr.
Russell S. Wright

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Wilburn J. Adams, Rockland.

NEW YORK

Louis C. Nielsen, Amagansett.
Rene J. Panuska, East Islip.
Charles E. Statia, Granville.
Hewlett H. Davis, Miller Place.
Victor Rowe, Ontario Center.
Walter G. Kluge, Orient.
John A. McGarr, Oyster Bay.
Mary B. Bunnell, Sclo.

NORTH DAKOTA

LeRoy A. Anderson, Binford.
Herbert W. Booth, Towner.

PENNSYLVANIA

Lawrence W. Nees, Geistown.
Thomas J. Cavanaugh, Nanty Glo.

WASHINGTON

William K. Wuesthoff, Davenport.
Donald J. Auvil, Entiat.
Vincent B. White, Okanogan.
Troy T. Dean, Otis Orchards.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp,
D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal Spirit, we pray that
this day may be blessed and crowned
with the wonder and glory of a God-
illumined vision of life's moral and
spiritual values.

We humbly acknowledge that it is
becoming increasingly clear that we can-
not meet and master our human prob-
lems without the comradeship and con-
solation, the inspiration and strength
of these sacred spiritual realities.

Grant that they may never be obscured
and supplanted by habits of character
and conduct that are unworthy of the
sons of God.

To Thy name we shall ascribe all the
praise. Amen.

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

THE POSTAL SERVICE—NEED FOR
BETTER SERVICE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unan-
imous consent to extend my remarks at
this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am to-
day requesting in a letter to the Hon-
orable TOM MURRAY, chairman of the
House Committee on Post Office and
Civil Service, prompt hearings on my
bill—House Resolution 58—and other
measures to bring about rescission of the
order of the Postmaster General curtail-
ing postal services. My bill also calls
for an investigation of this curtailment
and calls on the appropriate standing

legislative committees of this body to
examine into the necessity for and pro-
priety of this curtailment. The Ameri-
can people, now obliged to pay increased
rates for mail service totaling an esti-
mated \$250,000 annually, ought to be
receiving in return the services which
they had received prior to the Post-
master General's April 18, 1950, order.
Instead we are faced with deficit for
1952 estimated by the Postmaster Gen-
eral to be \$768,008,261, an increase of
some \$217,000,000 from the 1951 year,
and no idea of restoring services.

The New York World-Telegram and
Sun, in an editorial climaxing a series
of five articles—which are inserted in
the Appendix—surveying the poor con-
dition of our postal service, puts some
blame on the Congress for tying the
hands of the Postmaster General and
also forcing the hiring of temporary
employees.

These articles point out two major
defects and make one important com-
parison. They raise the whole ques-
tion of political influence in the person-
nel system of the Post Office, a political
influence which is admitted. This is a
serious blight on the whole system and
very serious to the career employees. It
harms the efficiency of the system. It
often causes the career employees to be
saddled by the public with blame for
conditions for which they are certainly
not responsible. Secondly, the articles
point up inefficient methods, archaic,
old-fashioned—which do not belong to-
day. Finally, they show that mail serv-
ice in London and Paris which are com-
parable cities to New York is so much
better than our own that it must be hard
reading for every American. And these
are the countries which have deep eco-
nomic troubles as compared with our
own relative prosperity.

The Hoover Commission reports show
how the Post Office could be run effi-
ciently. What has happened about rec-
ommendations of the Hoover Commis-
sion is summarized in excerpts from the
address of Mr. Walter D. Fuller, chair-
man of the board, Curtis Publishing Co.,
at the Second National Reorganization
Conference of the Citizens Committee for
the Hoover report held in Washington
on February 18, which is also set forth
in the Appendix.

The Congress has within its power the
restoration of services to the previous
state of dependability. Further in-
creases in rates, especially in other than
first-class mail and post cards may need
to be considered. Efficiency in operation
and personnel policies need to be dealt
with. Members cannot really complain
unless the Congress exercises this power
to do all that Congress can do to change
conditions and then sees that the execu-
tive department does the rest.

It is well that the joint committee of
the House and Senate, authorized in the
last session to conduct a thorough study
and investigation in respect to the gen-
eral operations of the postal service, will
shortly begin to function. In the mean-
time, American families and American
businesses should not be made to suffer
because of curtailed mail deliveries, post
office hours and similar inconven-

iences. Postal services should be restored now. Progress, not retrogression, should be the keynote of our postal service.

CHANGE IN PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Chair to say that no one will be recognized for 1 minute this morning?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of that fact I wonder if it would be a proper parliamentary inquiry to inquire of the majority leader as to the action next week on the measure that is pending? The notice of the whip indicated it would be read for amendment on next Monday. We have all proceeded on that basis. However, we have received some information that that plan as announced and as I thought was agreed upon has been changed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I welcome the inquiry of my friend. The first appropriation bill is ready for consideration. Of course, we all know the importance of getting those bills through as quickly as possible. So the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill will be considered on Monday. It is expected that will be disposed of on Monday. We will try to dispose of that bill on Monday. Then consideration of the UMT bill will follow.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, many of us had expected that this present bill would be read on Monday for amendment, although we must recognize, I suppose, that the program is in control of the majority. Let me ask the majority leader one further question: If consideration of the Treasury-Post Office bill is not concluded on Monday, will consideration continue over on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. HALLECK. And consideration of that bill will continue until the appropriation matter is disposed of?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my intention and that is what will be done. In other words, the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill will come up for consideration on Monday and we hope to complete its consideration on that day. If not we will proceed with its consideration until it is disposed of.

Mr. HALLECK. I would seriously doubt whether that bill, which is quite an important one, could be concluded on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have answered the gentleman's question. We hope to have it concluded on Monday, but, if not, we will proceed with its consideration until it is concluded.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to the majority leader that I am a little disappointed in his statement. As minority whip of the House I sent notice to every Republican Member, in conformity with what was stated by the majority leader last week, that the bill now under consideration would be read for amendment on Monday. As a result of the gentle-

man's statement, I am placed in somewhat of an embarrassing position.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry for the embarrassment of the gentleman, but there is nothing about what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said but what is consistent with time-honored custom. There is no change in the program. There is a variance and the variation is to bring up an important appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the parliamentary inquiry has been answered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Abbott	Feighan	Morrison
Allen, Ill.	Fine	Moulder
Anfuso	Flood	Murray, Wis.
Aspinall	Fugate	Nicholson
Bailey	Fulton	O'Toole
Baring	Gamble	Potter
Barrett	Garmatz	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Granahan	Prouty
Beall	Hall	Rhodes
Betts	Edwin Arthur	Rooney
Buchanan	Hall	Sabath
Buckley	Leonard W.	St. George
Camp	Hart	Sasscer
Case	Herter	Scott
Celler	Hess	Hardie
Chatham	Ikard	Secret
Chudoff	Jonas	Sheehan
Combs	King, Calif.	Staggers
Cooley	Klein	Stockman
Corbett	Lanham	Sutton
Coudert	Larcade	Wheeler
Crawford	LeCompte	Wickersham
Dawson	McGrath	Wolcott
Dingell	McIntire	Wood, Ga.
Dollinger	Martin, Mass.	Wood, Idaho
Ellsworth	Mason	Woodruff
Fallon	Miller, Md.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 543) covering memorial services in the House to be held on Wednesday, May 14, 1952, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, May 14, 1952, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on House Administration under the provision of clause (1) (j) (2) (C) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave for 60 legislative days to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the life, character, and public service of deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings, the Speaker shall call the House to order and then as a

further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased he shall declare the House adjourned. The necessary expenses connected with such memorial services shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration and approved by such committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS ACT

Mr. VINSON. 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. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, 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. 5904, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 31 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, of course we are not debating a new subject today. I doubt if there has ever been a subject debated as frequently by the Congress as has been this subject of universal military training. We all recall that last year when the matter was under consideration I stated on a number of occasions that this was one issue which I felt should be considered by the Congress without reference to politics. It is one which so closely affects the safety and well being of the Nation that it should never at any time be regarded as a political issue.

I also felt at that time, as I feel now, that it is a subject that should be considered very calmly and without the importation of irritating issues and things which may arouse the passions and prejudices of people on collateral issues. Unfortunately, again we have had brought in here every controversial issue of the day. They have all been thrown in adroitly at some time or other during the past 2 days.

I have been very much intrigued by the debate, however, Mr. Chairman, because it has been so thoroughly apart from the bill now pending before the committee. I have listened to practically every word which has been said in opposition to this bill, and I now find myself in the position of discovering that very little of it relates to this bill. The vast majority of the argument has concerned the idea of having an 8-year total obligation, including service in the Reserve, or a question of 6 months of training; and the question of whether or not there should be universal military training.

Now, let us go back to last year, at the time we passed Public Law 51 of the Eighty-second Congress. That is the law today, passed by the overwhelming vote of this House, and placed upon the statute books. Now, what did we do in Public Law 51? In Public Law 51, we created

the National Security Commission, whose report is the basis for this bill. We created then the National Security Training Corps so that neither of those issues are pending here, the permanent law having been enacted in Public Law 51 of last year.

At that time we also increased the total service obligations, including service in the Reserve, of persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed in any of the Armed Forces from 6 years to 8 years. So we are not here debating the question of whether the Reserve obligation should be 8 years or less because last year we passed into the law that the total obligation of persons thereafter entering the service in any manner would be a period of 8 years. At that time we fixed the pay at \$30 a month. At that time we provided by law that the active duty training period would be 6 months, so that that matter is already the law.

Of course, we had a number of routine provisions in that law. We provided that the Selective Service System would attend to the inducting of the persons to be trained under the program, and we established a mechanism by which the program could be put into effect either by the President or by the Congress by concurrent resolution. Then why are we here with this provision again? Because we provided in Public Law 51 that the Commission within a stated period of time should report to the Congress what it recommended as to certain very limited things. They were to report a broad outline for a program to assure that the training would be military in nature. That is the provision of Public Law 51.

Another thing the Commission was required to report on were measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the trainees; also a code of conduct and their provisions for disability and death benefits and the obligations and liabilities of the trainees. In Public Law 51 we provided as a condition precedent to the induction of any man into the National Security Training Corps that this report should be made and that the committees of the House and the Senate should consider the report, and that certain provisions would have to be enacted into the law by the two bodies before anybody could be inducted into the corps. So why all of the debate we have had here about whether there should be universal military training, and the great time that my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT] spent as to whether we had committed ourselves to the principle of military training? I do not think there is any implication that we committed ourselves to the principle of universal military training. I think we adopted into positive law a system of military training to take effect upon the passage of a law which would provide for these benefits to the trainees and which would insure that it was military training and not some other social program under the guise of military training.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is not the real issue whether or not the plan submitted is actually military training of the type contemplated by Public Law 51? Is that not the only issue in the case?

Mr. KILDAY. I am just coming now to what this bill does. It is very surprising how little it does do. It fulfills the condition precedent that we required in Public Law 51.

There are certain routine things in the bill such as the wording of the oath, which, by the way, requires upholding the Constitution, things of that kind, but the balance of this bill is primarily in the interest of and for the protection of the trainee. Practically everything in the bill is for the benefit of the trainee.

For instance, it provides that he shall have the same protection that is enjoyed by civilian employees of the Government; that is, he shall have the protection of the Federal Employees Compensation Act. He will have the same \$10,000 gratuity insurance benefit as is possessed by members of the active military service while he is on duty and for 120 days thereafter.

It provides the moral atmosphere in which he is to be trained. It prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquors on the posts where these boys are to be trained. It gives power to the executive branch of the Government to control vice and the sale of intoxicating liquors at or near the places where these boys are to be trained.

Then it provides for a code of conduct. It had been our feeling, and this is the reason we asked the Commission to give its recommendation, that perhaps the trainee should not be subjected for military offenses to the same type of court-martial procedure as would be the regular or the contract soldier or the soldier on full military duty or service.

The Commission recommended, however, and this bill so provides, that the new uniform code of military justice shall constitute the code of conduct for the trainee with certain very important exceptions. He cannot be tried before a court martial for certain designated offenses without his personal permission given in writing. If he does not agree to trial by court martial, then, of course, if it is an offense that is cognizable under the law, and this enacts the code of military justice into the Federal code for the purposes of this act, he would be subject to trial in a Federal court the same as if he had not been taken into the corps. If he prefers to be tried by court martial, then he must agree to do so in writing, and that would be a condition precedent to the attachment of jurisdiction by a court martial.

So those are the things which this bill actually does. You will see that there is very little compulsion on the part of the trainee. Most of the things in this bill are for his benefit.

Let us remember that last year, last April 12 and 13, we voted on this matter. Public Law 51 whose provisions I have briefly outlined here was passed on a roll call vote by 372 to 44. That was on April 13. The House refused to recommit that bill by 296 to 21. Of course,

I understand the contention is made that that bill also extended selective service that, therefore, a vote against it would have prevented the extension of selective service. But, you will recall that my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] was quite active in that debate. You will recall that he had an amendment which, as I recall, was in the nature of a substitute which eliminated all of the provisions of that bill which had anything to do with universal military training, and retained only the extension of the draft. I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina, if that is not substantially correct?

Mr. BARDEN. That is substantially correct, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, but that is not the issue upon which the substitute bill was defeated. Immediately those of you who helped to combine with the minority which was after that bill, joined together and said if we did not pass both, we would not have any selective service.

Mr. KILDAY. I enjoyed the gentleman's talk of yesterday as I always do. I love to participate in debate with the gentleman because he asks no quarter and gives no quarter. He is one of the few men I know who is able to dish it out and also to take it. I would like to say to the gentleman now that I am glad that he has said something with reference to this bill, because of the speech yesterday, while it was most enjoyable, could have been made in opposition to the Statute of Frauds or the Magna Carta or anything else. It did not touch this issue at all, and I am glad that the gentleman has finally said something about this bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I will be glad to take either side of the issue with the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. But, Mr. Chairman, I insist that was the case. Anyway, the gentleman from North Carolina states that I am substantially correct in the statement I made as to the content of the Barden amendment of last year. We had a teller vote in Committee of the Whole, and there were 140 favoring Mr. BARDEN's amendment at that time, and 232 opposing it. By 92 votes here in the Committee of the Whole we sustained the provisions of that bill having to do with universal military training because the Barden amendment was a clear-cut, straight-out elimination from the bill of everything having to do with universal military training.

I am pleading with you for one thing in this connection. I have stated that I feel it should not be considered in any political light, and I mean that for myself as well as for others. I will have no complaint with anyone who finds it in his conscience to vote against this bill. I do want to plead with you, and plead with you most earnestly, to let us face this issue, and face it squarely. Let us not have another situation of attempting to sweeten it up or make it a little more palatable; or being in a position where you vote to recommit, but do not vote against it. This matter has been pending here for years and years and years. I hope particularly that the House does not see fit to vote to recommit this bill for further study. If there has ever been

a proposition which has been studied, this is it. During the war we had a select committee under the late Clifton Woodrum on postwar military policy. We had hearings on this question for weeks and weeks, and we took thousands of pages of testimony. Later, shortly after the war, the former Committee on Military Affairs took thousands of pages of testimony on this very same proposition. Then the President appointed the Compton Commission, headed by Dr. Carl T. Compton, perhaps the highest class commission ever created for an Executive study. That Commission heard many thousands of words of testimony and made their report.

In the Eightieth Congress, the Republican Congress, the Committee on Armed Services took this matter up in a bill offered by our former colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Towe, and again we took thousands of words of testimony and favorably reported the bill. Last year, in Public Law 51, we again went through all of that study; and now on this bill. So let us not be in the ridiculous position of saying that after all of this study, because this is an election year, we are going to send the bill back to committee for further study. Let us face it directly. Let us either pass it or kill it, and kill it for all time. Let us have this issue terminated. I say that for these reasons: We are attempting to maintain a military budget of between fifty and seventy billion dollars. Any man in his right mind knows that we cannot do that for any protracted period of time. Everybody knows we will wreck our country if we attempt to maintain that budget. Public Law 51 is on the books as an element of economy in the military budget, and if we are not to use it, if we are not to rely on it, let us get rid of it, because we must then look around for some other means of reducing this military budget. What those means would be, I do not know. It may be that we will just have to take a calculated risk and reduce the numbers of our Armed Forces, and hope to God that if a blow comes it will come where we are strongest. But let us do something with this issue. Let us either pass it or kill it. Let us not equivocate. Let us not delay. I plead with the Members of this House to terminate this issue.

I am not one of the oldest Members of the House, but still, along with others here, I have worked on this one proposition for 13 years. This is the time to decide it. We must decide it for the welfare of our country. Whichever way you want to vote, vote; but let us not equivocate. Let us not dodge the issue.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The issue is whether we will have UMT, or not, is it not?

Mr. KILDAY. I thought I had made myself clear.

Mr. VORYS. Well, the gentleman did not make himself clear, because he talked as if that issue was decided last summer; and, as I understand, that is the issue that is before the House now.

Mr. KILDAY. The issue before the House now is the approval of a plan of military training and the provision of the things that we required by law to be reported here, to provide for the security and for the moral welfare and for a code of conduct. That is all there is in this bill. Of course, it is true there is a condition precedent. Unless this is passed, you cannot induct anyone into the National Security and Training Corps.

Mr. VORYS. The issue is whether we have UMT or not. That is the issue in this bill. That is the issue, and if it is here now it was not settled last summer; and if it was settled last summer, it is not here now.

Mr. KILDAY. Well, the gentleman is a good lawyer. I know that when he was practicing in court he never followed that same idea of a rule of materiality with reference to an issue that was pending. The gentleman is a good lawyer, and if he had attempted to do so there is no judge who would have permitted any such idea on the rule of materiality.

Mr. VORYS. Will the gentleman yield for one other question on another phase?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Can the gentleman tell us how many of the present Reserves are nonveterans? I understand that General Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, said that 53 to 60 percent of the National Guard enlisted personnel are nonveterans.

Mr. KILDAY. I am sorry I cannot give you that figure. I think it is quite considerable but nowhere near that number, and I think it is a very unfortunate situation, but the Congress is responsible for it, because in attempting to duck and dodge UMT in the Eightieth Congress, the other body insisted on putting provisions into the extension of the Draft Act that exempted from the draft everybody who could rush into the National Guard or a Reserve organization prior to a given date. It was the idea that some people had of being able to dodge this issue. It has, of course, worked in reverse.

Mr. VORYS. Will not the same thing happen under the voluntary service under UMT? If you try to have UMT while the draft is going on and if the bill is passed as it is before us, a boy who serves 6 months in UMT is not liable for further service until Congress acts again?

Mr. KILDAY. Let me make the speech, please; the gentleman has asked the question; please let me make the speech.

Mr. VORYS. I want to make the question clear.

Mr. KILDAY. I understand the question thoroughly. The question involves the mechanism under which UMT can be placed in operation. You can take any provision of any law or any proposed law and come to an absurd conclusion or construction if you so desire and can generally construe it the way you think it suits your case the best. The proviso for the implementation of UMT is that the President shall find and so state by Executive order that it is possible within the security needs of the Nation either to reduce or eliminate the period of service for persons under 19 years of age. Of

course, if you want to be absurd in statutory construction you can say that the President can reduce the period of service of those under 19 by 1 day and then activate UMT. Maybe that would be possible, but it is not at all probable and cannot possibly happen. This would have to be sustained by public opinion, and public opinion would not sustain any absurd construction of that kind. The order would most likely say that the service of those under 19 was no longer required and that those under 19 will be trained and those over 19 will be available for service just as they have been under the Selective Service and Training Act and just as they will remain.

Mr. VORYS. Does not this bill, and I am asking for information, does not this bill provide that the UMT alumni, those who have gone through the 6 months course, cannot be called into active service without further action of Congress?

Mr. KILDAY. Further action of Congress would be necessary, yes; because it provides that they shall not be called for service except in such numbers as may hereafter be determined by the Congress. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Am I correct in understanding that the gentleman said, not once but several times, that it was his hope that we would vote upon the bill as introduced and against amendments?

Mr. KILDAY. I did not say that about amendments. The bill is here under an open rule and everybody is entitled to vote for or against amendments. The hope I expressed was that we would not attempt to take an easy way out, but that we would finally get a clear-cut vote on whether we want UMT or do not want UMT.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman that I hope those on this side will vote all amendments down including the motion to recommit and vote the bill itself either up or down.

Mr. KILDAY. For once I hope the gentleman prevails.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. During my 10 years in Congress I have been against universal military training, but I realize that we are faced with a situation in the world which has caused those who have taken that position in the past to re-evaluate the necessity of building up these reserves. I want to pursue further the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio: If one of these boys who comes in at 18 and serves 6 months is released into the Reserves for the next 7½ years is not that discriminatory against the boy who went in at the same time under the draft for 2 years?

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot imagine a situation or a set of circumstances involving two boys of the same age, one of whom would be taken for training for 6 months and the other inducted for 2 years of service.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I mean to say that 6 months later they will take the other boy in at 18 under the draft.

Mr. KILDAY. They have the legal authority to do that now, but they have never reached down that far yet.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They have not gone below 20.

Mr. KILDAY. They have not gone below 20.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The point I want to have clarified is the discrimination between boys of the same age, one being taken for 6 months' training and 6 months later the other drafted for 2 years, leaving the first boy subject to 7½ years' service in the Reserves. Are you dependent upon the Congress to make available to the Armed Forces these boys who have been trained in UMT during that 7½ years?

Mr. KILDAY. That is a matter that would be up to the Congress because further legislation would be necessary. Now, on this matter of discrimination, may I say it is now discriminatory to draft a boy who is 18½ plus 1 day and not draft a boy 18½ less 1 day, or take a man who is 26 and not take the man who is 26 plus 1 day. Is that not discrimination? Probably it is just a matter of luck so far as the day upon which a particular boy might be born. Those are definite segments in separate group.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I followed the chairman's argument on this question of unfairness and I will say it was very informative. I realize we cannot have a system, apparently, that is absolutely fair to everyone's conception of fairness.

Mr. KILDAY. No.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I recognize the problem that is involved. I do want to say that the Congress should follow this act by not allowing these boys to remain out of service until they are 26 because they are in the Reserves. In other words, I think that Reserves should be used to take care of the unfair situation that now exists in reference to these boys who have fought for 4 years.

