

about \$2,000,000,000 a year more than the House of Representatives thought was necessary. The total came to about \$20,000,000,000 in the period from 1940 to 1950. I suggested a program that I felt might have stopped such practices and effected economies.

I believe the proposal I termed a "grass roots economy program" would be helpful in our efforts to keep this Nation solvent and should be included in any long-range policy.

ALL THE ELEMENTS

I have not tried to give any full or detailed exposition of all the elements I believe are necessary for a rounded-out program for America. I have merely tried to indicate that America cannot embark on any sort of policy that does not provide for some cooperative effort on the part of all the phases of our civilization that combine to make the American way of life.

I do not believe we can remain strong merely by providing a great military force without regard to its effect upon our production or our economy. On the other hand, I do not believe we can keep strong by balancing our budget at the expense of the military. Neither do I think we can save our civil rights by allowing our defense secrets to be sold to the enemy. Nor do we protect our children by completely disrupting the family life of America.

The way to strength, in my opinion, lies in an over-all, united effort by all the people of America. No vital part in our strength must be either over-emphasized or underemphasized.

We must not be topheavy militarily or otherwise; we must not spend ourselves into destruction; we must not sell ourselves into bondage by throwing away our liberties; we must not deplete our productive effort; we must not destroy the American way of life. Disaster lies in all those directions.

Any single remedy that does not give consideration to at least all those factors is not the answer; it will fall of its own weight.

"BETTER TO LIGHT ONE CANDLE THAN TO CURSE THE DARKNESS"

I have proposed the solution that appeals most to my judgment. It probably is not a good solution but if even one line of it has the slightest merit, at least that is something. I believe all Congressmen should offer their own solutions, not because any of us think ours is the best, but rather in the spirit and hope that something in our suggestions may be constructive or point the way to the right answer.

I have no desire to risk the scoffings of those who will easily prove what I already admit—that I not only am not an expert on military, productive, educational, historical, legal, or financial matters—but actually I know but little of any of those things. My only excuse for this talk is what I stated in the beginning—that if I have any thoughts at all on the subject, the position demands that they be expressed for the consideration of those with greater experience, knowledge, and judgment.

I shall not mind being accused of not having spoken wisely or well so long as I know I have spoken from my conscience and to the best of my ability. That I have done and I am content.

Let me conclude by again pointing out that practically everything I have said has been based on the assumption that we are not yet in world war III. Let us hope that with the help and cooperation of all, and with the help and guidance of God, we may yet find the right policy and program that will lead to peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from a speech made last night by Hon. Herbert Hoover.

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

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include an article.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the text of an address made recently by the President and also the text of the emergency proclamation.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the mayor of the city of New York and a speech before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3357. An act to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MAHON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) for today, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 22, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. BURNSIDE introduced a bill (H. R. 9940) to provide for the evacuation of dependents of Armed Forces personnel from occupation zones or areas, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. JENNINGS introduced a bill (H. R. 9941) for the relief of Dewey Esco Hill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

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

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

Most gracious Father, we lift up our hearts as again o'er the earth's dark shadows the angels' song is heard, and over an earth grown old with its burden of care again the voice of the Christ Child rings out with its cheer, that mankind are the children of God.

May we see with new eyes, as Christmas comes to a world where ill will has wrought such horror, that that One whose coming breaks the ages in two is set for the falling and rising of nations; that He does not stay in the manger, He walks in our world of pretense and greed and self-seeking, and that where He goes the judgment of God goes with Him. Bending low through the gate of the child heart, may we find the simplicity, the freedom, and the truth that sword and tongue and pen can never give. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McCARRAN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 21, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 21, 1950:

S. 3091. An act for the relief of Master Stanley (Zachne) Hiller.

On December 22, 1950:

S. 3329. An act for the relief of Kiyomi Kitamura;

S. 3430. An act for the relief of Martina Arnalz Zarandona (Sister Blanca Eugenia);

S. 3444. An act for the relief of Victor Francis Oberschall; and

S. 4111. An act for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Connor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Kefauver	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Clements	Kerr	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lodge	Sparkman
Eastland	Long	Stennis
Ecton	Lucas	Taft
Ellender	McCarran	Taylor
Frear	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Gurney	Magnuson	Wherry
Hayden	Malone	Wiley
Hendrickson	Martin	Williams
Hickenlooper	Millikin	
Hill	Morse	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of ROBERT A. TAFT, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Ohio a Senator from that State for the term beginning Jan-

uary 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, ROBERT A. TAFT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Ohio a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness His Excellency, our Governor, Frank J. Lausche, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbus, this 18th day of December in the year of our Lord 1950.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] CHARLES F. SWEENEY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. DOUGLAS presented the credentials of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS.
To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness, His Excellency, our Governor, Adlai E. Stevenson, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield this 29th day of November A. D. 1950.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EDWARD H. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were on page 10, strike out line 12; on page 15, strike out line 10; and on page 21, after line 10, insert:

XXXXXXXXXX Salgo, Miklos, or Nicholas Salgo or Nicolas M. Salgo.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the House has amended Senate Concurrent Resolution 108 by striking out two names which were withdrawn by the Attorney General since the resolution was submitted in the Senate, and by adding one name which was referred to the Congress on December 1, 1950. I wish to say that the Committee on the Judiciary has examined the one name which has been added, and I now move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that Members of the Senate be permitted to introduce bills and resolutions, and to submit petitions and memorials, without debate.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—
WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Carl John Cullum from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON COMMISSARY ACTIVITIES OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the commissary activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in Alaska and other points outside the continental United States, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Mrs. Oda B. Thompson, of Philadelphia, Pa., referring to her claim against the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Tacoma, Wash., relating to appropriating Federal grants-in-aid to communities adjacent to military bases for recreational facilities and programs, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS—RESOLUTION OF YORK (MAINE) LIONS CLUB

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Lions Club, of York, Maine, favoring an amendment to the Constitution providing that the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, or industrial enterprise in competition with its citizens except as specified in the Constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 247)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a pamphlet entitled "Legislative History of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Eighty-first Congress," be printed as a Senate document.

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

CHRISTMAS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him entitled "Statement on Christmas, 1950," which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR AND INFLATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on war and inflation prepared by him for delivery over the NBC radio network, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY IN PRESENT WORLD CONDITIONS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERR

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator KERR regarding America's responsibility in present world conditions, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHINESE COMMUNIST INTERVENTION IN KOREA—STATEMENT BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on Chinese Communist intervention in Korea, delivered by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, foreign secretary of the Philippines, on December 7, 1950, in the First Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Committee on the Present Danger, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOYHOOD BACKGROUND OF SENATOR HUMPHREY—ARTICLE FROM THE DOLAND (S. DAK.) TIMES-RECORD

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Doland People Tell of Senator HUMPHREY's Boyhood Background," published in the Doland (S. Dak.) Times-Record for November 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAPAN FORCED TO PLAY PASSIVE ROLE—ARTICLE BY SEBASTIAN HAFNER

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Japan Forced to Play Passive Role," written by Sebastian Haffner, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of December 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEAN ACHESON—ARTICLE BY GEORGE SOKOLSKY

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "These Days," written by George Sokolsky, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of December 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY ACHESON'S CRITICS—LETTERS IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters from the columns of the New York Times of December 20, 1950, with comment by the editor, regarding to effort to force the dismissal of Secretary Acheson, which appear in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (DEL.) MORNING NEWS

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial having to do with the reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government, published in the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News on December 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE BY RADIO COMMENTATORS TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD tributes to Senator JOHNSON of Texas by Edward R. Murrow and Eric Sevareid, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT HOOVER—EXCERPT FROM BROADCAST BY ELMER DAVIS

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an address by Elmer Davis broadcast over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. on December 21, 1950, regarding the recent address by President Hoover, which appears in the Appendix.]

NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS—LETTER FROM SENATOR BYRD TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I have written to the President of the United States.