Mr. KILDAY. The point is to get started on building up the right kind of a Reserve. The greatest discrimination that we have ever been guilty of was to call back for the Korean war the boys who had fought through the entire World War II. Why did we have to do it? Because we had no adequate Reserve system. If this system had been in existence for a period of 5 years prior to the beginning of Korea, there would not have been any such thing as one man being called upon to serve twice when another was not called on to serve at all.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Along the line of the question raised by the gentleman from California with respect to preferential treatment it is alleged these trainees are going to get because they go into the Reserve and are not required to render any military service, as the gentleman from Texas has indicated, before they are brought back into the service additional legislation—an act of Congress—is necessary. It is inconceivable to me that a Congress which succeeds us, being confronted with the need

of calling into active service its Reserves composed of men who have had military service, that that Congress would not say to boys who have had no military service: "Come into the service," and that those who are veterans will be a secondary consideration.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman. Of course, we cannot take the position that this is the only Congress there is going to be or the only one with sufficient intelligence to handle this matter. As long as it is kept within the control of the Congress in the future we can be sure that the different groups are going to be treated justly. The American people will not stand for injustice from any Congress, I do not care at what time it may be in existence.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said before. This matter has been thoroughly studied, thoroughly discussed, and the issues are well understood. Let us face the issue when we reach it next week. Let us either vote UMT into existence and begin building our Reserves or let us do something to reduce this military budget that we have—something else. I do think it is our patriotic duty to settle the issue now. Let us begin a national-defense system on a long-term basis rather than living from day to day as we have been doing in the past.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for 20 years it has been my pleasure and privilege to serve in this honorable and distinguished body. In all that time no issue has been more important or more far-reaching in its consequences than the legislation now before us. Universal military training or peacetime conscription is not a new problem but a rather old one. For over 30 years certain leaders of the American Legion and of the armed services have worked diligently, honestly, patriotically and ceaselessly propagandizing America in a determined effort to saddle upon this country a system that, in my opinion, is totally foreign and actually hostile to the best interests of the American Republic and its citizens. Much of the money that has been spent by the Defense Department has been illegally spent in propaganda for purposes other than that for which it was appropriated. That was clearly brought out by the Harness committee in the Eightieth Congress of which our present colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], was then chief counsel. But in spite of this determined drive to fasten peacetime military conscription upon us, each and every year that I have been here, and for 10 years prior to my coming here, the American Congress, regardless of its political complexion, has succeeded in preventing the enactment of this nefarious scheme.

Every red-blooded American knows that there is no more loyal or patriotic organization in this country than the American Legion, but certainly that organization does not possess a monopoly upon all wisdom, virtue, and patriotism, and certainly its judgment in all instances is not infallible. If anyone thought otherwise, I am sure his doubt would have been dispelled at the banquet given us night before last by the Ameri-

can Legion at the Hotel Statler in Washington. I do not think it is wise, and to say the least, it is poor taste for any host to invite a guest to a banquet, and then threaten him with political extinction if he does not carry out the mandate of the host. I am sure that every intelligent and patriotic Member of this House wears no man's collar and will not be coerced or compelled to follow the dictates of any minority pressure group in this country. We are sent here not to carry out the mandate of any labor group, any farm group, any old-age group, any racial group, or even a veterans' group. We are sent here to represent all the American people, and in voting on any piece of legislation we must look at it from all angles and for the welfare not only of our immediate and particular constituencies or States, but the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

I have no quarrel and I shall not have any quarrel with any Member of this body as to how he shall vote on this particular measure. Each one of us must search his own soul, look into his own conscience, and exercise his best judgment based upon long and serious study of facts, rather than being swayed by propaganda or threats from any source.

It is quite understandable, sir, why certain high-salaried men in the American Legion with liberal expense accounts want this bill passed. That is their business. That is their job. They do not speak, however, for the rank and file of the American Legion any more than the leader of any other group speaks for the rank and file of its members.

It is quite understandable why members of the armed services are interested in wanting to saddle upon us peacetime military conscription that will give them vast bodies of men to command. As I have often said, no preacher ever had a congregation large enough to talk to and no general ever had an army big enough to command.

In peacetime the military are chiefly interested in pay, promotion, retirement, and having their sons succeed them at West Point and Annapolis; and you know it. They know it. And I have appointed the sons of military and naval officers.

I have always tried to be a friend of members of the armed services. This is the one, big, fundamental issue on which we radically, violently, and irreconcilably differ.

Do you want this thing? I want to give you just some of the reasons why I am against it.

First, it is a radical departure from our American traditions and best interests. Every major power, every great nation that has ever had military training or peacetime conscription inevitably has been led down the road to war, defeat, and ruin. Germany, Italy, and Japan, today, are a shambles. All the way from Mannheim and Ludwigshafen along the Rhine to Darmstadt, Frankfurt to Cologne, over to Bremen, Hamburg, down through Berlin, and Dresden on to far-off Stuttgart and Muenchen.

The result of Prussian militarism started under Bismarck, was carried out

by the Kaiser, and was lauded to the skies by Hitler, yet some people would like to Prussianize this country.

Oh, it is argued by some that Japan, Italy, and Germany failed, but just look at Sweden and Switzerland. They have not been overrun. No; but it is not because they have universal military training and service. Sweden, with a little more than 6,000,000 people, less than the city of New York, and Switzerland, with a little over 4,000,000 people, about the size of the city of Chicago, one on the right flank of Germany and the other on the left flank of Germany, Sweden furnishing iron ore and raw materials to the Reich while Switzerland furnished watches, precision instruments, and agricultural products, milk, cheese, and chocolate. It was to Germany's interest not to attack Sweden or Switzerland because so long as they remained neutral Germany did not have to defend them.

No intelligent, serious-minded person for one moment would honestly and candidly argue that we should adopt universal military training because it has happened to work in Sweden or Switzerland. That is puerile and ignorant thinking. History is on the side of the people who oppose this peacetime military conscription because it has been tried, and it has always failed. It will fail again.

If you force men against their will into military service the country is lulled into a false sense of security. Look at France. France built the Maginot line. They had universal military training and a huge standing army. France thought she was impregnable, but she was overrun in a few weeks' time. Peacetime military conscription did not save Poland. It was this peacetime conscription that bled the economy of France and rendered her weak and impotent. Let me say here that the battle front can never be stronger than the home front. Modern, mechanized wars are not won by mere masses of men, but by up-to-date weapons, scientific research, and technological development.

The quality of weapons has always prevailed against the mere masses of men. If we start to match man for man with the hordes in Russia, and on the continent of Asia, we are licked before we begin. Japan surrendered with 3,000,000 soldiers on Honshu, Hokkaido, and Kyushu Islands. She had 3,000,000 men under arms, and yet they surrendered. Why? Because our great and gallant Navy, our B-17's, and later our B-29's had literally burned up and blasted to bits all of the Yokohama area in Japan, and the Tokyo region, Nagoya, Nagasaki, Kobe, Osaka, and Hiroshima. Every city in Japan, with the exception of Kyoto, like every city in Germany, with the exception of Heidelberg, was blasted to bits and destroyed—not by mere numbers of men, but by modern, up-to-date weapons.

The chief reason we should defeat this bill is not alone on moral or social grounds, however valid those grounds might be, but the reason I am against this bill is because instead of adding to our national security, it imperils and weakens our defense. What we need

now more than anything else are guns and bombs and planes and tanks. Already the Russians are outproducing us in planes. They are shooting more planes down today in Korea than we are manufacturing in this country. Are we going to build up a great reservoir of manpower here in this country at an enormous expense to bleed our economy white as France was bled white from 1870 to 1939? We need steel, aluminum, and machine tools. We need more than anything else scientists, technicians, and mechanics, and, gentlemen, you are not going to get them under universal military training. You are not going to produce any experts in the field of radio, radar, television, or electronics in any 6 months' time.

What a farce this bill is. How futile it is. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] when he said, "It is remarkable how little this bill does. I should say it is. It does nothing except to weaken and undermine our Nation and this great Republic. It takes a long time to develop experts. Offhand, I cannot just think of anyone in any branch of the armed services who ever gave us any great inventions. I know that Thomas Edison, Henry Ford, the Wright brothers, or Eli Whitney would never have been produced in any UMT or under the military, because the military is cast in a mold. They are put in a strait-jacket. They produce a rigidity of mind that closes the intellectual door to new ideas. In college classrooms you can talk back, but you do not in the Army. It is blind obedience and unquestioning following of commands. It closes the mind to new facts, to new weapons. No elasticity or freedom of the mind is left.

What has made America great? Her freedom, because in freedom is our strength. Oh, you say this will not Prussianize America. This bill will not militarize this country. Heaven knows we all hate war. The reason we are not Prussianized or militarized is because we have never had this European scheme, but once you adopt it you will find out that Americans, after all, are human beings, pretty much like the common clay in all people all over this world. We are not so different. We will become imbued with a spirit, we will be indoctrinated, particularly if you can take boys with fuzz on their cheeks and chins at an impressionable age. Just give us time and we will travel the same road to disaster that has been traveled by every other great power which has lived under this ruinous scheme.

They tell you how good this is going to be for the boys; for their health. A great Britisher said that the battles of the First World War were won on the hockey and cricket fields of England, at Eton, Harrow, Oxford, and Cambridge. As far as physical training on the baseball diamond and football field in our colleges and universities is concerned, these boys can remain in their own local environments, under the wholesome influences of church and home and school. That is the place to develop character; not by segregating men into large bodies. It is bad to segregate any group of men,

particularly boys of 18 and 19, far from home, living in an abnormal and unnatural environment. I lived in barracks three decades ago with boys and I would not choose it as a particularly favorable spot to develop character. It stands to reason that free and independent men make the best army on earth, but the army is not the best place to make free and independent men.

Now, what about the cost? No one can accurately tell you what this is going to cost us. The commission has made its report. The commission is composed of five outstanding patriotic Americans, three civilians and two military leaders. In spite of their wisdom, virtue, and patriotism they have all favored UMT for many years. It was a lopsided commission that was set up to report to us, but a Missourian knows how to cut the cards and stack the deck.

I want to make this thing clear: Universal military training is not an established law of this land; it cannot become law until the Congress, both Houses, Senate and House, by affirmative, positive action passes legislation to make it so. That is what is before us, and I am glad the issue at long last has been divided. I argued last year—there is very little that I can add to the speech I made in the well here when I spoke for over an hour on April 3 of last year. I stood here and argued against the shotgun wedding, the illicit marriage of the extension of the draft with UMT. I did everything in the beginning of the hearings in the committee, and my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] agreed that the issues should have been separated then. But no; we all knew, and certainly the proponents of UMT knew we would have to extend the draft because of the Korean conflict and because of world conditions. We all voted for extension of the draft. I even voted in conference to give the President the power to call the Reserves whether Congress was in session or not. But the proponents of peacetime conscription knew that the only chance in the world they had of getting this thing saddled upon us was to tie it in to the draft. When we extended the draft, what we did in that bill, Public Law 51, was to set up the National Security Training Commission composed of Senator Wadsworth, Will Clayton, Dr. Compton, of MIT, Admiral Kincaid, and General McLain to make a study and report within 4 months time, which they did on October 29 to the Congress; and then each Committee on the Armed Services, the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate, could take up the measure, study legislation proposed, then report to the respective bodies the results of their findings.

Today we are not voting for the hybrid mongrel bill of last year; today we are voting on only a single issue and that is whether we are going to have not the draft, temporary legislation that is meeting all of the requirements of this hour, but whether we shall set up peacetime military conscription on a permanent basis. We are going now to adopt the very thing we have spent so much in blood and money in past years to destroy.

The virus and the disease of the vanquished has infected the victors. What a sad commentary.

We were told when that bill passed last year that UMT, if it were set up, would not go into effect until after the draft ended; that is what we were told. But now we sneak in, instead of postponing or waiting until the present crisis is over, which General MacArthur has advised, to which both Hanson Baldwin, the military expert of the New York Times, and Mrs. Anna Rosenberg herself have admitted cannot go effectively into operation until the present emergency or crisis is over; notwithstanding that promise we now sneak in and we are going to take—oh, just 60,000. The 800,000 will come later. "We will take 5,000 a month," a trifling number. We will get the camel's nose under the tent, then he will take over the whole circus later on. We just want to get the foot in the door, we just want to ease the needle into you now, then we will come along a little later and we will throw the harpoon into you. Indeed!

You know what is going to happen. You know the provisions in the Senate bill that after these boys have 6 months training they are put in the Reserves for 18 months and can be called up at any time. That same provision was in the House bill. But, oh, our astute, resourceful and clever chairman, that wise old owl who has a barrel of tricks, and you never know when he is going to pull one from the bottom, he who has been in this House twice as long as I have, and if I live to be as old as Methuselah I would not be as smart as he is, knew he could not even get that out of our committee. But he knows how to sugarcoat that bitter pill. He knows how to put lace and fringes on the garment to make it attractive. Sometimes I think he should have been a dress designer. He states that we are going to write a provision in here to protect these trainees. In his opening speech he came over and hammered that home: "Hear me, get this. He is called in for 6 months' training, then he goes into the Reserves. He cannot be called into service until the Congress, 'until you and I,' until we call him back in such manner and in such numbers as we might deem wise."

That is wonderful, is it not? How long do you think that provision would remain in the bill when it goes to conference? You know, I sit in conference and I have learned a few of his tricks. I have never had a higher honor or greater privilege than sitting by the side of CARL VINSON, one of the finest and best men I have ever known, a wise, able legislator. The trouble is sometimes he is too darned wise.

The trainee is going to serve 6 months. He will not be called back until the Congress orders him back. Now, you train this boy 6 months, then put him in the Reserves. When he goes back to Oshkosh, Kokomo, or wherever he came from, Tupelo or Galena, I do not know how these boys are going to get refresher courses or training in the armories in so many places where there are no armories

and where there is no equipment. But you spend a lot of money on him giving the 6 months' training, you put him in the Reserves, then war comes on 2, 3, 4, or 10 years later. In the meantime he has grown soft and flabby, a lot of them have married and have dependents, they will be exempted for one reason or another, others will become disabled. But those who are able to pass the mental and physical test will have to be trained all over again. They have learned squads right, squads left, and setting up exercises. They can learn that at home now at their own expense with a little effort. More important they will have to learn how to use new and improved weapons of war.

But we are going to spend \$4,000,000,000 the first year, and try to cut it down to \$2,500,000,000 the following years. But, listen, no military man ever gave you an estimate of the cost of the program that got within gunshot or hearing range of the original estimate, and you know it. The methods and techniques of modern warfare rapidly and radically change. A boy trained today for 6 months will in all probability have to be trained many more months to operate any war machine in the future. Keep these American youths in our scientific, technical, medical, and engineering schools instead of wasting time, money, and talent on something to please the generalissimo.

They say they are going to reduce our standing Armed Forces. We cannot reduce them in the immediate future. There is no chance, and you cannot put UMT into effect as long as we have the draft, as long as we are at war. We simply do not have enough manpower to afford this luxury. We do not have enough manpower to have universal military training and the draft at the same time.

Here is the worst part of this bill. Ah, brother, before you vote for it, you think of this. This farmer has a son. He goes into UMT. He serves 6 months and then goes into the Reserve. But his cousin, his neighbor on the adjoining farm, or the fellow who lives across the street from your grocer, gets different treatment. One boy goes in for 6 months, but the other boy is drafted for 2 years in active service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

You are very kind and very gracious. Having lived with this problem for several years, I did have several points to bring out, but I do not want to be selfish with my time. I have been called every dirty name in the catalog in the past 2 days for not yielding every Member all the time he wanted, and put him on first. Oh, it is a wonderful honor and prestige to have control of the time, but I am not going to trespass on your time and patience. You have been very gracious. You are kind and I love you all.

This situation will become so intolerable, with one boy serving 6 months under UMT and another boy drafted to fight 2 years, perhaps in Korea, Indochina, the Near East or some other place,

that none of us will be in the next Congress.

Members of the Committee, in closing, this may be my last year in this body, but if I do leave I want to leave saying that I stayed here long enough to see that this measure gets what it needs, not a doctor to dress it up, emasculate, and amend it, but an undertaker to bury it, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] wanted to do yesterday, without benefit of clergy, with no tombstone to mark the spot.

We all know that as long as there are brigands in the world and aggressors abroad we must, in sheer self-defense and for our own survival, remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. The opponents of UMT are not against adequate defense or national preparedness. We have got to continue for some time to vote these back-breaking appropriations, but let us see that the American taxpayer gets his dollar's worth and put an end to the waste, extravagance, and inefficiency of our Armed Forces instead of voting them more power to control not only our money but also human life, the young human life of this Nation.

And, as we go forward trying to keep America strong, let us not vote for a scheme, however nice it may sound, that would undermine our economy and render us weak. Let us center a little more attention on peace rather than war. Let us look forward to the distant future—perhaps it is not too distant—when we shall beat these swords into plowshares, where we will work for universal disarmament, and we will do it at the very moment that Russia and the nations she has reduced to serfdom will give us assurance and a guaranty of open and free international inspection and control of all armament.

Let us work for peace and not build up a military machine thinking only of war. War is not inevitable. We want to live and let live. But liberty is more precious than life itself and we shall die to preserve this liberty that is ours.

God bless you all.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I particularly invite the attention of the Committee and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri to the language in section 140 of the bill which provides that the Congress shall determine the numbers of reservists who may be ordered to active duty, after their training, and the manner in which such men shall be called into service. It is almost identical with the language and has the same purpose as that set out in the bill the House passed on October 15, 1951. In the bill that passed then, known as the Armed Forces Reserve Act, which applies to every reservist whether he is under UMT or not, it is stated:

The Congress shall determine the number of members of the Reserve component necessary for the national security.

So every reservist, whether obtained under UMT or through any other method, can only be called in when Congress takes further action.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED]

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I know the task that confronts me in following my distinguished friend and colleague from Missouri, whom I love dearly. I do not believe I have ever heard a more able speaker, but sometimes, you know, there are facts which face us, evidence which is brought in before us which is so strong it cannot be overcome by all of the oratory in the world.

My friend made a statement with which I concur fully when he said that freedom is our strength. It certainly is. It is a thing that we love dearly. It is a thing that our ancestors fought for when they came to this country. It is the thing they have preserved for us until this day. Now we have an opportunity to continue to preserve that freedom that we love so dearly for our children and our children's children who are going to follow us in this great country.

And when I think of how narrowly sometimes in the past we have succeeded in protecting that freedom, it makes me realize all the more fully the responsibility we have here today. The gentleman said that universal military training did not prove successful in Germany. I am not in favor of any Prussianized America. I want to call your attention, however, to the fact that it so nearly succeeded in preparing Germany for war that, if it had not been for the efforts of other countries to hold them off until we could get ready, and if it had not been for some of our great leaders here at the time who were called warmongers, when they tried to get us ready, we would have lost that freedom then. We saved it, oh so narrowly. I want to tell you that this question, as has been said by my chairman, and as I believe, is the most important question that has been presented to the House in a long time. I do not believe that any question has been presented to this House, which is any more important than the question we have here today to decide. When the manpower bill was before the House, and when it was before our committee, I opposed the drafting of 18-year-old boys because I did not think it was necessary for them to go into service, and for the military to drop the age limit so low as to get these boys with fuzz on their cheeks, and although the other body passed that bill, we made the age 18½ years and fixed it so that no man could be sent into a combat area until he had reached the age of 19. But, that is not the question before us today. It is the training of these men for whatever they may have to face in the future that we are concerned with today. This is a training bill. Is there any man in the House of Representatives who wants to see any of our soldiers in the future, as they have sometimes in the past, go into combat when they are not thoroughly trained; when they do not have the training that they ought to have? How many soldiers do you think are buried somewhere today, on foreign soil, mainly perhaps because they did not have sufficient training? Do you remember back during World War II when some of those antiaircraft units

were quickly changed to infantry units because they had to have them, and they were sent right on over there? Do you think that the training that some of these boys had before they went to Korea was sufficient? We are trying to see that these boys get the training that they ought to have.

Universal military training cannot be effective without an effective Reserve system to follow it up. We have to have both. We have to have an equitable Reserve system, and we have to have a fair Reserve system. What happened this last time? They started calling in the inactive reservists, veterans and men with families. What we are trying to do now is to put in the Reserves a trained body of young men who, it is true, will go into the Reserves for 7½ years, but will really be in the ready Reserve only 3 years, if they actively participate in the drills. That means they will get through with the ready Reserve while they are just 22 or 23 years of age, before they have taken on many of the responsibilities and obligations of citizenship, such as marriage and children, but where they will still be able to go into the service, and yet they will not cost the Government as much. Speaking about the fairness of this thing, that is one of the things for which the bill provides. It corrects some of the inequities that have gone on heretofore. What this bill does is to put a trained body of men into the Reserves, none of whom are veterans so that if they have to be called the Congress can call in men who have been trained and who are ready although they will not have already seen service in the Second World War or in the Korean war. That has been one of the troubles heretofore. We have not had many men except veterans in the Reserves. Oh, they mention the National Guard, and the fact that 50 percent of them were not veterans. All of them have been well trained. I am proud of the Thirty-first Division from Alabama and Mississippi that was called in, but those men have had to go through months of training before they could be sent overseas.

What we need is a body of young men who have been trained to go into these Reserves, men who are not veterans, that Congress can call in.

It is said that it is unfair to take one man for 24 months' service and give another man 6 months' service and then put him into the Reserves. I grant you there is something to that statement, but let us look at it. When we had the manpower bill before the House, what happened? We had some of the same arguments then that are here now, by educational groups, to defer the college groups; by the farmers, to defer their groups; by others, to defer their groups. What do you have in that system?

As I said when I spoke on this floor when we were considering that bill, I thought then that we might be giving the man in college an advantage of deferment that we were not giving to the boy who had not had an opportunity to go to college. Now we have so many deferments that we find these boys deferred, not at the end of one academic year but to the end of their college

careers in many instances and after they have graduated and perhaps become married and have children being deferred, deferred, deferred, and not getting into service. This boy who comes in here for 6 months does not get these deferments. There are only about two statutory deferments. He has a right to be deferred until the end of his academic year if in college, or until graduation if he is in high school provided under 20 years of age. Whereas, the draft is getting only about 1 out of 8 or 9 or 10, this bill, it is estimated, will get approximately 8 out of 10. Even if it gets but 7 out of 10, it at least bears some semblance to the name "Universal Military Training."

Mr. HOLFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman on this particular part of his speech. I do not want to interrupt his trend of thought, but along that very line I know of a family that is very close to me where three boys have served: one in the North Atlantic on a destroyer for 4 years, one in the South Pacific for 4 years, and the other is back from Korea, now in Bethesda Hospital at the end of his fourth year. All of those boys are married. Some of them have children. They are all right now eligible to be called back into the service under the present law, while these 8 out of 10 are being deferred, young men who have not had military service. When you are talking about fairness, I ask you if there is anything fair about the present situation.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I do not think so. That is what this bill will, in some measure, remedy. Eight out of ten of them will have to get this training. Then they go into the Reserves. When they go into the Reserves they will be subject to the call of this Congress. It is inconceivable to me that when this Congress gets ready to call in the Reserves—and all of them will be subject to the action of Congress under the Reserve bill—the President can declare an emergency and call in the Ready Reserves, but only in such numbers as are fixed by Congress. So you will have the whole thing at your command. All of the Reserves will be at your command. It will be up to you to say whether these men who have seen service in Korea and in the Second World War will be called in first, or whether these young men will be called. What will you do? The only common sense thing for you to do would be to call in these boys first. In all probability that is what you will do. So it is not so unfair.

One other thing my distinguished friend said. He went on to say we want to do what is best for the American people. I agree with him on that. I have always felt friendly and tried to go along with these groups whenever I can—these educational groups, the farm groups, the labor groups, who come here and who think that these boys are going to be hit by this bill. Well, let us see.

This bill fixes it so that the boy on the farm will not have his occupation interfered with too much; the laboring

boy who is called in is given full reemployment rights; the boys in college, if they are called in June or the 1st of July, will be out and ready to start back in college the 1st of January. Any man who will let 6 months of basic military training interfere with his college education does not want an education very badly.

If you will pardon a personal allusion, I know boys myself who served 2, 3, and 4 years in the Second World War who came back, finished their education, and are following their professions today.

As I understand, when these boys go into training camps they will be assigned to the various branches of the service; Infantry, Air Force, Navy, and so forth, and given the basic training in that branch. If that is followed up when they go into the Reserves, by an effective Reserve training in that same branch of the Armed Forces it should not be too difficult to maintain a well-trained and efficient Reserve all over the United States. A man could get into a Reserve unit and follow the same type of training he received in the basic training camps. If we have an effective Reserve, if we give men the type of training that ought to be given them, then they would not need as long a refresher course when they are called into service as otherwise—some, perhaps, but not as long; and how much more efficient and effective soldiers, sailors, marines, and air men will they be on account of the training that they have had?

Now, about our country becoming Prussianized or militarized because of universal military training, it just depends sometimes on what you are thinking about and what you are arguing. A person was talking to me the other day. He first talked about the Presidential race and was talking about some five-star general he would like to see elected President. After a while the discussion got around to UMT and he told me that he was against UMT because he felt it would Prussianize and militarize the country. Rather inconsistent, don't you think? Is there any man here who is really seriously thinking that the passage of this bill is going to Prussianize America? Take all these veterans who have come back from the wars; many of you are veterans. Have you seen any effort on the part of any of the veterans to militarize or Prussianize this country? Do you think that 6 months' training of these boys will militarize America?

The only way this country can ever be militarized, dominated, or subjugated is not by ourselves becoming militarized but, through our helplessness and inadequacy of defense, have some other country take us over.

We cannot have a farm group in this country unless we have farms, and we cannot have farms if we do not keep them, if we do not protect them by adequate defense. We cannot have organized labor without laborers, and the laborers cannot have the operation and benefit of organization if, through our inadequacy of defense and failure to prepare our defense, we let Joe Stalin come over here and take us over; because then instead of having free or-

ganized labor we will have slave labor. When I think of the educational forces that are opposing this bill, may I ask, what kind of education will we have in this country if we lose our freedom by failure to prepare for defense?

They talk about these boys—18-year-olds—going out for 6 months basic training and not being under proper supervision or inspection. Well, we have in this bill a provision that in the first place the men who train the boys in these camps have to be good men, men who know how to treat boys, men who understand them, men of high moral character who in training these boys will recognize the fact they are dealing with young men, that they are coming in contact with boys who are just reaching their adolescence. The boys have the right to go to these inspectors when they come around to find out how things are being operated. We have to have some confidence in people that they will establish these camps in communities and localities where they should be established. We have provided every kind of legal safeguard in here by making it a violation of law to sell boys alcoholic beverages of more than 1 percent. We have provided for chaplains. We have other moral safeguards.

By the time a boy reaches 18 years of age, he has come up in an American community and he is old enough to be drafted for service at 18½ years of age. He has been brought up in a Christian community of the United States, he has been living in his home, he has been in his Sunday school, he has been in his church, he has been in his school, under the tutelage and teaching, as a rule, of fine American citizens. Usually by the time a boy becomes 18 years of age his fundamental character has already been established. After that time he is often sent off to universities, at least, most of them are. We all believe in our universities. There is one of the greatest universities in the United States in my home town, the University of Alabama, of which I am proud.

But, you know, no matter how careful they are in those universities, when the boys go there they join fraternities, they go off to other cities to football games, they have parties, and they do not have a guardian going around with them every moment to safeguard them. Surely, if a man is old enough to fight for his country by the time he is 18½ or 19, he is old enough to take 6 months of basic training by the time he is 18.

The training will be fine for them. It will develop them physically. It will teach them something even more about discipline than they have heretofore known, without destroying their self-reliance as citizens. It will make them become more careful of their personal appearance and form habits that will be valuable to them throughout life.

I trust this bill will be administered with common sense as far as the question of segregation is concerned. There is no provision in the bill either for segregation or against segregation, as in the manpower bill, and the administrators of this bill must use common sense in the administration of the bill in this regard, especially in the Southern States,

if it is going to be a full success. I have been assured by the Department of Defense that this bill will be administered with common sense, and inasmuch as I know that the Thirty-first Division has been properly treated in this regard, I am willing to go on this assurance for the present, but I would like to see the bill changed in regard to training the young men in the same States or localities where they are inducted for training, as I believe it would be better to send them elsewhere to bring about a common-sense administration of the bill. If these young men are inducted in proportion to their respective races and trained in the State of their residence, without segregation, there would be an absolutely intolerable situation as far as the South is concerned.

As I stated in my opening remarks, I do not believe that any question has been presented to the House in a long time of any more importance than this measure. It is necessary to prepare America to defend herself from any aggression and I urge your support of this important legislation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, one thing I am very happy about in this debate is that this bill does not go along any party lines. Every man will have to make up his own mind as to what is the right thing to do and whether this bill is the one that fits his ideas of securing America or not.

In order to illustrate my approach to the bill I would like to read a part of the testimony of Admiral Kinkaid when he was before our committee on this bill. This appears on page 2355:

Mr. JOHNSON. One other question: Yesterday, when Mr. SHORT was mentioning that all of the Commissioners were predisposed to UMT, you shook your head.

Now, will you explain briefly your attitude on UMT?

Admiral KINKAID. Yes.

I foresaw that question, and wrote out a little paragraph. If I had been asked 12 or 15 years ago if I favored universal military training, why, I would have replied in the negative, because I wanted to adhere to our historic traditions, and to our concept of the American way of life.

Since then a great deal of water has gone over the dam. The whole world has changed, and our position in the world has become such that we have only the alternatives of maintaining an enormous military establishment of Regular forces or of maintaining a modest force backed by a trained Reserve, ready for call in time of emergency.

Mr. Chairman, that explains the evolution of my own thinking on this problem. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] talked to you a while ago on this problem, I was impressed by how curious the human mind can be. He and I have traveled over the entire world and seen every hell-hole where the war penetrated, all kinds of places from the Orient to the Near East, to Western Europe and the islands of the Pacific. We were trying to study and analyze what is the proper security program for the United States of America, and how the postwar problems of the displaced persons, surplus war property, and re-

habilitation of the vanquished countries could be solved. Yet on this bill, which I think does secure the United States of America, we differ radically.

The evolution of my thinking on this problem has come about by studying the cold facts the world presents to us today. Make no mistake, this may be one of the great, historic debates of the Congress of the United States. We are considering a new system of security that does change our traditional policy. That policy has been to rely on a small regular force and a voluntary system of reserves, who came to the support of the Regulars in time of war.

In the last 35 years we have seen two great wars come and go. In each case our might was the balance that won the war. But what is war for? To bring a just and honorable peace. Do we have peace today? After the first war we demobilized rapidly, and it was not 20 years until the shadows of war were again cast across the different countries of the world, finally reaching our own.

We had a second war, and we gave the impetus, the balance, the strength, the ingenuity and the scientific development that won that war. Do we have peace today? No. Seven years have gone by and the world is more chaotic, there are more threatening situations, there are more hot spots in the world where war can flare up than there were on the day the war ended.

From my 35 years of observation of what we have done and not done in the military field and what we have done and not done in peace, it is my considered conviction that we have to find some modern system of defense that will be continuous and permanent. We cannot play hot and cold after every war and expect America to lead us into the ways of peace. Such conduct merely invites aggression and may again lead to war.

Think of a few of these facts. As I said, 7 years ago the war ended, yet today we are still groping for peace and it is a long ways away. In the last war, just before the war ended American ingenuity and scientific development came into play. We had developed the atomic bomb, and just as a prelude of what the future held in store for the world in case another catastrophe should befall the earth, we dropped two atomic bombs. Any man who has seen the devastation those two bombs wrought, as I have, will think a long while about letting America become insecure.

Is there any doubt in the mind of any man or woman in this House that the Soviets are putting pressure upon the whole world? When you think of Trieste, for instance, and what the Kremlin did there; when you think of Iran and Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and so forth, and Korea, the most recent and glaring example, it is obvious, I believe to any thinking person that the Soviets are bent on dominating the free world. Perhaps only a little at a time but the books of Lenin and Stalin show they are aiming at the whole world. A Communist—godless—world and a free world, they say, cannot exist side by side.

During the 7 years since the capitulation of the three dictatorial powers, as

we became more impotent militarily the pressure stepped up. First, it was in Greece, then in Iran, then in Korea. All over the world, they are putting on the heat. Do not all of you see, as I think I see, that all the Soviets wish to do is to isolate one free country after another until finally the great object of their maniacal delusion will be the United States of America? We have strained ourselves in offering policies of peace in the United Nations. We back the United Nations as the best implement we have for peace today. After all our efforts, we have gotten nowhere. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] mentioned, we offered a method of controlling atomic warfare. The Soviets would not agree to it. They would not concede that there should be a realistic right of inspection by representatives of the U. N. We offered many other proposals and during all the time that the United Nations, impotent as it is, has been in session, about the only one who has gotten anything of value out of it is Russia by making it a world sounding board for her propaganda. Of the 48 vetoes that have been invoked in the United Nations, Russia has given 47. Does anyone believe that after the exposé of the Hiss case, the Soviets do not have a desire to put pressure on and even to finally take over, if they think we are weak enough, the United States of America? What is the mission, I ask of you, of the United States in this curious, changing, explosive, and small world? In my humble opinion, the mission of the United States is to furnish the leadership to the free world which will bring about world stability and perhaps world peace. Can we do that by having a weak, impotent nation? History has shown that our strength to a certain extent in the diplomatic field and by negotiation rises and falls with our military strength.

Our traditional policy which we have carried out for a century and a half was based upon the theory that we would have time to prepare. In the first war, we had time to prepare, although we did not start to do so until after we had declared war. The first officers' training camp, which I attended, opened on May 12, 1917. We had time and a wide ocean, and two allies on our side. It was almost a year and a half after the declaration of the war before we made ourselves felt.

In the second war, although we saw it coming right at us, the Congress was so reluctant to do anything to get ready for the war that, when the House of Representatives considered the renewal of the selective service law in 1941, a little over a month before Pearl Harbor, it only passed by one vote. Does not Pearl Harbor and Korea mean a thing to American Congressmen? What is Korea and Pearl Harbor? They are the indication and the demonstration of the way any future war will come. There will be no declaration of war. There will be an overt attack on us right away. That is why, in my humble opinion, we must have men ready and able and skillful enough to repulse the attack and to turn it the other way.

I want to point out one thing to you, which I wish every one of you would remember, no matter what your views may

be, and that is that this is a training bill. The thing I want to specifically point out to you in that connection is that the ones who win the wars of the world are the men—that little group of men who are on the fighting front, the men who meet the troops of the enemy in mortal combat. We can have all the production in the world. We can talk about all the ideals in the world, we can have the scientific skills and development; but if that little group of men facing the enemy in a crucial attack does not win, then we do not win. If they lose we go down in dust, a defeated Nation. I will give you a few illustrations as to how close the situation is at times. In the First World War, the Germans attacked west of Paris and almost engulfed Paris. Then they suddenly attacked to the east of Paris. What happened? At Belleau Woods near Chateau-Thierry the second American Division checked the Germans, repulsed them, pushed them back, turned the onrushing German tide, and that was the beginning of the end of the German drive. There were two regiments of marines and two regiments of doughboys. They were trained to the nth degree.

I will give you another example. In 1940 Britain was almost at the bottom of the barrel. They were hanging on the ropes. The Germans were driving England into the ground with their stuka dive bombers, raiding England at will. It shows how a small group, well trained, skillful and courageous, can win a victory. What happened? In the first place the Germans made the fatal mistake of not placing rear guns on the stuka dive bombers. They rolled at will over Coventry, Liverpool, Southampton, London, and swept destruction and ruin before them. Britain was holding on by a thread. Everything looked lost. But the British forces developed a good plane, and a little handful of men flying Spitfires and other planes rose above the British Isles, and they knocked the dive bombers out of the air like sitting ducks. That little group of men who were fighting the enemy in mortal combat turned the tide that finally helped save the war for Great Britain and the other Allies.

As Winston Churchill so ably said: "Never did so many owe so much to so few."

Do not forget there are many similar cases in world history.

What does this training have to do with that? Here is what it has to do with it. In every kind of contest where skill is required there are certain fundamentals that combat troops must have. The infantry has one kind, the artillery man has another, the sailors have another, the fliers have another. If you have those fundamentals, then you can build skill, technique, and proficiency on that and win a victory that may mean life or death to your Nation.

Every flier knows the hours and hours pilots spend on acquiring the characteristics of their plane; on studying characteristics or performances and weaknesses of enemy planes; on all conceivable sorts of maneuvers and situations which they may encounter enemy planes; hours and hours in gunnery practice. Why? So when the supreme moment

comes to bring victory home or die in their tracks, they will bring victory home.

Remember that victory is not the victory alone of this little group of skillful and courageous men. It is your victory and mine. It is what saves us and our country and our institutions.

How does training contribute? With a fresh group of trainees coming in each year with the fundamentals necessary in all the various branches of modern war, we build on those, which are basic, the added skills and the poise and judgment so when the supreme test arrives it will be met and our men come out victorious.

It has been said over and over in this debate that we will train a few boys today and in 5 years they will be out of date. But that merely indicates that those critics do not understand the program.

We graduate a group of UMT trainees every year, train them for 6 months intensively in all the varied skills of modern warfare. I am only recommending this because I think it is the right thing to do that will bring us to peace. Train these boys in the arts of warfare so that they can handle themselves if a catastrophe comes, which we pray to God will not come.

Well, suppose they do get rusty; the war does not come until 4 years from then. You have a group of men trained that year. Every year you change the training. Every year you adapt it to the new situation, new techniques, new tactics, new developments so that the men may finally become the most skillful in their branch of the service in the world.

That is the thing I want to leave with you. It is that little group of people which finally clashes with the enemy in mortal combat that will save America. If we have that group and the enemy knows it, they will stop a long while before practicing aggression. I am not one of those who fear we will have a Russian attack tomorrow. I do not know what they are going to do. Nobody else does. I want the American home and American institutions secure by having an adequate force so that potential aggressors, who do not dare to lose, will not contemplate that sort of move.

That is where our efforts at peace and negotiation may start to become effective. When our adversary realizes we are strong enough to take care of ourselves, and we are continuing to keep our strength intact, our adversary will be willing to negotiate to find a common ground for settlement. Then the campaign for peace really can come into its own. That is the basis of our present build-up of our military. But the important thing is we are shifting our policy so we will continue to be strong, as a national policy, and are relying on continual replenishment of reserves to keep us in that position.

Everybody in the Chamber knows, they must know, that this talk about militarizing America—my colleague from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED] mentioned it—is sheer nonsense. It shows a lack of confidence in our youth. I want to tell you that as long as we have an

American House of Representatives, elected by the people, from the grass roots of this Nation, you never can militarize America. If you believe in the training of our homes and our schools, you cannot militarize boys who have had that kind of training in the short space of 6 months. Of this I am positive.

Let me get clearly before you just exactly what this bill does: It provides for 6 months of intensive training. It will have very good byproducts in the way of making a boy realize the predicament America is in and his duty to help protect his own life as well as the life of the Republic. He will get 6 months of basic military training. That will not disturb anybody's education; every sensible person understands that thoroughly. It will not make the slightest difference; in fact, it will add to his education, because he will appreciate it all the more. Then he has 7½ years more in the Reserves. Some have called it slavery; some conscription; but, Mr. Chairman, there is no conscription to that; conscription is where you take a man and throw him into a war; that is conscription. Neither is that training slavery. He may if he wants to shorten that 7½ years—it is all in the law, and I will include the provision, in my remarks.

Here is what the law says:

The Reserve Act, H. R. 5426, which has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate, provides:

SEC. 208. (a) A member of the Reserve components required to serve therein pursuant to subsection (d) of section 4 or other section of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, or by any other provision of law, shall be placed in the Ready Reserve of his armed force without his consent for the remainder of his required term of service.

Public Law 51, Eighty-second Congress, provides:

(3) Each person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component, for a total period of 8 years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Reserve bill provides that he may join the Ready Reserve and after 3 years of service wipe out all his obligation. What is wrong about that? Is there anything wrong about letting the trainee finish his obligation in 3½ years? Is there anything oppressive? Is there anything unfair? Is there anything prejudicial about that? I cannot see for the life of me how there is anything that is wrong about that situation. The 3 years in the Ready Reserves will not interfere with his education or his work, except for 15 days a year for which he is paid.

Let me show you that what we are trying to do today is only to bring the system of protection for America up to date, such as was envisioned by the

founding fathers. Here is what Jefferson said in 1818:

We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens. We can never be safe until this is done.

George Washington in 1783 said:

It may be laid down as a primary position and the basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal services to the defense of it, and consequently that the citizens of America from 15 to 60 years of age should be borne on militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to them, that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice. They ought to be regularly mustered and trained and to have their arms inspected at certain times, and able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 25 drafted to form a corps in every State to be employed whenever it may become necessary to the service of their country.

William Jennings Bryan said many years ago that if America were attacked a million men would rise to her defense. We want to bring that statement up to date. We have to have modern minute men, the men who are ready to give us protection. Today we have no waiting time, we have no geography in our favor any more, when they fly the oceans in 4 hours. All we are doing, Mr. Chairman, is to bring our military system up to the last minute. By passing this legislation we are guaranteeing that there will always be an available, trained-to-the-minute group that can help defend America if America is attacked. Through our strength we can get peace in the world. America has that mission to perform, to unite the free world; and, naturally, finally the Soviet world will say: "We had better bargain; we had better reason; we had better talk to these people and bring stability."

This bill is a step, a long step in that direction.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am a little embarrassed standing before these good men and these gentle ladies because I am a veteran of almost 4 years training in the last war and, according to some of the speeches made this afternoon, moral degeneration, Prussianized thinking is the end product of that training. But if these good folks will overlook my character analysis which was made this afternoon I will try and deal with the issues that are involved in the legislation pending before us.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could say in standing here before you that I am asking you to support a political issue on which the people of this Nation are united, but unfortunately, I cannot. Public opinion polls show that our people are almost equally divided on this grave and important issue.

It is an easy thing, as a Congressman, to demand the necessary sacrifices of our people to protect their liberties at the time of a Pearl Harbor, but the task of voting for these sacrifices of our people 4 months before Pearl Harbor, when the draft was extended by a vote of 202 to 203, is immensely difficult.

Then, we had the invasion of Czechoslovakia and other countries tolling their warning. Today, we have a nasty little war in Korea. If that war were the only war we could contemplate in the future, then universal military training would not be necessary for our country, but we know that if world war III comes, it will be sudden; it will be without warning. This Nation, as the arsenal of democracy, will be the primary target. We will have no allies to carry on and buy us time while we prepare. No one thinks we will have time to train forces after war is declared. We had years before in the other two world wars, but now we shall need to be able to effectuate an immediate switching to mobilization.

There will be no opportunity for those who vote against this bill to go down into the well and change their vote from "nay" to "yea."

My deepest concern in this bill is that some of my dear friends in the House who believe as strongly as I do in universal military training, will vote against it because it does not exactly fit the picture as they see it.

I must agree with them that had I been the author of this bill, there are some changes I would have made. I dare say that if each of us had our own individual way, we would have had 435 different versions of this bill.

I have yet to see a bill which has been passed by the Congress that I could not find something wrong with it, and find reason to vote against it—and so it will always be in a democratic country with so many different interests. It seems to me, in deciding whether to vote for or against this bill for universal military training, that the question posed is: "Do the good features of this bill for strengthening the defenses of our country outweigh the bad features as each Member sees them in this bill?"

I think the scales clearly read that this bill will be of great benefit to the people of our country; that it is in the public interest.

Veterans who have worn their country's uniform, who have sacrificed to preserve its freedom; who know what it means to be shoved into battle without adequate training—veterans who know the humiliation of Corregidor, because their country did not have adequately trained, large, ready pools of reserves, do not want their sons to go into battle as green shock troops.

They want their sons, and I want my sons, to be trained adequately to deal with the combat decisions of the battlefield.

I stand here this afternoon to speak on behalf of the veteran reservist.

I stand here to plead the cause of the nearly 800,000 veteran reservists recalled to active duty to serve in Korea.

We have heard a great deal here since these debates started about the inequalities and injustices and inconveniences which will accrue to a great number of individuals who have never yet served their country.

We have heard too little about the inequality, the unfairness, and tragedy which has occurred to those who have served their country in the past.

In the circle of confusion which has surrounded the debates on this subject, we have been inclined to forget the most fundamental and basic of all issues—that is, what are we going to do to prevent this injustice from occurring again?

I take my stand to speak for those veterans. I stand to defend them against the slander which has been hurled against them since these debates began that because they have served their country in our Armed Forces, they are now morally degraded, militarized, and brutalized, while those who have managed to avoid service are model citizens. I stand here to present the viewpoint of the courageous self-sacrificing men who fought in World War II only to be recalled again for Korea, in order to save this Nation of ours.

I take my stand and I take it firmly.

I call for the adoption of universal military training.

I do this in spite of the insinuations and implied threats of "You better watch out, boys, if you vote for UMT, you are going to be defeated in the next election."

That implication, that charge, has been used rather loosely in these debates and I say to those who make this charge:

What kind of people do you think we are?

Is Congress to adjourn and close its doors and consider no controversial legislation once every 2 years simply because there is a congressional election? Are we the type of people who are so timid and shy and frightened that we keep our eyes cocked on the next election rather than on the survival of this Nation?

If that is the kind of people we are, this Nation will not long survive.

I repeat, just what kind of people do you think we are?

Do we lack the courage to act for the best interest of our country?

Do we lack the courage to speak up for those Americans who are fighting in Korea, protecting our privilege to stand here today and debate?

Are we a league of frightened men, afraid to take action to save our Nation in this time of peril?

I say, "No." And I will take my stand on that issue.

I know full well that the American people on any future day of reckoning will look with favor and trust and admiration on a man who considers not "how many votes he will lose" by this action but "how he may best serve his country."

If the sad day has come when we think only of self-interest and our privilege to strut momentarily around the Halls of Congress, I say this Nation is lost.

I repeat, what kind of people do you think we are?

Let us consider the conspiracy of confusion which has been woven in these Halls and across the Nation in regard to universal military training. Let us contrast that with the indelible facts as presented by the Commission and by the Armed Services Committee. Let us quit talking about issues completely irrelevant to UMT and start talking about the program as presented. Let us not

set up some bill, some program, that does not exist and make up fictional arguments against a fictional plan which no one has ever seen.

Let us consider H. R. 5904, the first step toward righting the inequalities heaped upon our veterans in the past.

We who believe in UMT are not grabbing for UMT in a vacuum.

We do not desire to take 18-year-olds into UMT merely for the sake of passing a pleasant afternoon in the Congress.

We desire to do so because we must do so.

Too long we have taken a hop, a skip, and a jump, grasping here, grabbing there, and frittering away our manpower like fat bacon in a hot skillet in an attempt to meet the manpower needs for the security of this Nation.

We have bounced along from crisis to crisis always hoping that this crisis would be the last one, and often wrong.

We have stood in this very Chamber and loudly voiced our opposition to Russia, our plans to stand fast against Communist aggression, our plans to do this and our plans to do that, apparently believing that the best defense for this Nation was a defense of hot words voiced in a heated atmosphere.

The words we utter here, brave and noble as they may sound, unfortunately will not stop a single Russian soldier or Russian tank; otherwise the Russians would have been stopped long ago. But what we do here in the way of constructive legislation will determine whether or not we survive.

We cannot stand here today and chop out the solid cornerstone upon which security rests—trained manpower—and accomplish what we must do for the sake of this Nation.

We stand in danger.

We must act.

We must act with courage and without fear of petty personal consequences.

I know we will do so.

When Korea burst upon us with all its horror in June of 1950 that Communist onslaught cruelly revealed to this Nation the heart-rending price that must be paid for military unpreparedness.

Immediately following World War II, we relied unduly upon the fictional doctrine that the atomic age had eliminated the need for large military forces. At the same time, we unjustly relied upon the thousands of seasoned veterans recently returned from Europe and the Pacific, and bravely asserted that we did not need UMT. We reasoned: "If we have another war, all we have to do is call up the veterans. Why, we won't need UMT for 10 years. Veterans will last that long"—completely ignoring the fact that veterans, like anyone else, have a birthday once each year.

Others advanced the argument: Why have UMT? If anyone attacks us we will be ready and, besides, the only way to keep from being hurt in a war by an enemy is not to be there when he strikes. These statements smack very much like the one made by William Jennings Bryan that if any foreign foe should attempt to invade this country, they would be met on the beaches by farmers with shotguns and pitchforks and roundly

trounced. I wonder how many of us here still follow that philosophy.

To those people who say the best way to avoid being a casualty is not to be there when a guided missile or an atom bomb explodes, I can say only that it is quite evident that those courageous people obviously do not intend to be there. But it is quite tragic that others will be there and they should be trained to know how to survive in such an eventuality.

When the attack came in Korea, we as a Nation, as a result of the arguments of these groups, were caught in a self-induced shortage of trained manpower. Our regular units were at half strength. There was no class of young and basically trained graduates of a UMT program ready to take their place in the battle line.

As a result, Reservists and National Guard men who had fought the Second World War were the only source of trained men.

Some 800,000 Reservists were called to fill the ranks. Among these, 67 percent of the enlisted men were veterans of World War II and 80 percent of the officers were veterans. These men had fought long and courageously through the most trying circumstances through World War II. Many of them had interrupted their home life and business in World War II and had done so gladly to serve their Nation. Others had taken up businesses and taken on families after their release from service. Now they were called again because this Nation had not had the foresight to look into the future and prepare Reserves, through a program of universal military training, who had not seen prior service.

Many of these men have died.

All are suffering disruptions of their lives and careers. This recall of veteran Reservists was not only tragic but wasteful.

Businesses were lost, careers interrupted, and hearts broken—all because we had stood here idle in face of the greatest threat to our national survival since this Republic was established.

Unfairness comes about in the development of circumstances. But we should not deliberately compound them by failure to provide initial equality for all alike. At the present time thousands of men are being brought into the military services. They will receive training extending into 2 years of service. On discharge they are moved into Reserve status, where they are liable for still further service for 6 years more, in case of emergency. At the same time there are nearly 2,000,000 men who are deferred, many of whom will receive no training, no service, no Reserve liability. In case of a future major emergency, many of the veterans who have served in Korea and even veterans of World War II would have to be called again to fill the gap while these others were being trained. The man who is selected now serves 2 years, including a hitch in Korea, and will have Reserve status requiring training for a period of years, while his neighbor who did not go will still have no Reserve status and will not have to turn out for a single drill. This situation is indefensible. Universal military training would give the men who

did not go the training necessary to make them available in case of an emergency and would move them into a Reserve status so that they could be called ahead of the men who have already devoted 2 years or more of their time to the defense of this country. They would at least have to attend drill along with the Korean veterans. While it is difficult to call one man for service and another for training only, we are now calling one for training and the other goes scot free.

A universal military training law is necessary now for the reason that no one can foresee exactly when it will be possible to consider reduction in strength of the Armed Forces, nor what pattern of force could be followed in case of gradual demobilization. It can be done sooner with universal military training than without it. With universal military training established by statute, planning on reduction of forces can be done logically. Heretofore, we have demobilized into nothingness, while we pleaded for legislation prospective to a logical program. A Reserve program without it was devised and proved inadequate. It brought us to a situation on the occasion of the Korean hostilities which forced us to again call on veterans who had already performed their share of military duty, while other young men, who might have been in training 3 or 4 years ago, escaped entirely.

Some of the people claim that we cannot have UMT and the draft running simultaneously; that we cannot have UMT until we cease all draft for service; and, therefore, that we should not now act on this legislation. Others say they are in favor of UMT, but not this plan, and then fail to produce a plan of their own.

This is just another way of saying, "We are against UMT. We don't want to face facts."

UMT and the draft must run simultaneously. If they do not, we will be unable to build up a Reserve which has not seen service before in wartime.

Unless such a Reserve can be built up and gradually increased, we may never be able to take the risk of reducing the standing forces, due to the fact that we will not have large enough Reserves to permit it. Therefore, we may be faced with the necessity of maintaining the standing force at their present level for a period of 15 or 20 years. To those who fear militarism this should give pause, for in large standing forces lies that danger, not in UMT.

It is time we began to look to the fairness of this situation; it is time we started building up our Reserves and distributing the obligation of citizenship more widely.

Until we right the injustice heaped upon our veterans, we better not talk too much about fairness and justice.

But there are those good Americans who say, "Not now. Let's postpone this. Let's not start UMT for 3 years. Let's postpone decision upon the security of our Nation."

Are we to listen to this siren song, the easy way out?

Can this be justified?

Do we by these hollow words straddle the fence and say, "Yes, let's have UMT,

but, no, not now." Let me tell you, you do not have to spend time mending political fences if you do not sit on them. If we do so, it means that we build no Reserve composed of nonveterans.

It means—

For three more years let us have inequity of service to our country.

For three more years let us have injustice.

For three more years let us have unfairness.

Can that be justified?

Three more years of heartbreak.

Three more years of suffering.

Three more years of broken homes.

Can this be justified?

For three more years let us build a Reserve composed of veterans and no one else.

For three more years let us continue to have a large standing force.

For three more years let us have high-priced preparedness.

Can that be justified?

No.

Well, what are we going to do about it?

What kind of people will they, the veterans, think we are?

Any system which permits the willing, the courageous, and the conscientious to volunteer their services for danger in the Reserve, while the unwilling, the unpatriotic, and the lazy accept the benefit of military security is basically unfair. This leads quickly to the liquidation of those courageous souls upon whom our Nation has always depended for victory in war. Citizens who are not willing to give at least 6 months of their time toward training themselves to be useful when their Nation is in danger, are not worthy of the freedom their fathers fought to make possible for them. The American conscience cannot condone a military policy which demands that in war we use veterans rather than men who have seen no prior service.

I challenge any Member on this floor to justify this inequity.

If we continue to foster and tolerate this attitude of evasion of equal responsibility for our national security and actually justify it by a congressional roll call, it will grow to proportions that will lead us into oblivion.

It will stifle both individual and national courage.

We will reap the consequences of indecision, of paying tribute, followed by dangerous compromises, followed by our collapse.

But some say that, "Now is not the time to take action. Let's wait and see what happens. Besides this is a ticklish year." I say this, "I'm glad this is an election year in the United States, for that's a sign the United States is still free." It is said here that you have to survive to serve. I say today you had better reverse that saying and serve if your Nation is to survive.

But, let us keep in mind at the same time that this is no election year in Russia and Russia will postpone no decision relating to their national survival in this year 1952.

What kind of people do you think we are?

There are those conscientious people, fine people, and good people representing

church groups and others who oppose UMT, because they oppose all violence.

I agree with them entirely. I oppose violence, but I also oppose heartbreak and inequity and unfairness. To those people, I say the only hope for a world in which Christianity, charity, and peace exists is a world in which the United States still survives.

If this Nation with its heritage of centuries, of culture, religion and high-minded ideals falls to Russian communism through military weakness there can be no hope for the fine people who voice those high ideals.

Certainly we, as Christians, oppose violence and death and war, but, unfortunately, the world has not yet come to abide by the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount.

This issue cannot be weighed by the depth of sincerity of its supporters or opponents, but must be determined by hard practicality, and not theory.

The world is today half slave and half free.

There is loose in the world the monster of tyranny intent on enslaving us all.

If we are to preserve these very people and the institutions that these people represent, we must preserve this Nation of ours. Otherwise, we will all perish together.

These people honestly and sincerely say, "Let's don't train our men—let's don't have universal military training for through UMT we train men to die on the battlefield."

This logic does not follow.

It is the blind logic of those who look for the best, failing to see the rattlesnake curled at their feet.

Until wars are no more—the untrained will be the first to die in battle—not the trained.

It must be made clear to all that there is no choice now between drafting men for service or not drafting them. In the foreseeable future all young men will go into the Armed Forces for 24 months, unless we have UMT. But if UMT can be obtained many of these same young men will not have to serve a 2-year period but rather will go into training for 6 months followed by their Reserve obligation. Many of these fine groups opposed to UMT are opposed to all military service. They forget that if we do not have UMT their sons must serve anyway but for a 24-month period.

To these fine, Christian people, I say this: I have known many men—brave, kind and courageous—who fought and sacrificed in World War II so that this Nation could survive. These men came back to their homes, their families, their parents, their businesses and settled down to enjoy the free world that they had won. After but a few short months of this American life, they were recalled and sent to Korea disrupting lives, families, homes, and all the things dear to them in order to defend this Nation once again.

Why? Because there were no other trained men available—because we had not adopted a program such as UMT.

As long as we live in a brutish world as we do, I say the fair thing to do

is the Christian thing to do. We must spread the obligation of citizenship so that it does not hit the same men over and over and over with heartbreaking regularity.

Spread it in the American way so that each man does his duty once, so that no man has to do not only his own duty but the duty of others.

Certainly if all the peoples of the world, particularly the persons who control international communism accepted and practiced Christianity, there would be no need for UMT or an armed force of any nature. But to accept this doctrine on the theory that it would convince the Russian Government of our sincerity of desiring to maintain peace is a gamble of all that is important to Americans.

To permit an anti-Christian nation to destroy the bulwark of Christianity will not preserve Christianity. To say that UMT is anti-Christian is to infer that the defense of our Nation is unwarranted. If this is true, our Nation is not worth preserving.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to act.

Our belief in the defense of our Nation here, is best demonstrated not by the hackneyed words of hot oratory, but through positive action.

The eyes of the veterans now serving in Korea are upon us.

The time has come to take a stand for a program which will place the obligation to serve this Nation on an equal basis, which will build a large Ready Reserve and prevent us from ever having to call upon men for double duty again.

Too many of us talk a great deal about the multitude of rights which we exercise as American citizens and forget the few courageous souls who sacrifice, fight and die that we may exercise those rights. I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that these rights are matched only by the duties of citizenship.

The rights are well known, the duties sometimes more obscure.

Do not be misled by the circle of confusion and quibbling which surrounds this debate.

There is no compromise with unpromising facts.

To paraphrase Tom Paine:

These are the times that try men's souls. The sunshine soldier and the air-conditioned patriot will, in this time of crisis, shrink from decision. But those who bear it now will deserve the love and praise of all mankind. . . .

Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. But we have this to comfort us: the more difficult the task—the more glorious the triumph.

We cannot defend this Nation by arguing here in these Halls about how much we dislike Russia, the Pentagon, the Legion, or any other particular group or individual.

We can defend it only by what we do here.

We can take our stand for fairness and equity only by what we do here. I stand here to vote for the veteran and to ask that you remember him in your

decision and that you remember, no matter what kind of year this may be, that it may well be the last year for us to take positive action to defend the future of this Nation.

To those who say we are too cowardly to take this action, I repeat: "What kind of people do you think we are?"

Must we Members of Congress live only for today?

During this debate I have almost reached the conclusion that some Members think that UMT stands for universal mañana training. It cannot be put off until mañana. We must show the aggressors of the world that freemen are willing to pay the price of remaining eternally vigilant to protect our hard-won freedom.

We must show them that we have profited by our past mistakes, and not that one day we intend to go charging up the hill of sacrifice during a crisis, only to come coasting down into the morass of complacency when the dictators still their cannon fire.

Let us neglect our duties by forgetting yesterday's battles or tomorrow's threats, and you and I can be sure that our sons will be marching off to war unprepared, just as did their fathers and grandfathers before them.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman does not walk up the hill and down the hill on this issue. He meets it foursquare. I am proud of him and I am proud of the statement he has just made.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to a most able presentation by our colleague [Mr. BENTSEN] in favor of universal military training.

One of the great things about our democracy is the fact that we can differ and have free speech. I come to present to you in the 20 minutes allowed me by our distinguished chairman the reasons why I am against universal military training.

I begin with a quotation:

We stand for compulsory military service for every man. If a state is not worth that, then away with the state.

That quotation comes from *Mein Kampf*, and was written by Adolf Hitler. This is the philosophy back of universal military training, not here alone but throughout the world.

Unwittingly, the proponents of this measure have smeared themselves with the black brush of nazism. Many innocent Americans are found guilty by association. In the case of universal military training there is no guilt by association. It stems directly from Adolf Hitler's thesis.

On the other hand I give you a quotation from George Washington, the father of our country:

Avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty.

At the Constitutional Convention James Madison said:

A standing military force, with an overgrown executive, will not long be safe companions to liberty. Throughout all Europe, the armies kept up under the pretext of defending, have enslaved the people.

Today, as we face this issue, outside of the professional militarists, there is not a single decent, self-respecting organization in the entire United States of America, farm, labor, education, civil liberty, youth, religious, including the United States Chamber of Commerce, that is in favor of universal military training. If I am wrong, I stand to be corrected.

The United States Chamber of Commerce began the fight in 1915 to bring about universal military training. On January 25 they went before the Armed Services Committee of our House and reversed their stand completely.

Many of the organizations, in fact the vast majority of them who were on record as being opposed to universal military training, are now in favor, and were in favor, of the draft.

Let not the issue of religious pacifism becloud this situation. The late great prince of the Catholic Church, Cardinal Dougherty said:

Compulsory military training in peacetime in the United States of America, if such a change in our American system is brought about, will be a windfall for military officials and a catastrophe to taxpayers. It will be the ruin of our young men.

Another venerable leader of catholicism, Archbishop Cushing, said:

Does anybody seriously think that the Army is the best place for the physical, religious, and moral training of Catholic youth? That is a strange doctrine for America. It is a new idea for America, but it is not a new idea in the world. This idea was tried in Italy. Mussolini said that universal military training would give the youth of Italy the stamp of nobility. I ask if our young people should envy the fate of Italian youth? Hitler said that compulsory military training would give each man a ground for pride in his citizenship. I ask you what ground for pride is left to the cheated youth of Germany?

The Commission appointed by our President, the National Security Training Commission, has reported to Congress a plan for universal military training. I do not want to impugn the motives of those concerned, but if you will examine the report of the National Security Training Commission you will see that it is chock full of falsehoods and sheer hypocrisy. In the first place the Commission did not let anyone come before it who was opposed to universal military training. They heard 75 witnesses and only those who were in favor of UMT came before it. It was stacked from the beginning.

Let Congress, and our Nation, and the world know that we in this House did not pass universal military training

last year. The vast majority of the Members of this House, such as myself, were in favor of the draft, and because a universal military training proviso was needlessly, if not purposely, tacked on to the draft bill, it went through. Thank God the issue is not clouded this year with the hot air of professional patriots; it is out in the open. There is not a single organization in the United States in favor of it except the American Legion.

General MacArthur, with whom a lot of us disagree politically, yet whom all of us applaud as a military leader, said at our congressional hearings last August:

I should advise most seriously if I were considering universal military training that I would wait and get through the emergency that faces us now; and then on what has resulted, and what exists then, I would sum up the facts, and make the decision.

That is good common sense.

I do not believe we should scrap 175 years of American heritage and the advice of the religious and civic leaders just in order to move the Capital from Washington, D. C., over to the Pentagon.

Yes, it is a hard thing to say, but I say that universal military training is a hoax, a tragic, costly hoax of defeatism. It could not have been conceived better by anyone in the high echelons of the Communist Party.

It is a harsh thing to say, but it is nevertheless a fact that most of the promises being made to the American people to induce them to adopt permanent universal military training are false. A careful examination of the universal military training report presented to Congress by the National Security Training Commission will show that these promises have no factual basis. UMT will not save lives. UMT will not save money. UMT will not save time in getting armies into action overseas if war breaks out. UMT will not do many of the other things the American public has been told it will do.

The truth is that if we pass UMT we would not even be able to put it into operation, UMT could not go into operation if we did pass it until after the present emergency is over, because you cannot take 800,000 of the 18-year-olds out of the manpower of the Nation without seriously disrupting the Selective Service System.

Hanson W. Baldwin, outstanding military editor of the New York Times, said:

It is unlikely the UMT would be invoked by the President for some time to come, for to start it now in the midst of our present emergency would greatly complicate our preparedness program.

Why is the Pentagon so anxious to have universal military training? We have the Reserves ready for Korea. Yes, we do.

I have before me an exchange that took place between Representative SHORT, Representative KILDAY, and Representative PHILBIN with General Evans on April 22, 1948, when we had 2,400,000 reserves in our Army. General Evans was the executive director of the Reserve Officers Association and he said in substance, as he talked to Representatives SHORT, KILDAY, and PHILBIN that General Marshall and the Army would not

permit an effective Reserve and National Guard program because they wanted to force the Congress to adopt UMT.

Would men trained in universal military training be available for immediate service in the event of war? Absolutely not. After they were trained for 6 months and go back into the Reserves they would have to be retrained again. That is not me saying that. That is the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Collins, writing to a Member of the other body last March, when he said that an intensive refresher training course would be necessary to use any people from UMT who are called back into the service.

Would universal military training help to reduce casualties in case of a future war? Absolutely not.

Official Army studies, as the Infantry Journal reported in September 1949, show that the greatest number of casualties suffered in conflict are suffered by trained men because they are up in the front. In fact, the Infantry Journal summed up by saying:

No factual data exists to support the universally held opinion that the infantry replacement has initially a higher casualty rate than the veteran.

The Army and Navy Journal concludes by saying a man has more chance of being hurt in training at home than in combat overseas.

Would universal military training improve the national health? No. The same physically and mentally unfit who cannot pass the test now will not pass if this UMT goes into effect, since boys are to be drafted into UMT, if the Commission's recommendations are approved by Congress, on exactly the same physical basis as they are now drafted into the armed services.

Would universal military training save money for the Nation? No.

Here, my friend is where we get down to some facts. Anyone who says we are going to save money through UMT does not have the correct information. Universal military training at the end of 9 years would cost us at the least estimate \$46,431,153,000 and every year thereafter \$6,704,000,000. If you are going to try to balance this by taking out of the Army the Regular men, then you would have to remove from our standing Army 1,500,000 regulars to balance it. In other words, if you pass universal military training, and using the argument that it would save money, it means we would have to reduce our Regular Army by 1,500,000 men and it would still be costing us more than before. If we want to save money, let us get down and start saving money where corruption is still taking our money in the Army and elsewhere, but do not use the argument that we are taking our teen-agers to save billions when it is not true.

Would universal military training eliminate the need for a large standing Army? Absolutely not.

I pointed out it cannot go into effect until the present crisis is over and in the next place it would require 200,000 commissioned and noncommissioned officers as instructors. Where are you going to get 200,000 commissioned and noncom-

missioned officers from out of our Regular Army to serve as instructors? We have not enough today as we are fighting this war.

What kind of war are we fighting today? We are not fighting a war at Lexington or at Concord.

We are fighting a war with jet planes, guided missiles, and atom bombs and no teen-ager can fight in a war like that with 6 months' training. In a war fighting with such weapons the matter would quite possibly be decided before the UMT reserves could be called up, by the time Congress got around to calling up the UMT. By the time they would have returned from their homes, country or city, the atom bomb would have landed and blown up our various cities. That is the kind of war we are in.

UMT is old-fashioned. UMT originated with Napoleon, but it is not the kind of a program for today's war of jets and fighters and atomic bombs.

Finally, I want to point out that the basic, underlying philosophy of universal military training is the basic, underlying philosophy of Stalin. There are four things that Stalin believes in: Materialism over the spiritual; final loyalty to the militaristic state; destruction of individual conscience; and truth subordinated to the gospel of force. That is UMT. UMT puts materialism over spiritual values; it makes final allegiance to the brass hats; it destroys the individual conscience and it subordinates truth to falsehoods. Our Nation was founded by pioneers who came here to escape the arrogance of militarism in Europe. We will shatter the dream of our forefathers by the passage of UMT. Yes, Germany had UMT, and Italy and Japan. But who won the war? We never lost a war. We are the only nation in the world that has never been defeated, and we never had universal military training. Why should we have it now? Name for me any country in the world from whence our forefathers came that practiced conscription that won a war or won a victory. Shall we crucify our Nation on the cross of militarism? Shall we abandon the dream of freedom for the nightmare of servitude? Shall we abandon the God of our forefathers for the Mammon of brass hats? Do you think 800,000 teen-agers, doing setting-up exercises, can scare the 25,000,000 army of Soviet Russia? The thing that is going to scare Russia and the thing that is going to whip her is democracy, freedom of conscience, and freedom of speech, and freedom to serve, and freedom to die. That is what is going to do it. Let America go forth as a shining example; and to do it we will give our very best to preserve freedom here in America, even though my race, which walks through the shadow of second-class citizenship, when the time comes to answer Uncle Sam's call, we will answer it, and with freedom in our hearts we can destroy any army of conscripts raised by anyone anywhere in the world.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, two great forces are striving for mastery in this great land of ours. One is the stronger at present, judged by external appearances, and by the depths of its encroachment into the seats of the mighty. It has practically taken over the seat of our Government here at Washington. It has seized control of the means of communication in this country, and has infiltrated most of our social groups. It has deeply infected even the membership of this House. It has taken over our institutions of so-called learning and taught some of our pulpits to preach a spurious gospel.

It has even prostituted our language so that many words now have the very opposite connotation than the meaning ascribed to them by the venerable Noah Webster. The charge brought against the ancient philosopher Socrates might now, in very truth, be leveled against this group:

That they have made the worse appear the better, and have turned the world upside down.

However, if it be true that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, the opposite force in our country is still the stronger.

The great heart of the true America, the America of the grass roots, still throbs as the life blood of patriotism courses through its veins. It still is the true source of governmental power in this country. It still speaks with a thunderous voice; and you had better listen to it.

Confused? Yes. Why not? The institutions of government, of learning, of social communications, of social intercourse, and of religious teaching, our founding fathers set up and endowed with certain rights, may have proved recreant to their trust; but the great heart of America still beats as faithfully at the grass roots as it did in 1789.

It speaks with no uncertain voice, either. The true voice of the America, which has sent hundreds of thousands, yes, perhaps, millions of letters to this House, demanding in categorical language that your constituents want none of this National Security Training Corps being considered through this week, means just what it says. And you had better listen, read, mark, and inwardly digest their message. The voice of America—the true voice of America, is speaking to you.

The forces of the spurious neo-Americanism have overshot their mark. Lulled by the clap-trap and schizophrenic vaporings of the United Nations, through their desires for peace at any price, the giant of the true America is now awakened from its troubled sleep. They have had enough of international messiahship.

Korea, and the near treason of the recent meeting of the top brass of the military commands of Britain, France, and the United States in the Pentagon, has taught them, and it should have taught you, the dangers inherent in the un-

bridled control of the military over the civil authorities of this country.

The State Department and the military brass have already plunged us into another undeclared war in Indochina, another police action.

The common folk of America want no more of it. Neither do I. And I think the vote in this House will register the fact in no unmistakable terms that neither does this House.

Gentlemen of the House, our greatest threat to the peace and well-being of America today is not Russia—great as that is.

It is the one-world United Nations, the State Department, and the top brass of the Pentagon, which has long ago ceased to take its orders from this body; its only supreme authority.

Had I a hundred votes, I should cast all of them against this measure.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest for some several weeks, morning and afternoon, to witnesses before the Armed Services Committee on the proposed universal military training legislation.

Certainly the testimony left one much confused. And as one listens to the debate here in the House, for and against, one becomes more confused.

Permit me to indulge for a moment in what has happened in the past. As I recall, after World War I we sunk our battleships, destroyed our fortifications, and went down the pathway of pacifistic peace, placing our trust in treaties with people we thought were as right-minded as ourselves. This was a war to end all wars and make the world safe for democracy. Nothing was accomplished. But it did pave the way for the Lenins, the Trotskys, the Stalins, the Hitlers, the Himmlers, the Goerings, the Mussolinis, and Cianos who followed in the wake of our attempts to restore a war-torn world to peace and stability.

So we moved along, hoping and praying and trusting that nothing would occur to disturb peace in the world. Then, suddenly on December 7, 1941, the Japanese dumped tons of dynamite on our battleships and fortifications, wiped out some 3,500 American lives and 50 percent of our fleet; and we found ourselves in another major war totally unprepared.

Certainly none of us want to find ourselves again in such a desperate position—totally unprepared in the event we should suddenly be catapulted into another world war, and we are frantically building up our defenses that may enable us to meet any emergency that may occur.

Back in 1949 the Armed Services Committee prepared a defense program of some \$17,000,000,000 which was cut back, as I recall it, to some \$10,000,000,000 or \$12,000,000,000. We cut back the Air Force 70 groups to 48 groups. We canceled the carrier. We moth-balled the fleet. Admiral Denfeld was fired. We cut back the ground forces, the Navy Air, and the Marine Corps.

We were then precipitated into the Korean war and we were sending our

boys into Korea to fight tanks with carbines. Let no one tell you—with battle casualties around 110,000—that this is any police action. It is a war.

We now are trying to build up our national defense. Appropriating billions of dollars to meet the needs and demands that may be made upon us in world affairs. And this program may eventually wreck the economy of this country.

It is a very grave situation and one cannot tell what may happen, or when anything may happen, or whether anything will happen. So we are trying to develop programs to give this country strength in event we should need it, and, we come up with universal military training as one of the programs.

Even in the face of the dire situation existing in world affairs, we should approach this question cautiously before accepting any legislation without careful consideration and until it clearly defines exactly what it is intended to accomplish. In this instance, I am unable to determine whether it will accomplish its intended objective; and if so, how and when. The Department of Defense appears just a bit too anxious to get this legislation on the books. If needed immediately, certainly there would be no hesitancy to go along, but with selective service working most equitably and satisfactorily, it is my sincere belief that this universal military training proposal should be carefully thought out now and not muddled through with plans and programs that will keep the youth of America in such a frame of mind that he will be unable to determine what he can or cannot do. I believe a satisfactory program can be worked out and initiated at the proper time.

I am not satisfied with this proposed program. And it must be admitted that we won two wars without a universal military training program. Whether or not the time is propitious to attempt such a program is questionable in my mind. Selective service seems to be working in a most satisfactory manner in meeting our present requirements. This attempt to phase-in universal military training with the present Selective Service System is one that should be given very careful consideration.

Repeatedly I have asked witnesses who have come before the committee to present some sort of workable plan, but none have offered any plan which would be fair and equitable; to my way of thinking. And this proposed legislation, in my opinion, is most discriminatory. Until some plan is presented that would be fair and equitable to all the youth of America, I am not inclined to go along with universal military training legislation.

As originally planned, universal military training was to be initiated when selective service was discontinued, which would be in June 1955. But attempts are now being made by various suggestive plans, to phase it in with selective service. It is a bit premature in my way of thinking. How you will answer the folks back home will be a very difficult problem if this legislation is adopted.

For example, take two boys who live on the same street. Call them John Smith and John Brown. John Smith

is called at 18½ years of age by selective service and gets some 6 months of basic training and 18 months actual service. Maybe he is sent to Korea where he might lose an arm or a leg, or be killed in action. John Brown comes along and goes into the universal military training program for 6 months of basic training, and then he is returned to civilian life to pursue his education, vocation, or whatever he may desire to do.

Now do you think the parents of John Smith are going to be satisfied to see their boy go to Korea or Europe or some other place to serve while John Brown comes back home to go to school? This, in my way of thinking, is discriminatory and not fair treatment for either boy.

Universal military training was conceived with the idea of making it universal—high or low, rich or poor. Everyone getting 6 months training, with no deferments, no exceptions, with every youth in America getting basic training.

However, attempts are being made by various methods, such as the volunteer plan, to phase it in with selective service, or whatever approach would be decided upon. But if this is a volunteer plan, how can it be universal, and how are all boys going to be treated fairly and equitably?

I asked witness after witness to come up with some plan that would be fair while selective service was still in effect. Nobody seems to know the answer, from General Hershey down, and nobody knows the answer now. Therefore, I cannot see how we can attempt universal military training until some program is developed which would treat all boys on the same basis.

Now it might be argued that if there is no necessity for the draft to maintain a standing army and garrisons overseas, that this universal military program would strengthen our Reserve and civilian components; that the Reserve components would take the young men when they complete their basic training and would be able to do more unit training.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I understand the object of universal military training is to provide for a well-trained Reserve.

Mr. GAVIN. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can the gentleman point out to me in this bill where provision has been made for an active, well-trained Reserve after these men have finished their 6 months military training?

Mr. GAVIN. That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. KEARNEY. I understand, when I asked that question day before yesterday on the floor of this House, that it had been taken care of by the passage of the Reserve bill which we passed sometime last October, but I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the other body has not yet touched that bill.

Mr. GAVIN. I understand it is still in the Senate and no action has been

taken. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

However, let me remind the Members of the House that unless funds, facilities, and supplies for all training units are available, and the units kept up to full strength, they will not be ready to go.

This expansion of our civilian components or reserve training units and ROTC and NROTC will cost considerable money in addition to the immediate cost of universal military training. But, unless the Reserve units are kept up to full strength with full facilities and not permitted to deteriorate, as happened in the past, the benefits from universal military training will be lost as far as the individual is concerned.

I have yet to hear of any program for the ROTC that would meet the great and wide variety of demands that would be made if universal military training legislation is adopted.

My great concern about universal military training is not that it would ruin the youth of America or build up a great military caste, but, that a program be worked out that would be fair and equitable to all boys and a Reserve program that is well-defined and set up to meet our needs.

It is argued that building up the Reserve corps would reduce the size of our standing army and greatly reduce the cost of national defense. However, in reducing the size of our standing army, we are going to pick up a tremendous volume of expense in carrying on the Reserve programs if they are carried on as they should be in order to have a Reserve corps that would be ready at all times.

So it is questionable just how much would be conserved by reducing the size of our standing army.

Now, if we reduce the size of our standing army to merely a recruit training organization such as, I have been advised, the French operated from 1920 to 1939, using old equipment, old methods and having numbers but not quality, we certainly would not be much better off. France had the manpower, but not the equipment.

In periods of economy it has been the tendency to build up manpower, reduce research developments and maneuvers, and stop the procurement of equipment.

If universal military training is adopted, unless the Reserve corps is kept active, alerted, fully equipped and trained to the minute—plus modern equipment to meet any demands that may be made upon us in event of an emergency, it would not be of much value, in my opinion.

This whole matter should have more careful thought and attention so that a program that is fair to all boys; that is clear, concise, and readily understandable to the American people, can be developed and presented for consideration so the youth of America can determine their futures.

All I can see that this program will do is muddy up the waters, confuse the whole issue over selective service and universal military training to such an extent that nobody will know what it is all about.

I feel that with the unstabilized conditions now existing in world affairs that every thought and consideration must be given to building up our defenses; particularly as it applies to planes, tanks, guns, ships, jeeps, atomic weapons, and all other items necessary to fight a war. And then some program when necessary for the training of our boys and a well-defined Reserve program.

But to me, this proposal in its present state is not the answer. The program appears to me to have the cart before the horse.

It is a very grave matter. Our military leaders are charged with the responsibility of preparing this country for defense and certainly something better will have to be offered if we are to be set and ready to go.

It is my opinion that selective service is meeting our manpower requirements and whether or not it is good policy to phase in universal military training with Selective Service at this time is questionable in my mind. The whole question should have more careful thought. I do not have the answers, but I certainly do not think we should rush headlong into a program that will confuse the American people and the American youth, and muddy up the waters, to a greater extent than at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PENDING LEGISLATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, it is a pity that on this unusually bright day, surrounded by the countless blessings, conveniences, advantages, and opportunities, we, of necessity, must devote our time to the subject of war or efforts to prevent the recurrence of war more deadly than the human mind can conceive. As for me personally, I hate war. I would have no part of it. But the law of self-preservation impels me to raise my voice in support of one of the most important and far-reaching legislative proposals ever presented for consideration on the floor of this House—a plan for universal military training. With all the fervor and zeal at my command, I urge the passage of H. R. 5904, the proposed National Security Training Corps Act.

A great landmark in the history of this Nation was established by the Congress in 1951 with the passage of Public Law 51. By this act, the principle of universal military service in peacetime or during emergency was established as a national policy. H. R. 5904 now seeks to implement that policy.

Pursuant to Public Law 51, the President, with the approval of the Senate, appointed the National Security Training Commission, comprised of five distinguished and outstandingly able men. As provided by the act, this Commission submitted its legislative recommendations to the Congress on October 29, 1951. I wish to commend this report to your most earnest consideration. It is comprehensive and reflects a deep understanding

standing on the part of its authors of the many implications and impacts the adoption of its recommendations will have upon our social, economic, and political structure. I wish also to commend the House Armed Services Committee and its able chairman for the careful scrutiny given to this proposal and for the results of their deliberation as evidenced by the bill and the accompanying report.

THE AMERICAN TRADITION

There is no gainsaying that the American tradition is opposed to universal military training in peacetime. That has been and will always remain a profoundly cherished national principle. And so, in contemplating my position on this important legislation, I have found it necessary to weigh all the problems posed by this bill as against that sacred tradition; and, too, I have found it necessary to examine every facet of the proposal as it reflects upon that way of life we call American.

The American tradition—no universal military training in peacetime. But are we today dwelling in an atmosphere of peace? A godless state is running rampant throughout the world. The authors of the fearful philosophy of the Kremlin seek to dominate the world. A nation of some 200,000,000 people before World War II now embraces some 800,000,000 peoples within its vassal borders. This was accomplished in part by force and in part by indoctrination. The repeated statements of Marx, Engle, Lenin, and Stalin that capitalistic nations must be subjugated, and if necessary, by force, constitute no idle threat. That force has been demonstrated beyond peradventure.

The sacred tenets of American life must be preserved. We have witnessed the bold, insidious infiltration and indoctrination attempted by communism among our own people. By this all the rights and liberties we enjoy, including those guaranteed to us under the Bill of Rights, are placed in jeopardy. There are those who give violent lip-service support to the preservation of those rights and liberties, but, in contrast, there are those of us who would give our very lives to insure their preservation not only for this generation but for all posterity.

For these reasons, after long and careful deliberation, I know there is no other course for me to pursue than that which will afford for my beloved country the surest protection of its sacred ideals and institutions. And that course, gentlemen of the Congress, is to support the only feasible, long-ranged plan proffered by the bill under consideration. But I shall further amplify on my reasons for support of this measure and on the principles which it encompasses.

IS SELECTIVE SERVICE SUFFICIENT?

Most of the witnesses opposed to universal military training, who have appeared before the Armed Services Committees of both Houses, contend that the Selective Service System answers all of our defense requirements; that universal military training is impractical, colossally expensive, and that, in any

event, it should not be implemented until after the present emergency has passed.

Of course the Selective Service System meets our immediate emergency needs. No one disputes that. But selective service is not designed to meet the long-range requirements in our plans for national defense. Authorities generally are agreed that the international tension which presently disturbs the world, will endure for 10 and perhaps 25 years. The burden of selective service over such a span of time would become intolerable. Of course, the financial burden of maintaining the universal military training corps will be great, but it will be far less than the burden of maintaining over that span of years a standing military force of from 3,500,000 to 5,000,000.

Let us see how the plan will work and how it will not only alleviate but eventually eliminate the necessity for a Selective Service System in peacetime. Eighteen-year-old boys will be called up through the Selective Service System for 6 months' training, following which the trainees will be assigned to one of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, there to continue their training, in a civilian-reserve capacity, for a period of 7½ years. The training in the corps of each of the services will include basic military training, specialized training, and leadership training.

Here, then, will be created a manpower pool of approximately 800,000 men annually—a trained manpower pool whose training will continue through the reserve years of service. This is the American concept: no large standing Army, Navy, or Air Force, but a Reserve, trained manpower civilian pool which must ever be the bulwark of defense of our beloved Nation.

All three services are agreed that the training plan can be inaugurated within 6 months after the enactment of this bill, and that it can be done concurrently with the operations now proceeding under the Selective Service System. The process necessarily would be gradual. Perhaps 60,000 in the training corps initially, the number to be increased concomitantly as the need for call-up through selective service diminishes. To me, it is only sensible to implement this program progressively. It can be done.

THE PRINCIPLE OF UNIVERSALITY

The paramount concern of those who would build the defense of this Nation is that that defense should be borne equally by all who share the blessings of a life under a free America. We cannot and must not tolerate a system which permits the willing, the courageous alone to volunteer to bear the burden of defending our way of life, while others accept the benefits of military security but yet offer no contribution to sustain it. Service, above all else, must be universal.

Having said this, I am not unmindful of the fact that all persons who contribute to our national defense need not be men who bear arms. I know, as you do, that men and women on the farms, in the factories, in our transportation facilities, in the sciences, professions, and elsewhere, play an indispensable role in any and all defense efforts. They are a

part of this universal service of which I speak. And in making this statement I do not advocate conscription of labor, agriculture, and industry, all having proven in the past their willingness and capacity to fulfill the defense demands made upon them.

WILL UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING PROMOTE MILITARY BUREAUCRACY?

Some opponents of universal military training express apprehension that the training contemplated will indoctrinate our youth with a militaristic philosophy and that a dangerous military bureaucracy will entrench itself on our Nation with its seat in the Pentagon.

No desire or evidence of love for military bureaucracy was ever displayed following the wars heretofore participated in by our country.

Let me say, that in World War II, 15,000,000 persons were called to the colors. These, at that time, with their families, constituted almost one-third of the population of these United States. Yes, these 15,000,000 persons returned to civilian life indoctrinated with a greater love, a greater understanding, and a greater appreciation of the American democratic way of life. To even suggest that these men and women were corrupted by military service is insulting to all the veterans of World War II and the veterans of Korea, and to all their families.

Educators unanimously concede that the World War II GI was the outstanding student in the history of advanced education. General Eisenhower, then president of Columbia University, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1948, said:

The American generation that went into this war came out of it better men than they went in, and one of the things that I pose as evidence is this: Every university president that I have had the privilege of talking to, and nowadays I talk to a few of them, says that the veteran is doing better in school than any class now there or any classes have ever done, and that, habitually, the veterans are standing in the top half of the class, and they are simply walking away with academic honors, showing that they have gotten something they did not have before.

The school officials of my own district advised me that the highest scholastic records were made by the veterans who were privileged to pursue their education under the GI bill passed by this Congress.

And have these 15,000,000 patriots left an impress of militarism on this Nation of ours? Were they indoctrinated with notions, ideas, or philosophies that would endanger the future of our country? Let every Member of this House make his own answer to these questions.

MORAL CONSIDERATIONS

As American parents, we are concerned with the moral welfare of our sons and daughters. I resent, as must every father, mother, wife, sister, or brother of these 15,000,000 men and women, the insinuation that the moral fiber of these defenders of our Nation were marred, weakened, or destroyed as a result of their military training and experience. Mrs. C. D. Wright, speaking before the Senate committee in behalf of the Gen-

eral Federation of Women's Clubs of America, answered this slanderous charge, as will most parents of service persons, when she stated that her three sons returned from World War II better and stronger men morally and spiritually than they were before they entered the services.

I personally know that from my experience in World War I, I gained training which has been most helpful to me. My sons who served and now serve in the Armed Forces too have gained strength and inspiration for better citizenship.

The type of training and the standards provided to protect the welfare and morals of the members of the corps is exemplified by the so-called Fort Knox experiment. In 1947 and 1948, under the command of Maj. Gen. John M. Devine, 3 classes of 664 17- and 18-year-old boys were trained for a period of 6 months. These boys were given a vigorous military training but not at the expense of their moral and spiritual welfare. General Devine told the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1948:

The other part of our program was this: We were particularly concerned in relieving the minds of the parents as to the moral welfare of their boys under military training. We set out to apply practically the idea which has been expressed so often that it is not enough to develop men physically and mentally, but we must also develop them morally and spiritually.

To accomplish this, we put the chaplain in our program. We made him an active member of the faculty. He has a class every week; once a week he comes in contact with everyone: Initially he interviews every boy that comes into the unit, the idea being to break down the barrier which does exist between the clergy and the soldier. It exists also between the clergy and the civilian.

To make the man feel at home with the chaplain and to make him a regular member of the family, he actually teaches a class every week. That particular course is called citizenship, for lack of a better name. It is designed, however, to teach higher standards, ethical standards, moral standards; to teach the fundamentals of human relations; to take religion out of the church and put it into the front yards of everyday life.

The topics which the chaplain discusses are, for example, the Citizens and Fair Play, Sportsmanship, the Citizen and Morality, the Citizen and Honesty, designed to teach higher standards to boys who need them, to help boys already having high standards to maintain them.

The National Security Training Commission has emphasized a program designed to protect the moral and spiritual welfare of trainees in the corps:

We have kept constantly before us the importance of incorporating into the program all the advantages to health, education, character development and training for citizenship that can be provided without surrendering the essential military objectives. Unless the training contributes in a meaningful way to a youth's readiness to defend himself and his country, it cannot be justified. But there is every warrant for confidence that this military preparation can be successfully fused with measures intended to make this a period of growth for our young men—mentally, physically and in their appreciation of moral values. Universal military training, involving as it does a sharing of the responsibility for safeguarding our democracy, can and should represent an historic step forward in the ability of Ameri-

cans to live and work together for the common good.

Our report contains detailed legislative proposals to promote the safety, health, welfare, and morals of the corps. We are aware, however, that, as regards welfare and morals, the measures which can be spelled out in law are but a small part of the total measures required. Essentially they prohibit or restrict, whereas the greater need is to inspire and lead, to establish high standards of honorable conduct within the program. These would be manifest in the trainee's basic sense of responsibility, an understanding of his obligations to his country, a sense of pride in his unit, a desire to achieve excellence, moderation in his personal habits, and tolerance toward those about him.

We believe the achievement of standards which would produce such attributes is entirely within the reach of a UMT program and should constitute one of its chief goals. Our optimism on this score is bolstered by our review of the successful Fort Knox experiment. Its lesson is clear: The key to moral and responsible conduct on the part of trainees lies in the quality of their leaders. We therefore consider it a matter of first importance that all trainers involved in the UMT program be carefully selected and thoroughly indoctrinated in the working philosophy of the program. They must accept responsibility on a round-the-clock basis, and that applies to every level of leadership from top to bottom.

It is gratifying to me personally, as you my colleagues might well judge, that the pending bill has a strong provision against the sale, consumption, traffic in, or possession of alcoholic beverages.

THE ATTITUDE OF CHURCH AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

Some, but by no means all, religious and educational leaders are unalterably opposed to universal military training. Their reasons are many—contrary to Christian teachings, danger of military domination, corruption of our youth, and the inculcation of false values and philosophies.

It is with the greatest reluctance that I take issue with these leaders of thought in America. I consider myself a profoundly devout Christian.

I am as ardently for peace as the most extreme pacifist, but my love for peace will not admit of a policy of abandoning my country and all its ideals and institutions. And, so long as we live in an atmosphere of danger, I want my country prepared to defend these ideals and institutions. I can find no satisfactory substitute for universal military training to insure that defense.

It is a significant fact that veterans' organizations, almost unanimously, support the principle. And it is also deeply significant that the Gold Star Mothers of America have gone on record emphatically supporting universal military training.

CIVILIAN CONTROL

Public Law 51 assures that the over-all control of the training corps shall be civilian in character. This is as it should be. With this we are assured that no military domination of this Nation can ever result. Certainly a permanent, great standing army could well lead to military dominance. Universal military training is the only sure alternative that will preserve the great principle of civilian control.

CONCLUSION

One of the most often heard arguments against universal military training is that nations which had such training have lost wars, while the United States, without such training, has won its wars. This argument is fallacious. Germany had such training during the Napoleonic wars, and it was this training that contributed to the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo. Again, in 1870, Germany, operating under its system of military training, defeated France. In 1940 Russia had a universal training system, and she won with that system in 1945. Switzerland has had the system for over 100 years, and it is generally conceded that the system accounts for the fact that she has had no wars, although she has been in the very cockpit of Europe. Sweden has had the system for over 100 years, and during that period of time she has had no wars.

It is true that we have won our wars, but it must be borne in mind that in both World Wars I and II our allies provided the necessary time in which we could build up our forces. In the future we will have no such time for preparation. Modern war can strike swiftly by an aggressor prepared to attack us.

I close with the earnest appeal to all of my colleagues that you give your support to this bill. I want my boys, and you surely want yours, to be well and efficiently trained. A trained soldier cannot only protect himself far better than an untrained soldier but he can also contribute to the protection of his fellow soldier or those who, perchance, might be under his command. There is no philosophy concerning conduct of war that can possibly be a substitute for trained manpower.

What is worth living for is worth defending. To me the adoption of universal military training will announce to the world our profound love for our liberties, our way of life, and our determination to defend these values.

I am for universal military training because it insures equality of service and because I find it to be the only answer to the defense of my country—a country which bases its philosophies on the Ten Commandments, upon the principles enunciated in the Magna Charta, our Constitution, and the noble Bill of Rights.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have listened very carefully to the gentleman's statement. I want to compliment him on it. I do not know of any other Member of the House who is more interested in the moral and spiritual welfare of American youth than is the gentleman from South Carolina. The fact that he can see in this proposal no endangerment to the morals of our American youth is, I think, a great tribute to his judgment and a compliment to the work of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BRYSON. I am very much indebted to my friend.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, Members of this distinguished legislative body, I am one of the junior Members of this body and I have chosen to listen to the eloquent debates on various subjects for the past 2 months. However, when this legislation was offered I felt that because of its far-reaching effects and the extreme importance of this legislation, I wanted to express my views with the thought that I could offer my experience as a background. This is, I feel, the most important thing I have ever undertaken for my country. I want to compliment the members of the Armed Services Committee in their efforts to bring to the House of Representatives what in their sincere feeling is a workable plan of universal military training.

It is my humble opinion that this is the most important legislation affecting the people of our entire Nation that has been presented to this House of Representatives for a long time. Too, it is my opinion that even though there is a difference of thought among the Members as to the plan, that the desire to bring forth a workable and equitable plan transcends party lines. This is not Democratic or Republican legislation. It is American and should erase that aisle in this distinguished body of men and women.

These are some of the questions that will be debated: Compensation, disability benefits, death benefits.

Adoption of UMT would not provide more trained soldiers for the present emergency.

UMT is not emergency legislation at all. Its proponents are simply using emergency psychology to fasten permanent peacetime conscription on all American youth.

UMT-trained men would not be available for immediate service in the event of war.

Universal military training will not help to reduce casualties in a future war.

The existence of universal military training would not eliminate the need for a large standing army.

The adoption of UMT would not frighten Russia into behaving itself.

UMT would not improve the national health.

UMT would not have a harmful effect upon the morals of the men exposed to it.

These are all debatable questions and could be stated in the affirmative as well as the negative and probably all will be thoroughly discussed during this session.

That we need a strong defense for this country of ours is not debatable. That it takes men, money, and equipment to have a strong defense is not debatable. The question of how to produce the men, money, and equipment in time of an emergency is quite well established in our Selective Service Act and our plan which is in effect at the present time seems to be adequate.

It is our peacetime Army, if there is such a thing as peace, that we are most concerned about. It is quite generally accepted that our failure for defense in time of peace has been our weak spot.

Because we have fumbled the ball in the past by letting our defense shrink below par and, too, not being aware of the outlying dangers, we are now going to saddle the burden of defense upon the youth of our country.

Adequate defense is only a relative term. Our country is stronger than any other country only when she has more men and equipment than any other country. It is not possible for any one country to have an adequate defense against all the other countries of the world if they were to pool their resources. With an honest, sincere, and forthright intelligence department and a Congress that would follow the dictates of the intelligence department, we can keep our defense at equal strength with any other country or possible enemy. Germany had an adequate defense during the Polish war but she did not have an adequate defense for what she got. We can only hope to develop our defense to that which is equal to any other country of the world.

I have not developed the philosophy that war is inevitable and that we are going to have to set up a machine to constantly grind our 18-year-olds into service year after year for a period of 6 months' training and 7½ years of servitude. This is a gloomy picture for him; a subject on which he has no voice. And I might add here, and if you can remember back that far you will agree, that life at the tender age of 18 and 19 is very sweet.

As for the kind of training that he is to receive during this 6 months at camp, I am not sure but if he is going to prepare for war, he will need something more than sex education and a training in the bonds of matrimony. If I were to prescribe, I would say first that he would be equipped with a pair of shoes that would fit his feet and that he would march and run day after day until there is not an ounce of fat left on him; that he would be rugged enough to carry a 40-pound pack 20 miles a day and double time the last mile. He is going to have the ruggedness to withstand the elements of cold and rain and mud, days and nights of hunger, sleepless nights, fatigue the kind of which he has never dreamed.

I put in almost 2 years of my life in the Army and for some of you who might have been in the Saint Mihiel sector around Nancy and Toul or in the Argonne sector in the vicinity of Varennes, Sheppy, Banthivell, the forces across the Meuse River to Stanay, you will agree with me on some of these hardships.

Probably at this point the 18-year-old will remember some of his religious training. When he is lying in a rain-soaked ditch seeking some protection from flying shrapnel and probably he has just lost his buddy, he will look up to the skies and say: "God help me. Is this the end? I pray for help."

This is the kind of world we are building up for our 18-year-olds. I want him to feel that this country of America is worth fighting for and be willing at all times to offer his life if necessary for its protection; but by the same token, I want him to feel that there is a liberty and freedom that he inherited from

the Father of our County, George Washington that is being denied him. He is willing to fight and die for freedom and liberty but not servitude from UMT. Cannot the intelligence and brilliance of this distinguished body of men and women bring about semblance of peace rather than building up a war machine for all time to come? I plead with you to continue the Selective Service Act as long as an emergency exists but to defeat anything that borders on universal military training. May God give us the courage to assess the risks of peace.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with extreme reluctance that I come into the well of the House as the freshest of freshmen members of the Committee on Armed Services to speak to you on this subject. I do so only because of a deep conviction on this subject, a conviction I have gained from 4 years in the service and from being a reservist ever since I came out of the service. I do so also out of a deep interest in the reservists who have had to go to Korea.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure on several occasions during the past few weeks of having breakfast in the House cafeteria with the genial and extremely able chairman of my Committee on Armed Services. During those most pleasant sessions I have swallowed with my scrambled eggs the varied and changing condiments of his universal military training plan as it developed. Though the condiments were served with exceeding charm and efficiency, unfortunately I found them all quite indigestible. Regretfully, when the committee voted, I had to withdraw from Mr. Vinson the proxy reputedly handed him by each member of the committee.

The merits or demerits of a UMT system have been discussed on this floor at length. Although I disagree with the chairman's present thesis that this House has accepted the principle of UMT, I will accept his invitation to discuss this particular proposal for UMT. I do so because I am convinced that those who have favored some form of UMT in the past could vote against this particular bill without any hesitation or compunction and without contradicting themselves.

We have a story up in my district which illustrates what I think this particular bill is. It is a story about a Franco-American farmer who went into a dealer's store to buy some fertilizer. He bought a load of fertilizer and took it on home. Early the next morning he appeared back at the dealer's, and the dealer said, "Pete, what's the matter with the fertilizer?" Pete said, "It don't smell on the inside like it reads on the label."

This bill, as reported to this House, is completely without gender as far as UMT is concerned, as far as building up an active reserve is concerned, and as far as any emergency is concerned. I understand from the many rumors of proposed amendments that I have heard that it is to be even further emasculated, if that is possible, in the interest of pass-

ing any old plan just so long as we pass it now. And why now? During the hearings on this plan it was continually reiterated by proponents of the bill that UMT was a peacetime measure unnecessary under wartime or emergency conditions. And I may say in all truthfulness that no one repeated it more often or more emphatically than did our fine chairman, the gentleman from Georgia. But he states on the floor of the House that even under present conditions of war and emergency UMT should be adopted as speedily as possible. Why, if not to take advantage of present fear and distrust to pass some legislation for a future Congress we consider not so wise as ourselves, or a future electorate that may have rid itself of the fear psychology engendered in recent years by those in power?

As this bill is reported and as it may well be put into execution, it is not UMT. This bill, if passed by the House and Senate, could be made effective the same day that the President signs it. He simply has to issue an executive order on recommendation of the Secretary of Defense reducing or eliminating the term of service for boys under 19. The Secretary of Defense testified before the committee—hearings, page 2400—that UMT "should be started as soon as possible" and it could be begun on a limited scale approximately 6 months after the enactment of the implementing legislation. The limited scale was later defined as 5,000 boys a month. In connection with their first proposal to take 60,000 volunteers for 6 months of UMT who would commit themselves to 18 months of additional service, they stated that it could be done without any additional appropriation. I am in no position to analyze the minds of the multitude of high-ranking officers now occupying the Pentagon. I am convinced that they want any old plan for UMT put in the statute books and now. I rather suspect that they would like to go further and make it an accomplished fact on a limited scale so that future Congresses might hesitate the more to alter or remove it.

What then happens to this thing called universal military training? No one here would question but what the draft must go on for years to come. If we pass this legislation, we create a privileged, draft-exempt class of 60,000 out of 800,000 boys who train for 6 months and then go into the Ready Reserve to be called for periods in excess of 30 days only in such number and manner as Congress may indicate. The other 740,000 remain subject to draft and to 2 years of active duty. One inequity does not cure another.

And let me remind each one of you that this bill contains a provision that persons eligible for induction into the National Security Training Corps may volunteer. Imagine the confusion in the Selective Service Boards. Imagine every mother and father of an 18-year-old boy down on your heads, and justly so, to get their boy into this select, preferred few. What a tale that would be, full of sound and fury—signifying much to you.

Where has the universality of service gone under such a system which could go on for years? The bill should more properly be termed "an act creating preferential draft exemptions." Mrs. Rosenberg has told us that any increase in the number of UMT trainees would depend on reductions in the size of the standing force—hearings, page 2417. And yet we are told that any reduction in the size of the standing force must depend on the output of trainees. Which circle are we running around now? Where are these thousands of trainees that will reduce the size and cost of the standing forces coming from in the near or distant future?

It has been often stated that the sole objective of UMT was to create a strong, well-trained Ready Reserve. No one pretends that 6 months training is of itself enough to create such a strong, well-trained reservist. That training must be continued, preferably in active units to keep him in that status. How does this bill contribute to that purpose?

It simply provides that trainees, after completion of their 6 months' training, shall be channeled into the Ready Reserve. The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951 passed by the House and now pending in the Senate does not compel membership in Reserve components. A trainee would have to remain in the Ready Reserve for 7½ years, but any one or all of them could do so as inactive reservists without joining any organized training unit. Their only obligation as such would be 15 days of training, if the particular branch of the service elected to call them. It is true that a so-called incentive is provided which reduces their Ready Reserve obligation to 3 years, if they participate satisfactorily in 3 years of Ready Reserve Training. Whether or not this would be an incentive is questionable. In the event of an emergency, it would be those who had fully participated in a training program who would be the most trained and most desirable to call up. On those trainees who became inactive reservists with little if any training UMT would be completely and utterly wasted, as they would have to be completely retrained. It has been said we could never again establish a voluntary reserve system. How does this help that situation? Any system of UMT would be futile unless the trainees went into active training units.

The cost of UMT is not alone reflected in the tentative estimates made by the Department of Defense. On top of this must be placed the millions, even billions, of dollars necessary for a tremendous expansion of the Reserve training program for each service. Any of you who may doubt this has but to look at the report of the committee and see listed from pages 32 to 41 the many new facilities and equipment which each of the services now lists as essential to an expanded Reserve program.

Of course, something must be done to prevent a repetition of injustices done reservists in the Korean crisis. Congress had provided adequate Reserve legislation. It is freely admitted that the very basis of our difficulties today is that the armed services neglected and botched

up their Reserve programs. Evidence in many cases would indicate a design to do this so that they could get UMT. This is the horse that should come before the cart.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to this House that it is completely unnecessary to pile the cost of this proposed UMT program on top of a necessary expense for the expansion of our Reserve training facilities. Let the armed services go ahead with their expansion programs to show that they are in earnest about Reserve training. Let the Reserves then train the Reserves. If compulsion be necessary to get our young boys into the various Reserves—as is not indicated by the Armed Forces Reserve Act which we passed—then we can simply pass a law providing that, if a boy of 18 joined an Active Reserve unit for 3 years, he would become a member of the Ready Reserve with the same privileges as are accorded the trainees in this bill.

You would not want for candidates under such a system.

Under such a system real universality of opportunity would be afforded from the very start.

Under such a system you would not disrupt American homes and the lives and education of American youths. You would not take annually from the productive capacity of this Nation thousands and thousands of man-hours.

Under such a system the armed services would be forced to devote their time and energy to really building a Reserve. They would not have UMT to play with or be able to come back to the Congress later to say that 6 months' training was not enough, that they needed the boys for 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion as an ex-citizen-soldier of 4 years' service and a present reservist, the proposed plan represents antiquated, strait-jacket, military thinking unsuited to our present-day needs, and not only completely unnecessary but dangerous in the crisis we face. Its adoption would further hamstring and impede our productive economy in meeting the tremendous demands that must be increasingly made upon it in the perilous days that lie ahead.

A Government expert computed on the basis of the 1940 census that 65 percent of the boys over 18 were engaged in productive activity—on the farm, in industry. The bill before us could mean the taking of thousands of these boys a year completely out of productive activity.

General MacArthur has often been quoted during this debate, probably because in military matters he has been proved to be so often right. In opposing the passage of UMT now he said:

I believe the fitting in of the manpower, of the expert efficiency of the country, is a very intricate problem that can't be settled in such a broad, general way as that. I believe the greatest possible consideration has got to be given to the demands of industry. I believe that if you are going to prepare the youth, that you have got to understand that modern warfare has as its basis—industry.

How true it is that in modern warfare victory has gone not to massed man-

power but to superiority in quantity and quality of weapons and equipment. How true it is that today America's first line of attack and defense is in superiority in atomic weapons and the air and sea carriers necessary to deliver them. How long must we cling to the outmoded and fantastic theory that we can muster the manpower to lick the Soviet Union on the ground, and waste priceless defense dollars in maintaining a mass army-in-being, and then add to that a useless UMT program that channels 50 percent of its trainees to the Army.

The eminent and distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has forcefully pointed out on this floor how far Russia is outstripping us in production of weapons of war. The presence of 5 jets to our 1 over Korea does nothing but confirm his argument. And yet he concludes from his valid statement of facts that we must meet this challenge by passing a law that could take 800,000 boys a year out of productive labor or away from scientific, medical, and other studies so badly needed in a modern war economy. Is this to be done in a vain effort to match the manpower of the Soviet? I believe the masters of the Kremlin would laugh at UMT for 800,000 American boys; they would be delighted at the further immense drain we proposed to place upon an already overburdened economy.

If our production is lagging, it is because of administrative and military policies that have not utilized our manpower and resources to the best advantage. It is because of tax and inflationary policies of Government that are fast snuffing out the incentive to produce that has been the very basis of our productive system in the past—a system that has hitherto outproduced and consequently outfought any other nation in the world.

We now propose to add to the difficulties of industry by passing a bill which would take many boys out of their labor market.

Mr. Chairman, it is common knowledge that the armed services are not meeting their own target dates for this emergency. It is common knowledge that there is a vast amount of priceless tax dollars being lost not only through waste and inefficiency but even through corruption. We cannot cure this evil by closing our eyes to it. It is our main job. Let us get back to it and away from a premature, undesirable peacetime measure. Let us not give them another plaything to bobble around.

I do not profess to be a military expert. I am the rankest neophyte on the Armed Services Committee. But I believe that in this emergency, as has been the case so many times in the past, the common sense of the American people must lead the military into the right path. As a first step we should put an end to the stubborn, senseless rivalry of the three major branches of the Armed Forces which unification has seemed only to intensify. Then the great waste in building up Army manpower in the United States should be stopped. Our salvation must lie in the air and on the sea, in both our Navy and merchant marine to

carry essential raw materials. The merchant marine must be modernized and improved without delay. The productive energies of this country should be directed to the production of planes and bombs and of the materials required for these arms. This program would call for a reduction in the present appropriations for the Army and large increases in the appropriations for the Air Force. We should give immediate consideration to whether or not procurement under a central agency headed by civilians would not save vast sums of money. These are our pressing problems—not peacetime legislation.

I call your attention to this issue—March 1952—of Air Force magazine. On the cover it has a picture of Stalin laughing, superimposed on a newspaper clipping, saying, "United States aircraft production slashed—Minimum defense date now set at 1956." That is almost 18 months after the critical target date originally set by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The editor has some truths to say that we should consider:

WHY JOE STALIN IS LAUGHING

He is laughing at our expense and at our military expenses; at the defense budget now before Congress; at the airpower scandal exposed in these pages; at our leaders of Government, because—

We force unrealistic military decisions by making a fetish of politics-as-usual.

We jam our military production machine with business-as-usual bottlenecks.

We ignore our best estimate of Russia's approaching air-atomic superiority.

We postpone target dates for preparedness beyond the point of calculated risk.

We are not buying security with our projected \$52,000,000,000 defense budget.

We could buy survival insurance with this money if we spent it wisely.

We live in a fool's paradise of atomic surplus and outmoded military strategy.

We fail to establish strategic priorities for military tasks and military goods.

We stretch out production and compromise the quality of our air weapons.

We underestimate the threat of all-out attack and of atomic blackmail.

We blind the taxpayer to his true alternatives with guns-and-butter thinking.

We invite Russia to bleed our economy and grab world balance of power by our failure to practice selective mobilization geared to a first-things-first strategy.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat: If this bill is not needed until the end of the draft—and is there one of us but believes it must be extended beyond 1955?—then it comes to us as premature and ill-considered legislation under the guise of a nonexistent emergency. It is a full confession that, bad or good, those who propose it want universal-military-training legislation of any kind on the books to bind future Congresses to come, to bind them because we feel they may be more responsive to the people who may send them here at that future date.

Let us put first things first and get back on our main job.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, there is a world of difference between approving of preparedness, or recognizing the need for a long-term military policy and feeling compelled to vote for

H. R. 5904. Advocates of this National Security Training Commission plan, including the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, are inclined to oversimplify the whole matter by indicating that the Congress must choose this precise plan of UMT or nothing. In fact, in his stirring emotional appeal that opened this debate the gentleman from Georgia said, and I quote:

The issue is clean cut. No one can fail to understand it. We can enact the legislation now before us and make it possible to implement universal military training with its resultant benefits—or we can tell the Nation that for years and years to come we must continue to draft their sons for service, maintain a large standing force with its staggering costs, and continue, again and again, to call out our veteran reservists.

This simply is not the whole story. We are not faced by a simple choice between black and white, only. There are other ways, traditional and accepted, to accomplish the only aim advanced by those who advocate the adoption of UMT exactly as outlined in H. R. 5904.

What is the reason the advocates of UMT claim that it is so necessary we accept the National Security Training Commission's recommendations? The gentleman from Georgia expressed it very concisely in the next paragraph of that same speech, and I quote:

Let me emphasize again that the sole objective of universal military training is to create a strong, well-trained Ready Reserve, made up of nonveterans, which will permit us to stop drafting men for service, and will likewise permit us to reduce the size of our standing forces.

If you accept this premise, and I do, the problem then is clearly defined. It is obvious that any program which results in the creation of a strong, well-trained Ready Reserve will solve that problem and could have solved that problem in the past. It is equally obvious that the chairman's assertion that the Congress is faced with only two alternatives—this UMT plan or nothing—does not stand up under a calm, unemotional analysis. There are several methods which better fit in with the American pattern of life, which have in the past successfully provided us with trained Reserves. There is another method which has produced trained men who were wasted, to a great extent, because they were never integrated into a Reserve or National Guard program.

I am speaking of military training such as was given in high school and college ROTC and the National Guard as well as under the CMTC, or Citizens' Military Training Corps, which was never revived after World War II, in spite of the fact that it was the most democratic means of training officers ever devised. This year, 62,554 high-school students are voluntarily enrolled in junior ROTC units in 265 schools representing 95 different school systems. This year there are 129,000 college men enrolled in 271 senior ROTC units. Just as an example of the effectiveness of the senior ROTC program, one college, Texas A. & M., had more graduates serving as officers in the Armed Forces during World War II than did West Point,

What has been the reaction of the Pentagon to this program of voluntary training? Have they promoted it and encouraged it and expanded it as an American way to provide a pool of non-veteran reservists? Let me quote to you from page 59 of the Gray report to the Secretary of Defense, made by the Committee on Civilian Components, June 30, 1948:

There are also applications for increased numbers of junior ROTC units in high schools. The committee recognizes the contribution junior ROTC programs have made to some schools and individuals. However, the direct participation of the services in these programs is not essential to their continuance. By assuming only limited sponsorship, the services could provide all the encouragement needed for the junior ROTC without having to furnish instructors and maintenance personnel or develop training programs for the schools. Those could be provided by the schools themselves with necessary equipment still being lent by the services.

In other words, the Gray report says, "Let's jerk the rug out from under the junior ROTC program by cutting off the funds."

Yet, less than 3 months before the Gray report was released, on April 5, 1948, when a Pentagon spokesman came to Capitol Hill to ask for money, he said, and I quote from the testimony of Brig. Gen. Wendall Westover before the House Committee on Appropriations:

The junior division (of high school ROTC) is relatively inexpensive to maintain, and it provides a valuable source of men who have had some basic military training. During the recent war, a substantial percentage of the graduates of officer candidate schools and the aviation-cadet program consisted of men who received previous military training in the junior or basic ROTC. Many of the non-commissioned officers belonged to this category. * * * The State of California is so sold on the idea it is setting up comparable units of its own. I do not know the number of units or the percentage of their schools involved, but I understand the program is very substantial.

This was Brig. Gen. Wendall Westover, then executive for Reserve and ROTC affairs of the Department of the Army, testifying before the House Committee on Appropriations.

General Westover also said, on that same occasion, April 5, 1948:

Although there are now on file in the Department of the Army 280 applications for junior units, it has not been practicable to establish any new ones in the continental United States since before the war.

I have been unable to determine how many high schools have applied for junior ROTC units since, whose requests have not yet been granted.

I have been unable to obtain from the Army or Navy figures as to the number of applications now on hand or rejected from colleges who wish to set up senior ROTC units including basic and advanced training. Some indication of the current situation is probably indicated in the information I have from the Air Forces in a letter dated June 13, 1951, which indicates that they recently rejected 388 requests for college Air Force ROTC units. They approved only 62 units out of a total of 450 colleges apply-

ing which brings their total up to 187 units at this time.

This, then is how the Department of Defense, which itself spent over \$275,000,000 not including the Army service schools or the Central Intelligence Agency schools, fails to cooperate with existing educational institutions to fit a reserve training program into the traditional American pattern of life.

I might note, in passing, that it costs the Army \$690 a year to train an advanced ROTC student, \$65 a year to train a basic ROTC student, \$10.74 a year to train a junior ROTC student and 90 cents a year to train a student in a type C unit organized under the National Defense Act. I am indebted to the staff of the Committee on Labor and Education for these figures.

The membership of this House is well aware of the shameful treatment accorded the Reserve components since the end of World War II. Some of the staunchest advocates of the Commission's UMT plan have stood here in the well and decried, rightly and courageously, again and again, the short-sighted policies of the Pentagon which have virtually sabotaged the effectiveness of the volunteer Reserve program.

In fact, the record clearly shows that the Pentagon has not been sincerely concerned, since the end of World War II, with the Reserve program. In January 1951, Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, was testifying before the House Committee on Armed Services. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] asked:

What has the Department—

Of Defense—

done and is doing now to help the Reserves?

General Evans answered:

Very little. All I am urging and begging and what I have been doing for 3 years is to have somebody do something with what we have now.

The record shows that the Reserve and National Guard were continually being cut back and hampered. An instance is the forced reduction of the National Guard, ordered in January 1950, to take effect by February 15, 1950, from a total strength of 356,515 officers and men to 350,000 officers and men.

In January 1951, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEMENTE] pointed out to the Committee on Armed Services that in October 1949, the number of Organized Reserve units was cut, by Pentagon directive, from 18,000 to 9,000. The Pentagon's position on Reserves was summed up last year by Col. A. B. McMullen, executive director of the Air Reserve Association, when he told the House Armed Services Committee:

The lack of continuity in Reserve policies and programs that has been demonstrated over the past 5 years would indicate that there is some serious question in the minds of some highly placed National Defense Establishment personnel and high-ranking officers of the Regular Establishments, as to the desirability or necessity of maintaining Reserve or civilian-component organization.

To summarize for just a moment, up to this point we have found that the only

reason anyone wants UMT is in order to provide a reservoir of nonveteran reservists. I certainly agree with that objective even if I must disagree as to the means. We find also that the Pentagon has, directly and indirectly discouraged the growth of high school ROTC, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserve program ever since the end of World War II. Why?

I think that question is best answered by reading you a short colloquy that took place while General Evans, of the Reserve Officers Association, was testifying before the Armed Services Committee on April 1, 1948:

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] asked:

General, then you would say that our present defense situation—or rather, lack of defense—has been brought on by the failure to develop the Reserves?

General Evans' reply was, "Yes."

A little later, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] asked General Evans:

In other words, as you interpret the attitude, they felt they need not build up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard because they were going to get UMT or the draft?

I have heard that statement made—

Said General Evans.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] also questioned General Evans on April 1, 1948, asking him:

My contention, General, is that if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves, having made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to build them up, we would not have this legislation here.

General Evans:

I agree with you completely.

The gentleman from Missouri, then chairman of the Armed Services Committee, asked:

There would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else.

General Evans replied:

I agree with you entirely.

In the light of this evidence, and my own experience as a Reserve officer during this period, I cannot help but be reminded of the now famous statement by Owen J. Lattimore:

The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not to let it look as if we pushed it.

Substitute the words "voluntary reserve program" for the words "South Korea" and you have the Pentagon's postwar attitude. History may prove that it is as dangerous and as costly to the defense effort.

Why then, does the Pentagon insist on this exact plan of UMT? Could it be because they want to build an empire of training commands, training establishments, and trainers? Could it be because they want to reach into the life of every young man in America, to mold his thinking and determine the educational courses he would be allowed to take?

Earlier this afternoon, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], a distinguished colleague and fellow Reserve

officer who favors H. R. 5904, said several times that he was going to discuss the plan and then, like so many advocates of this nebulous proposal, he discussed mostly foreign affairs and military tactics. I would like to tell you why I must oppose this plan and in doing so I will deal specifically with the provisions of the Commission's report to the Congress.

I oppose the plan implemented by H. R. 5904 because it goes far beyond the basic training authorized in Public Law 51 of the Eighty-second Congress. True, you will not find anything in the 35 pages of this bill, which defines exactly what training will be given our young men. That is left to the discretion of the training agencies. The bill in that respect is a blank check. However, if we assume that the pamphlet, Universal Military Training—Foundation of Enduring National Strength, represents the considered judgment of the Commission, we must also assume that the prescribed course of instruction will include training on many advanced subjects, most of which would be better taught in civilian educational institutions. We must also assume that, although Congress specifically provided that "the training carried out under the provisions of this act shall be of a military nature," the Commission intends to include in the curriculum such subjects as sex education, marriage and family life, religion, moral principles, and citizenship. These subjects are certainly more appropriate for instruction in the church, high school, or home.

The principal objections to the Commission plan for UMT, which is before us in the form of H. R. 5904, may be easily summarized.

The first objection is that 6 months is an unwieldy amount of time to take out of the average young man's life at 18. If he intends to continue his education, it means virtually the loss of an entire academic year. For the young man on the farm, it is almost impossible to pick 6 consecutive months in the year when he can be spared without affecting seriously the production of the farm. The young man who goes directly into industry will take his place in line, 6 months behind those of his contemporaries who did not receive military training and under the UMT plan of the Commission only 75 percent of the young men who graduate in any given year will be taken into UMT at once.

The second objection is that 18-year-old men, on the average, are undergoing physical and psychological changes from adolescence to adulthood. Removal from the security and restraining influences of their home, church, and community to a military camp can hardly be expected to have a beneficial effect on their morals and emotional well-being.

It is all right to pooh-pooh this argument, but right now a 19-year-old marine from my own district is under detention in Japan. He, without provocation and for reasons apparently unexplained, assaulted and killed a Japanese reserve policeman and wounded two Japanese civilians. When you say there is no emotional strain, when you say military training away from home does not in any way affect young men, you

simply are not stating facts that are known, facts that are supported by recognized psychiatrists and proven by the number of young men who crack up emotionally and have to be released from the Military Establishments month after month.

The third objection is to the tremendous cost. The first year of full implementation of the Commission plan is estimated to cost more than \$4,000,000,000, and succeeding years to cost more than \$2,000,000,000. On an individual basis, training one man under UMT for 6 months would cost \$289.76 more than it now costs to maintain one man for an entire year in the Regular Military Establishments, according to an estimate furnished the Honorable Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL and included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 5, 1951. Even after the first year the total annual cost of UMT would more than pay for the college education of all the students now in college, over three times the number there would be in UMT.

The fourth objection is to the Pentagon's insatiable craving for personnel "empire building." It is estimated by the Commission that there would be one trainer, including supply personnel, for each two men actually receiving training. This 1-for-2 ratio may be contrasted with the 1 instructor for each 12 students which is customary in colleges and universities. Does the military now have so much excess manpower on active duty that they can afford to absorb this "empire" as the distinguished chairman suggests? As a member of the Bonner subcommittee, I have just returned from a study trip around the world studying the Armed Forces waste, extravagance, and duplication in both supplies and personnel. I want no more opportunities offered them.

The fifth objection is to the acquisition of so much more real estate than was necessary during World War II, when the peak strength of United States Armed Forces was some 12,364,000. The Army, Navy, and Air Force propose to spend \$1,699,567,000 for the acquisition and construction of real property in connection with the UMT on top of the nearly \$5,000,000,000 appropriated this year by Congress for construction.

The sixth objection is to the scope of the training program, as revealed by the various services' plans for implementation of H. R. 5904. Public Law 51 specifically calls for only basic military training, but the tentative training schedules include many highly technical subjects, which could be better taught under civilian supervision and many controversial subjects better taught in home or church if we would avoid militaristic indoctrination of our youth.

The seventh and last major objection to the Commission's plan for UMT is to the proposal that the Commission have the authority to select the men who will receive medical, dental, and scientific training. Since men picked for this training would owe their first allegiance to the military, and presumably the military would select those best fitted for this type of work, this means the civilian

need for doctors, dentists, and scientists would be met by men who had been discarded as not fitted, and who had been further handicapped by not receiving the same training.

Thus far, I have attempted to show why there is a need for a program to provide nonveteran reservists because the Pentagon has deliberately sabotaged the historic American Volunteer Reserve program. I have shown you why the Pentagon's cunningly conceived scheme for UMT is unsatisfactory. Why, in my studied opinion the good features outweigh the bad.

However, in my opinion, Congress still has a grave responsibility which cannot be shirked; a responsibility to provide some means whereby this country may be defended and a vital part of that defense is and must be, a strong, ready, well-trained Reserve and National Guard. I do not believe we can trust the Pentagon to shoulder this responsibility in view of its past performance in Reserve matters. I believe that it is both practical and possible for Congress to evolve a compulsory type of training program which will, as the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] said yesterday, "coordinate the military with education institutions" and, utilizing the workable, tested Reserve program come out with an adequate training plan which will meet all of the objections I have listed.

This plan which suggests a logical extension of high school ROTC was evolved in an attempt to answer the question: If it is possible to produce a good second lieutenant in 4 years of college ROTC and a 6-week summer camp, why is it not equally practical to produce a well-trained private as a result of intensified military training in high school for 2 years, followed by a 6-week summer training period?

On Tuesday, under the 5-minute rule, I plan to introduce this high school ROTC plan as a substitute amendment. In order that Members of this body may have a prior opportunity to examine the legislation implementing this plan in detail, I have introduced it as H. R. 6765. Several Members have made very helpful suggestions in regard to this plan and I will today introduce another bill which will contain very minor modifications in response to their suggestions.

My presentation of this plan before the House Armed Services Committee will be found on page 2957 of the hearings, and a statement outlining the plan appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, January 30, 1952, starting on page A539. I intend to ask unanimous consent of the House, later this afternoon, to include several letters from representatives from nationally recognized organizations who have commented favorably on this type of military training, in the body of the RECORD immediately following these remarks. I pay a special tribute to the Catholic War Veterans, who, over a year ago, suggested a modified high-school ROTC plan which is very similar to this as evidenced by their testimony before the Armed Services Committee reprinted in the booklet they mailed to all Members of

Congress. I also acknowledge the support of Jack Kyle, chairman of the national legislative committee of the Philippine-Pacific War Veterans.

Under this citizens military-training plan the suggested course consists of 2 years of basic military training during the last 2 years of high school for virtually every young man in the country, plus 6 weeks at a summer camp for the physically qualified who would receive field training in the branch of service which he either elected or was assigned to. The ROTC-type portion included in the high-school phase would consist of classroom, gymnasium or drill hall, and field instruction.

The high-school instruction would include basic training as it was understood in the military prior to this concentrated sales drive on UMT. It would involve unified instruction, common to all services, including courses on orientation, military courtesy, customs and rules of conduct, hygiene and first aid, leadership drill and exercise of command, physical-development methods, weapons, marksmanship, map, chart, and aerial-photograph reading, supply discipline, organization and functions of the various branches of the Armed Forces, care and maintenance of equipment, and the military policy of the United States.

Men who drop out of school prior to completion of training would have several alternative methods of securing an equivalent military education. They may continue to attend the high-school military courses; they may enter a Ready Reserve or National Guard unit in their home community as a trainee; or they may substitute attendance at three, instead of one, 6-week summer camps.

It should be noted that it is entirely possible and practicable to operate this system of military training concurrently with the operation of the draft. This system would supplement, not supplant, the existing machinery, and thus could be instituted without creating the discrimination inherent in the proposed schemes to select some men for 24 months' service as draftees and other men for 6 months' service as universal military trainees.

The Committee on Armed Services has raised certain objections to this plan in their report. I will answer those objections Tuesday as I offer the substitute amendment to the committee.

As long as there is still a choice between an American way to secure non-veteran reservists and the administration's European Asiatic plan of UMT, I say, let us face our responsibility for national defense squarely, and, this time, let us buy the American way.

Grateful as I am to the American Legion and as much as I respect their gallant fight in behalf of the veteran, I cannot support this particular administration UMT plan. I am worried because it contains no termination date. I am alarmed by the statement on page 26 of the Commission's report, "We find ourselves in agreement with the military departments that these standards—physical and mental—are low, and we

recommend against any further reduction so long as UMT is either principally or exclusively a military program." Please examine that last phrase—"either principally or exclusively a military program." What else might it develop into? Forced draft of labor? Compulsory Government political indoctrination? That revealing phrase certainly warns me that someone behind this program sees its ultimate extension into fields other than military training.

INDEPENDENCE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Independence, Mo., February 16, 1952.
Hon. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNSON: It has come to my attention that you are sponsoring legislation which would, in effect, make ROTC training compulsory at the high-school level.

That is one of the best proposals to come from a Congressman in a long while. We have had a ROTC department in our senior high school since 1937. In my opinion, it is a valuable training program and the townspeople seem to agree.

Every high-school boy in the country could have such a program made available since we now have transportation facilities which would permit small high schools to transport their boys to a central training site. I believe a boy with 2 years of high-school ROTC training and an intensive summer training would be trained as well as the average private in the Army today.

This plan of high-school ROTC training for practically all boys would have these distinct advantages:

1. The boys could stay at home while they were trained.
2. The normal secondary educational program would go on as usual.
3. The plan would be within the scope of our economic ability. It would be much, much less expensive than UMT.
4. They would be trained about 2 years younger and at a more formative stage of their development. Therefore, the training probably would be more effective and lasting.

In order for your plan to be accepted by public-school administrators, it will be necessary for them to be convinced that the Army will not come in roughshod and try to dictate all that happens around school. The ROTC personnel will have to consist of men who can work with school officials on a cooperative basis. Our experience with ROTC officers has been very pleasant and satisfactory.

I hope you continue your efforts in support of a high-school ROTC training program.

Yours very sincerely,
L. G. KEITH.

OFFICE OF THE
ROTC LIAISON OFFICER,
TEXAS STATE GUARD RESERVE CORPS,
Dallas, Tex., February 2, 1952.
Hon. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was certainly pleased to read in the Denver Post of January 30, 1952, a report about your testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, wherein you proposed that compulsory high school ROTC training be instituted in lieu of the costly plan for universal military training. This is exactly my thinking on this subject, and I am certainly glad to learn that you are coming out for this program.

I have done a great deal of work with the junior and senior ROTC organizations here in Texas the last 3 years, and honestly feel that the junior program should be greatly

expanded. It is the best medium for the avoidance of juvenile delinquency and the best counteraction against the infiltration of communism among our high school age children. In fact, I cannot see how anyone with an ounce of common sense can fail to see the justification of every boy in high school taking this military training.

I have had several requests from high schools and junior colleges here in Texas to help them secure military training in their respective schools. However, the present policy, because of lack of funds appropriated by Congress, is to discourage the installation of any new junior ROTC units. I think this is absolutely a mistake and, while the senior units are very vital and necessary, greater emphasis should be placed upon the work in the high schools of our Nation. I have been up to Colorado recently and visited with the junior groups up there, and they need more support from parents, civic leaders, as well as from Congress.

If it would be at all possible to have copies of the testimony which has been and is being heard at the open hearings of the Armed Services Committee of the House, I certainly would like to have same. It would give me the information about who in the United States is interested in this subject, and perhaps we can stir up enough interest back home to let our Representatives in Congress know what the wishes of the people are in this regard.

I would certainly be glad to hear from you on this subject, and with best wishes, beg to remain

Sincerely yours,

JAMES B. BURLISON,
Major, Infantry TSGR,
ROTC Liaison Officer.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF ST. JOSEPH,
St. Joseph, Mo., February 18, 1952.
Representative CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note in the Educator's Washington dispatch a statement has been made that if the UMT bill fails you may present an alternate plan for extension of the high school ROTC services.

We have had ROTC in St. Joseph for many years. I have been favorably impressed with this program. As a matter of fact, during World War II a great many of our high school trained young men rapidly rose in the ranks to become lieutenants, captains, majors, and colonels. Some are still in the service in important military positions.

The plan as it now operates was apparently not designed for smaller schools. In considering an extension of the services to smaller areas, it occurred to me that perhaps a central headquarters could be maintained in a city similar to ours and other smaller communities would be serviced from the headquarters area. In our own area, for example, within a radius of 60 miles, I find there are approximately 7,000 students enrolled in the various high schools. We may assume that about one-half are boys. There are 19 high school districts. Some of the schools would be rather small, but perhaps as many as 60 to 75 could be enrolled at least in a compulsory program.

Although the present ROTC plans are on a voluntary basis, we have enjoyed an excellent enrollment over the many years. Our enrollment before World War II was twice as large as it is now. With so many competing units recruiting high school boys, it certainly speaks well of the present ROTC program to have as many in the program. If our own city were designated, for example, as a headquarters area, perhaps a sergeant could be assigned to a high school or two in the smaller schools. The officers could travel about like the circuit preacher in days gone by. The cost would be reduced con-

siderably if such a plan were followed. I am convinced that more than just a well-trained private would come out of the high school program.

Sincerely,

G. L. BLACKWELL,
Superintendent of Schools.

(Deleted for protection of
officer on active duty),
January 31, 1952.

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
Member of Congress, Indiana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNSON: I am writing you relative to your proposed plan to bring universal military training to the high schools.

The idea closely parallels one which I have held for a great many years and I would appreciate it very much if you would give me what detailed information you might have readily available.

The general idea seems to be so sensible and logical that it is amazing that the Department of Defense has apparently not fully explored its possibilities.

Only one of the many advantages which seem apparent is that so many of the subjects which would be a necessary part of the UMT training could be profitably and painlessly included in the regular high-school curricula. For instance, lessons in citizenship, geopolitics, motor-vehicle operation and maintenance, communications, map reading could all be fitted into the normal high-school course. Computation of coordinates, artillery survey, etc., could be used as a practical means of arousing the youngster's interest in math.

Another great advantage it seems to me would be in providing physical checks and medical and dental attention—something which selective service figures indicate is badly needed. The AMA probably wouldn't object to this feature as the teen agers are not currently a profitable source of revenue.

The plan would eliminate the necessity for taking youngsters away from their homes at an impressionable age. It would be much more economical than the present Department of Army plan since it would eliminate camp overhead.

I am sure that you will realize that I am not writing you officially in my present capacity as executive of the (deleted) military district. The above are my personal views and I am immensely interested in this project.

Sincerely,

(Name deleted).
Colonel, Executive (deleted) Military
District.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY
SCIENCE AND TACTICS,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1952.
Representative CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to express my appreciation of the plan for compulsory high-school ROTC, under your sponsorship, which the Associated Press reported on January 30. Not only would this plan be a palatable substitute for universal military training, but it would permit substantial savings in manpower, travel, camp operation, subsistence, clothing, pay, and trainee time, and particularly would not cause an interruption to the school life of the youths involved.

Both morale and morals would be protected, inasmuch as most of the training would be accomplished in the student's home community.

Please observe that two other possibilities may deserve consideration: (1) Toward the

end of effecting further savings and making the program more acceptable to educational groups, training could be provided by Reserve officers who are members of the school faculties, as is done here in the District, except, of course, that these persons should be on active-duty status; and (2) with the program in the schools, girls could be trained toward the end of having personnel available to perform civil defense duties or to augment the Armed Forces in a national emergency.

Your attention is respectfully invited to the program we are conducting in the public schools here under the provisions of paragraph 55c of the National Defense Act of 1920. We offer the 2,000 cadets in our division a 3-year course which—with minor modification, more equipment, and a summer camp—would more than equal Army basic training and MOS training for such common specialties as rifleman, driver, and clerk.

Perhaps this existing program could be expanded under congressional authority to provide an experimental situation by which results could be compared with the Army's UMT experiment, and which, if successful, could serve as a pilot model.

Certainly your proposal has considerable merit and offers an economical and permanent solution for our major military problem.

Respectfully,

BENJAMIN L. HUNTON,
Major, Infantry, United States Army
Reserve, Head of Department.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN
PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS, INC.,
February 5, 1952.

The Honorable CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
United States Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWNSON: We are very pleased to learn from your letter of January 31, 1952 that you are opposed to the universal military training bill. Also, we appreciate very much your interest in calling your alternate plan to our consideration.

Although I cannot speak officially because the alternate plan has not been considered by our delegates, I can assure you, personally, that your proposal is far superior to the present UMT bill.

Our delegates meet in Chicago on April 18 and 19, 1952, and I will present your proposal for their consideration at that time, that is, if the final decision on UMT hasn't been made before that date.

Thank you again for your consideration and you have our best wishes for success in your efforts to protect this country from being taken into an era of militarism.

Sincerely,

DENTON KERR, M. D.,
President.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER].

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this universal military training bill, because it is wrong in principle and impractical. It has been well established both in hearings before the Armed Services Committee and on the floor of the House that it would serve no helpful purpose in bringing to an end the present Korean war, but it would detract from this effort because of the thousands of military men that would of necessity be assigned to conduct the training.

Universal military training has an unhappy history; it has neither prevented war, nor has it guaranteed victory for those nations that have practiced it. The plan is diametrically in opposition

to our American tradition of freedom-plus-patriotism. It induces a war psychology and conditions the minds of its impressionable young trainees to expect war and its brutalization and killing as a matter of course.

The American people have always been opposed to such training, and rightly so, because this country was settled by people escaping from the evils of militarism and conscription in Europe. They have always feared the rise of militarism and opposed the economic expenditure militarism entails.

We might well ask ourselves what this training is for. Naturally, we should all be interested in adequate training of our soldiers and the best equipment that can be obtained, but wherein will training under this bill be better than the training given today under the selective-service system. Universal military training does not even contemplate specialized training. Does anyone believe that a boy of 18 who receives 6 months training will be prepared for combat duty in a year or as long as 7½ years after he has completed his training. Even military leaders who generally favor such program admit that retraining would be necessary when and if recalled for active service. No war has ever been won by prewar training. Wars are won by death-dealing equipment. Germany, with the most elaborate training system in history, has lost two wars to countries without such training. It is true that she swept all before her with superior equipment until that equipment ran short.

Universal military training would not only be of little value, it would be detrimental to our security. The Russians have been outbuilding us in planes and as pointed out by more than one military expert, Russia could today destroy every city in Europe without sending a foot soldier outside of Russia. The Communist forces fighting us in Korea have many more planes there than we have. What we need is more planes and more ships and more bombs. There is need for more steel and more aluminum and more machine tools. Back of this is the need for more skilled mechanics and technically trained men, more engineers and scientists. Our hope of winning the next war is in our industrial centers. We need up-to-the-minute training in aviation flying and engineering.

If we have another world war in the near future, universal military training will not have had any effect. If we have no such war for 10 years, we will have taken 8,000,000 young men away from productive labor, from important training as mechanics, from vitally necessary training for engineering and science. This is equivalent to a full year's work for 4,000,000 men. At the end of that period what will we have? Probably 60 percent of the 8,000,000 men will be in essential civilian production; another 10 percent will be physically unfit, and another 5 percent will have family responsibilities that will exempt them. Of the remaining 2,000,000, about 1,000,000 will have had training 5 years back. And this tremendous waste of manpower will have cost somewhere from \$30,000,000,000 to \$40,000,000,000.

As an instrument of national policy, UMT is ill-designed to achieve any of the military or educational objectives it is supposed to achieve. From a military point of view, it is increasingly meaningless in a day of mechanization and specialization. From an educational point of view, our homes, churches, schools, and colleges are better equipped than the Armed Forces to help our young men to develop into worthy American citizens.

To those who cite the father of our country as one who would favor such program, I quote in part from George Washington's Farewell Address, in which he said:

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith—here let us stop. Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed 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. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FORRESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

TODAY'S CHALLENGE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am pleased to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Mr. William M. Allen, president of the Boeing Airplane Co., of Seattle, Wash.

Bill Allen heads one of the great industrial organizations in the country, and does it exceedingly well. He is also one of Montana State University's most distinguished graduates, and we of Montana are proud of the success he has achieved.

It was a distinct honor to the student body of Montana State University to have the privilege of hearing the address, Today's Challenge, at its annual

Charter Day ceremony on February 15, 1952.

I commend the speech to my colleagues and urge that they give careful consideration to the fine American message it contains.

The speech follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE

(By William M. Allen)

The fact that I am here to talk to you today is either a testimonial to the mellowing effect of the passage of time or to the extreme tolerance of the head of your programs committee. Professor Freeman was a member of the faculty when I was a student here 30 years ago. As a professor of mine, I know that he was quite familiar with my enthusiasm for the adage that "all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy." In fact, unless my memory fails me, I believe that he inquired on one occasion (and I should add, with some sarcasm) as to whether I was getting on well with my extracurricular activities. In any event, when the good professor invited me to come over for charter day, I was not only highly complimented but most grateful for his tolerance which was aided, I am sure, by the healing effect of the passage of 30 years.

I think that I should also add that these many years that have gone by since I was a student have not dimmed my memory to the point where I have forgotten my lack of interest as a student in charter day addresses, or in any other address for that matter. I don't recall whether or not they had such a thing as a charter day talk in my day. If they did have, you can be sure that I never attended one. I say this so that the students who are here today will realize that I view your presence with a feeling of mixed appreciation and wonderment.

As you will readily understand, it is a great pleasure for me to return to our university. Although quite naturally there have been changes, nevertheless some of the people and many of the landmarks, both so dear to our hearts, still remain. I am sure as each of you return here in later years that you will find it a moving experience. I know that I always do.

I have often thought as I looked back upon my 4 years here that it was too bad that I didn't take college more seriously. However, I know that whatever your attitude toward college may be, all of you will find as you move on in life and look back upon your college years that the impact upon yourself of the time that you spend here will have been very great indeed. It is, of course, a most important period in one's life. I wish that I could have the pleasure of doing it all over again and, although I hope that I would do it somewhat differently, I must admit that when I really got down to cases I'm not so sure that I would.

So, having pretty well disqualified myself as a person to be advising college students on how they should live their college lives, I now propose to do that very thing—at least talk a little bit about the value of a college education as related to the American way of life.

The other day I was conversing with a young lad who is about to finish his senior year in high school and whose family has afforded him every inducement to continue his education. "I suppose you are planning to go on to college," I said.

"No, I don't think so," he replied. "I can make a good living driving a truck and not have to worry about any responsibilities. Why should I spend 4 years going to college?"

This hit me right in the middle of something or other. I had always thought that a position with responsibility was looked upon as something that people—at least Americans—should aspire to. Has something happened to our American incentives? What has become of the Yankee adage about build-

ing a better mouse trap and the world will beat a path to your door?

Have our incentives changed? Are we living in a society in which it is no longer desirable to aspire to positions of greater responsibility? Have the benefits which normally flow from a college education disappeared? Let's talk a little bit about these questions.

Of course there has been a change in incentives—at least in the degree of their importance. The most obvious change is in the opportunity for material reward. When I was in college certainly the best recognized incentive, if not inherently the most important, was that of money. I think that most boys went to college in those days for the principal reason of improving their earning potential. However, the old days when you got what you earned and when high income was a goal in itself are gone. The graduated income tax has sliced thinner and thinner the advantage of going to the next higher salary bracket, and the higher you go the more this is true. While money is still one of the principal incentives attracting a man to work for a bigger job, it has certainly lost ground. A high figure begins to lose its appeal when you don't get your hands on the dollar it represents.

Now if the old American incentive of working hard and making money doesn't pack quite the appeal that it used to, is it nevertheless still worth while to improve ourselves and aspire to a greater than average position of responsibility in this world of ours? We are living in a country that has built a tower of strength and prosperity on the principle of private enterprise and hard work because of the incentives that have existed. Our system has stood before the world as living proof that it is possible for one-fifteenth of the world's people, possessing one-fifteenth of the world's land and resources, to account for one-half of the world's industrial production. We have lived in an expanding economy and we know that our future lies in a continuing expanding economy. We are even to the point where we desire to help show the rest of the world how it too can expand its economy and raise standards of living by the same process. And then we find one of the main props being knocked out from under the system and we hear our youths saying: "Why should I go to college? Why should I work hard and carry greater responsibilities when I can drive a truck at \$400 a month?"

I am sure that you will agree that there are many other incentives besides the material one. We need to consider them and call attention to them. One major form of reward which we all recognize is simply the satisfaction of accomplishment. Another aspiration worth working and studying for is to reach a position with freedom and opportunity to go ahead so that you don't feel "at the end of the road." There is also satisfaction in gaining the ability and a position which gives you an opportunity to contribute leadership where it is needed. Still another incentive is the desire that each of us has to build a good name to be thought well of, and in some degree to be an inspiration to others. These are all incentives—goals worth working for.

A famous British mountain climber and explorer, who for years endeavored to climb Mt. Everest and finally lost his life near the summit of that unconquered mountain, was once asked, "Why do you want to climb Mt. Everest?" His answer was a simple one, "Because it is there." To a mountain climber, the highest mountain stands as a challenge to his skill and ingenuity. I think it is the same kind of an incentive that makes us want to meet the challenges we have in business and in society. We have our Mt. Everests all over the place and we are conquering, or endeavoring to conquer, them one by one. Those who are meeting these

challenges are exhilarated by the experience. The engineer who directs the wing design of a new swept wing bomber feels the glow of satisfaction for worthwhile effort when that wing proves a success. The college graduate may look forward to this certainty—that the reward of satisfaction for a job well done increases arithmetically with the difficulty and the importance of the job. You cannot be as happy pasting labels on bundles of wire, even though you do the job perfectly, as you would be working with associates in finding the solution to a knotty problem which, when solved, will make a contribution to the defense of your country or to the community in which you live. There is a great satisfaction to be gained in working on something worthwhile. A man now striking out upon a career, with a college degree in hand and with an urge to go ahead, can reap the rewards of this kind of satisfaction today just as he could have 25, 50, or 100 years ago. More so, because the jobs which must be tackled today are larger.

I mentioned freedom and opportunity. The desire to get into a position where you are free to think and act boldly, where you have the opportunity to venture along new paths, is or should be an incentive in itself. Although we abhor the idea of serfdom in this country, we do have regimentation of various sorts—regimentation in jobs, regimentation in unions, to mention a few examples. The farther a man can rise above his fellow men in position, the freer he stands. This is a basic incentive. One of the opportunities that comes to the man who works himself free of the general tide is the opportunity to contribute leadership, to help and inspire others. This is true not only within the affairs of a company or organization, but in various phases of community or national life. Many companies encourage their employees to take civic responsibility. Most companies now realize that not only do their firms have certain civic responsibilities, but that the men participating in such activities are broadened and benefited thereby. The company builds better men while building good will, and the individual gains the satisfaction of participating in things of consequence. Who gains these opportunities? Is it not the man who works to get ahead and who thus becomes available for other jobs of leadership?

This leads me to refer to another non-monetary incentive. King Solomon recognized it 3,000 years ago when he penned the proverb, "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches." Position and prestige are in themselves an incentive. But the proverb goes beyond this and emphasizes a good name as a goal worth striving for. Not just popularity, but being able to inspire the confidence and good will of others; being known for doing a good job and accomplishing things worth while.

Now this is beginning to sound like a sermon, and I can imagine more than one of you nudging your companion and saying, "Sounds like the old boy really believes in the American way of life." Well, I do most fervently. It has been dented a bit during the last decade or so, but the underlying soundness of our free enterprise system is as worthy of our support today as it has always been. I like to quote a statement which the House of Morgan made several years ago:

"In this country the great issue is whether we shall fall into the ways of those who expect to obtain better living for less effort and less enterprise."

You will recall that Walt Disney presented the issue in music when he had the grasshopper sing, "Oh, the world owes me a living."

It is my good fortune to be in a business where the importance of incentives provided by our way of life are constantly evident. The aircraft-manufacturing industry is highly competitive. Except in times of

national emergency, there is never enough business to keep the industry going, and with the concepts of design and manufacture changing as rapidly as they have and are, it is obvious that a great premium is placed upon ingenuity, plus the ability to put new ideas into effect. I see in operation each day the healthy result that flows from competition between business adversaries where the margin of superiority in any given direction is not great. My chief engineer once expressed it in this way, "We never do as good a job as when we realize that our best may not be good enough." It is that very thing that has made our country great. If it is to remain great, that spirit of competition—the existence of a premium upon ability and enterprise—must be preserved. There must be plenty of incentive for the good old American drive of honest effort and hard work, and incentive for ingenuity as well. We have in our company an invention-incentive plan under which employees and the company share royalties from patentable ideas developed at work. We also have a suggestion system whereby employees making suggestions of nonpatentable ideas share in any savings the company is able to make from such suggestions. The suggestions made by Seattle division employees during 1951 resulted in savings to the company of approximately half a million dollars. The "better mouse trap" adage is a long way from worn out.

Theodore Roosevelt, at the break of this century, said, "I wish to preach not the doctrine of ignoble ease but the doctrine of the strenuous life." The editors of *Fortune* magazine recently commented as follows:

"The strenuous life is an American characteristic. It derives, on the one hand, from the practical necessities of a virginal continent on which there was much work to do. But it derives, on the other hand, from an ideal: The ideal of the perfectibility of man, of human improvement. Where this ideal came from is a matter for scholars to debate; but it has in any case been accepted in one form or another by Americans from the very beginning. It has given rise to many American faults, such as overoptimism and a superficial concept of progress. But above all, it has kept Americans working, risking, venturing, striving; it has sparked the strenuous life."

Suppose we return for a moment to the lad who did not care for responsibility—who was content to drive a truck—and please don't misunderstand me, I have nothing against truck drivers. They render a very necessary service. But where would we be as a Nation if our youth generally adopted such an attitude? Thus far, I have mentioned only the individual consequences of such a viewpoint, but let's look beyond the individual and consider our position as a Nation if our young citizens generally approached maturity with such a philosophy and proceeded to follow it throughout their lives.

I need hardly remind you that the American way of life, which places first the rights and freedom of the individual, is today engaged in a struggle for its existence with a rival way of life which places the state first and is not concerned with the rights and freedoms of the individual excepting, of course, those few individuals who control the state. The outcome of this struggle is dependent, in my opinion, in large measure, if not entirely, on the industrial strength of our Nation and the moral strength of our people. If, in this struggle, we reach outright war on an all-out basis, we cannot hope to match our enemy man for man. If we are to win, it must be through superior weapons which, in turn, stem from the ingenuity of our people and the economic strength of our Nation. And in this regard, let us not permit ourselves to discount the enemy. Korea has demonstrated that if we

are to be prepared, with superior weapons, to meet a full-scale aggression, we must devote a very great amount of effort and our best engineering and design brains to the task. Will we achieve this result if the youth of today are content to occupy positions of mediocrity? Will we survive in this struggle if our Nation consists of people who avoid rather than seek responsibility? Certainly not. Our very survival is dependent upon an adherence by the great bulk of our citizenry to the principles upon which this country was founded.

And, industrial might and ingenuity will not in themselves do the task. There must be a moral strength on the part of our people accompanying these other factors, for if we do not have this type of strength we will deteriorate from within. In my opinion, one of the greatest danger signals confronting us today is the lack of concern of the American people toward immorality in Government. The danger of destroying ourselves from within is perhaps as great as the danger of being destroyed from without.

May I say that I think these threats, whether from within or without, or both, should be to us the greatest incentive of all time to make our system of freedom work the better. We not only must prove ourselves stronger than the Communist states, but we must, through our conduct, let our light so shine that others will follow our example rather than the example of communism. To accomplish this will take the best efforts of each of us to improve our Government and our business and social relationships.

As a start in this direction, business management is spending much of its time these days in an effort to improve the people that constitute our industrial and business organizations. We are giving attention to the indoctrination of new employees. We are holding regular classroom-type discussions among foremen to demonstrate how they can help the men working for them to improve their abilities and, at the same time, produce a more efficient operation. We are arranging both on-the-job and off-the-job training opportunities for employees. We are making every effort to advance our employees through upgrading and to help deserving men to become good supervisors—members of management. All of these and many more that I could mention are indications of a solid trend of mutual interest between business organizations and their employees.

But we still have many unsolved problems. For example, the strikes that cripple industry, each one of which must be music to the ears of "Uncle Joe." I have also mentioned political immorality in government—and there is the prevalence of crime throughout the Nation—these are a few of the unconquered fields for free enterprise. In the hour of our greatest technical triumph, we stand in the midst of national and international confusion and apprehension. We stand challenged to demonstrate that our American free enterprise system with its incentives is the soundest basis for progress. And then we have the task of inspiring the peoples of other nations to follow this lead.

The scientists who are bringing about such phenomenal technical progress are the first to see the need for getting down to sound basic values in seeking the answers to our national and world problems. As president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Kirkley F. Mather, of Harvard, in answering criticism for the development of the atomic bomb, declared:

"It is war itself that is immoral—not the weapons used by the warriors." Said he, "If civilization is to be saved from catastrophe, the ethical consciousness of each person must

be greatly strengthened, renewed, and improved."

I have talked to you about incentives for educated men and women of today to put forth greater effort to achieve positions of responsibility and to surmount some of the obstacles that are "Mount Everests" in our way. I have talked principally about the nonmonetary incentives that exist because the material incentive has had some of its edges chipped away. Certainly, the basic American principles of enterprise and reward still exist. It is our tradition to tackle and solve our problems rather than to steer around them. There are more challenges and opportunities for free enterprise ahead of us than there ever have been in our history. We have said that the bigger the problem to be solved, the greater the satisfaction that comes from solving it. The incentive to reap this reward of satisfaction in accomplishing something worth while looms big today.

Recently I read an advertisement entitled "This Is the Hour for Greatness." In a few words, it summarized the thoughts that I have endeavored to express to you:

"There are times that require greatness in men. This is such a time. Greatness in this hour is not beyond the reach of any man, nor is it reserved for those who make the headlines in world affairs. Its fuller measure is the willingness and capacity to rise to the urgency of the times whatever the job may be. Men with these elements of greatness are shaping this country's destiny today."

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

SHALL WE SUPPORT PUERTO RICO AT THE EXPENSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the other body within the past 3 weeks, Democratic and Republican Members have questioned various phases of the Puerto Rican problem.

I have read with interest the remarks of the senior Member of the other body from New Hampshire on Tuesday last. He pointed out that the present policy of the administration of the government of Puerto Rico is to "lure industry away from the New England States and from the Southern States."

That "lure," Mr. Speaker, apparently is compounded of the sinister if subtle ingredients of tax exemption and low wages.

Tax exemption first, sweatshop wages next, financing subsidies after that and low transport-by-water rates on top of that. At the end of that pretty industrial story of probable profits comes a big question mark.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Members in the other body from Maryland, Maine, South Carolina, and New Hampshire have pointed out that something is wrong in Puerto Rico.

What is that something?

They have made no direct, no flagrant charges against Puerto Rico as such. But they have questioned the wisdom of our Government's encouragement through subsidy and Federal grants and the direct and indirect expenditure of the American taxpayer's money of a system which at best is suspect by the standards of our own economy.

In my district a majority of the people earn their living by the sweat of their brows. They are working people. For generations they have toiled in the coal mines.

My district, Mr. Speaker, is in the heart of the anthracite coal country. And my district today is one of the labor areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as "distressed," although I feel that the word "distressed" is an understatement of fact. Mine is a district, Mr. Speaker, which through no fault of its own has become an example of what happens when there is an industrial exodus—a district which today is deserving of every consideration by the Congress and by those of our executive branches of government who now are shaping the economic destinies of our great country.

That is the reason I rise to suggest that when the good working people of my own district contribute tax money to Puerto Rico they be assured that this money is for purposes other than the promotion of sweat-shop conditions, no taxes at all on the industries themselves, and the maintenance of high-pressure, sharp promotional practices on the part of the present Puerto Rican administration. By high-pressure practices, I submit as typical examples the Puerto Rican Industrial Development Administration's \$120,000 per year contract with a New York publicity company, and the tens of thousands of dollars it pays out to a so-called economic-planning concern in Boston.

Planning for what? Let us take a look.

Here I quote from the New York Times of January 3, 1950:

One million five hundred thousand dollars spent to promote rum.

Mr. Speaker, this expenditure may not be unusual for its purpose. I am advised that millions upon millions are expended annually in our own country for the promotion of one kind of rum or another. I do not take issue with the idea of promotion of rum, or of automobiles or soap or any other commodity.

American enterprise has been nurtured by promotion, and our standard of living has been raised by advertising and promotion and Yankee ingenuity.

I do take issue, however, with the methods and the regulations and the loosely interpreted laws that are supposed to pertain to Puerto Rico and I object to the irresponsible expenditure of American taxpayers' money by the administration of Puerto Rico and its myriad agencies.

Let me remind you here, Mr. Speaker, that as the junior Member of the other body from Maryland pointed out the other day, all of the tax revenues collected by our own Treasury Department from the sale of this Puerto Rican rum are given back to the Puerto Rican government. These monies are given back to be spent by the Puerto Ricans for whatsoever purpose they see fit and with no supervision whatsoever.

The junior Member of the other body from South Carolina has pointed out that in absolute defiance of a law passed

by Congress of the United States in 1947 there has been to this good hour no Federal coordinator assigned to Puerto Rico for the purpose of advising the Congress as to the expenditure of Federal grants and subsidies.

I do not wish at this time to examine the reasons, technical or otherwise, why this has not been done. Reasons pro and con have been read into the Record of this Congress.

But I do say, Mr. Speaker, that I personally am concerned about the disposition of the hard-earned dollars of my own people, my good friends—those to whom I must answer and to whom I must report on my stewardship and their tax dollars.

My constituents, Mr. Speaker, are glad to pay taxes when there is work to earn money. And when they do pay taxes they want their dollars spent to help them, not hurt them.

"Something is wrong in Puerto Rico." That, Mr. Speaker, has been the theme song in the remarks in the Congress of the United States these past weeks.

Is there fire where there is so much smoke? If so, Mr. Speaker, we should know about it through honest, open investigation as demanded by the Senators who have raised their voices on this issue.

Let us not condemn a people for a political and economic situation which may exist in spite of their apparent prerogatives to remedy it.

The ballot is only as good as its honest exercise and use.

We have too many examples the world over of the ballot's misuse and of its use by force and coercion to accomplish the aims of a dictator.

Charges have been hurled that we, the people of the United States, are fostering and supporting a dictatorship on our own doorstep, Puerto Rico. If this be true, we should know it now.

We are spending millions, Mr. Speaker—nay, billions—for the encouragement of democracy abroad, and for the extermination of dictatorship. Can we do less than examine our own political and economic responsibilities when it comes to such suggestions as to the conduct of Puerto Rico's affairs?

I speak today for the taxpayers of my own district. There are no more patriotic citizens in this great country. They pay taxes, they will continue to do so, but as their Representative in this Congress I insist today and shall continue to insist that they get their money's worth, whether their tax dollar's allocation is for Puerto Rico, or for battleships, or for airplanes, or what have you.

Word has come to me that in another district in my State there is great distress because of the threat of removal of one of its principal industries to Puerto Rico, where there will be no taxes, where the labor will be cheap, and where the industry will enjoy these extraordinary benefits at the expense of the very people left destitute by this economic piracy.

Mr. Speaker, that just does not make sense.

But it does mean that the American taxpayer is subsidizing Puerto Rico on the one hand and cutting his own throat with the other.

When and if this circumstance shall be visited upon my district, Mr. Speaker, I shall be heard from again.

Meanwhile, if this economic tendency and trend persists with respect to Puerto Rico, a tendency toward robbery of the workingman and taxpayer in the United States, I suggest that we as elected representatives of the people must reexamine our responsibilities to this island and be prepared to act positively when such grave issues arise that affect our mutual interests.

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. RAMSAY and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio in two instances, in one to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. BOLLING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and to include an article from the February 25 issue of the Fairpoint Daily Herald, Fairpoint, Ohio.

Mr. COLE of Kansas and to include a speech by the Honorable Alfred M. Landon.

Mr. McVEY and to include an editorial published in the South Pointer newspaper, Dolton, Ill.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include editorials and articles.

Mr. ARMSTRONG and to include resolutions adopted by a recent conference on psychological strategy.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a portion of a radio broadcast by Mr. Paul Harvey.

Mr. WEICHEL.

Mr. JAVITS and to include a series of articles from the New York World Telegram about the postal service, notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$231.

Mr. KEOGH in two instances.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. BROWNSON to include pertinent correspondence in connection with his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. AANDAHL.

Mr. KENNEDY.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 29, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

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. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2077. An

act to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1449). 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. COOLEY:

H. R. 6837. A bill to grant foster children dependency status for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 6838. A bill to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a net operating loss for a taxable year shall be a net operating loss carry-back for the five preceding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6839. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 6840. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6841. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment-compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 6842. A bill to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to encourage the making of loans at low rates of interest to veterans, and to the widows of veterans, who wish to purchase or construct homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 6843. A bill to establish quotas on the importation of certain articles and products containing raw materials with respect to which priorities have been established or allocations made under the Defense Production Act of 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 6844. A bill directing a survey, examination, and recommendation for flood control and drainage projects in the Ninth Congressional District of Michigan; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6845. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 6846. A bill to amend title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, with respect to the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to prescribe certain fees and charges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6847. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Celler:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; 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. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 6848. A bill for the relief of Sharon Elaine Frankovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 6849. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of William A. Burkett as a senior special agent, United States Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 6850. A bill for the relief of Martha Bridges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 6851. A bill for the relief of Salomon Salti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 6852. A bill for the relief of William H. Marnon, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 6853. A bill for the relief of David Hanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the supreme source of all wisdom and strength, we are again turning unto Thee in prayer, compelled by our needs.

In these tangled and confused times there are so many problems to solve and so much that is basically and shamefully wrong.

Show us which of our proposals for a strong and adequate national defense are most reasonable and equitable and practical and whether they are in accordance with Thy divine will.

May we have the courage to search and reach out for those ways and means that are righteous and just and for the welfare of all mankind and for Thy glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. 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 disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) entitled "An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KILGORE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

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

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. GARY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1450), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. CANFIELD reserved all points of order.

APPROPRIATION FOR MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION, 1952

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 396, making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, the following sum:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Motor Carrier Claims Commission," \$52,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall remain available until December 31, 1952, and the limitation on the amount available for personal services as set forth under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, is repealed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the chairman of my subcommittee whether it is his intention to state briefly the reason this bill is brought up now.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Mr. Speaker, this is an item that needs immediate consideration. The Commission has been without sufficient funds now for some 3 or 4 weeks. We have had before the committee a budget estimate of

\$70,000 and the committee, after careful consideration of it, removed some of the limitations that had heretofore been put on the Commission and we also reduced the estimate by \$18,000. The committee had hoped and wished and urged that this rather small Commission would wind up its affairs by June 30 of the present fiscal year, but by some mishap they have not been able to do so. However, they promised that they will make every effort and they, in conjunction with the Department of Justice, now tell us that it is their best judgment that they can wind up by the 31st of December, 1952.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The reason why the Commission has not been able to complete its work is because a test case was taken to the Supreme Court, and that was just recently filed.

Mr. THOMAS. That is one of the reasons, among others.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the reason given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think my chairman should call attention to the fact that this came out of the subcommittee and also out of the full committee with a unanimous vote in each instance.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Abbt	Dollinger	James
Allen, Ill.	Durham	Javits
Anfuso	Eberharter	Johnson
Armstrong	Ellsworth	Jonas
Bakewell	Fallon	Kearns
Bates, Ky.	Feighan	King, Calif.
Bender	Fine	Klein
Blatnik	Fugate	Lanham
Boykin	Fulton	Larcade
Bray	Garmatz	Latham
Buchanan	Gore	McCulloch
Buckley	Granahan	McGrath
Burton	Green	McIntire
Camp	Hall	Marshall
Case	Edwin Arthur	Martin, Mass.
Celler	Hall	Mason
Chatham	Leonard W.	Morgan
Chenoweth	Hardy	Morrison, La.
Chiferfield	Harrison, Nebr.	Multer
Chudoff	Hart	Murphy
Clemente	Hébert	Murray, Wis.
Combs	Heffernan	Nicholson
Cooley	Heller	O'Konski
Corbett	Herter	O'Neill
Coudert	Hess	Osmer
Cox	Hill	O'Toole
Dempsey	Hoffman, Ill.	Potter
Dingell	Jackson, Calif.	Powell