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

DECEMBER 22, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You stated in your December 15 address to the Nation that the Director of the Budget had been "instructed to reduce nonmilitary expenditures to the minimum required to give the effective support to the defense effort."

Your statement encourages me to pledge to you my full support in this vital requirement.

When we started preparedness for World War I the Federal debt was little more than \$1,000,000,000. When we started preparedness for World War II the debt was a little more than \$40,000,000,000.

We are starting to prepare for this, the most perilous of all threats to our freedom, with a debt of more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Assuming conditions short of total war, expenditures in the current fiscal year, which began last July 1, will run to between \$48,000,000,000 and \$50,000,000,000. In peace and war we have been on a deficit financing basis in 19 out of 21 years, including the present.

The deficit this fiscal year will be relatively small, but we must not allow it to lull us into a sense of false security. New defense spending will not show up in its real proportion until next fiscal year, which begins July 1.

We have already imposed one tax increase of \$4,500,000,000. The second increase, \$3,500,000,000 in the form of an excess-profits levy, is being enacted now. Including these two increases, on a full year basis, maximum Federal revenue next year is estimated at little more than \$50,000,000,000. This estimate by sources follows:

Direct taxes on individuals.....	\$20,700,000,000
Direct taxes on corporations.....	19,400,000,000
Excise taxes.....	8,200,000,000
Customs and miscellaneous receipts.....	2,000,000,000
Net employment taxes.....	800,000,000
Total.....	51,100,000,000

Secretary Snyder testified before the Finance Committee that the level of governmental expenditures next year (fiscal year 1952, beginning July 1, 1951) may be half again as large as this year. This means the budget for the coming fiscal year would be approximately \$75,000,000,000.

From these revenue and expenditure estimates it appears that within a year we would be operating at an annual deficit of \$25,000,000,000, unless we reduce expenditures and raise taxes still further.

Security is our first obligation, and under existing conditions we must visualize tremendous military expenditures in a long-range perspective. It is frightening to contemplate continuation of \$25,000,000,000-a-year deficits indefinitely. We do not con-

trol the duration. It may be 5 years, 10 years, or longer.

There has never been a similar situation. The free-enterprise system is our first line of defense. We cannot relax our military preparedness. Neither can be maintained at maximum efficiency in an atmosphere of fiscal weakness which is certain to accompany prolonged deficits of the indicated magnitude.

These threatened deficits must be precluded completely, or greatly reduced, by the combination of further tax increases and retrenchment in nonessential spending. I submit that we should start reducing nonmilitary expenditures at this time with reductions in excess of \$7,000,000,000.

The urgency of your determination "to reduce nonmilitary expenditures to the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort" is obvious. Under our system Federal budgets are the result of joint action by the Chief Executive and Congress. Therefore, your leadership is required. Without it drastic budget reductions may be difficult if not impossible.

Budget reductions to the level you have sanctioned will involve domestic-civilian spending programs which are tied to long-term statutory commitments. If we are to reach these items to the extent necessary, joint executive-legislative action on basic legislation to repeal, reduce, or suspend the commitments will be required, and legislative recommendations to this end should be included in the President's budget proposals.

As a member of the legislative branch who has studied Federal budgets closely for 18 years, I believe the present crisis requires cooperative action between the executive branch and Congress to eliminate immediately \$7,000,000,000 to \$8,000,000,000 in non-essential expenditures from the new budget as follows:

1. Expenditures in strictly domestic-civilian programs, including the postal deficit, should be reduced (along lines suggested in the appended details and tables) by at least \$3,600,000,000
 2. The Armed Forces are notorious for extravagant use of civilian manpower. They are now employing approximately 1 civilian for each 2 men in uniform as compared with 1 civilian for each 5 men in uniform at the World War II peak. The military effort would be strengthened if, through greatly needed efficiency, the Military Establishment's projected civilian employment of more than 1,250,000 were reduced by at least 150,000 with a saving of..... 500,000,000
 3. Foreign economic assistance for the current fiscal year was estimated at \$4,000,000,000. This program is scheduled to expire only a year hence. Billions now being appropriated for foreign military assistance are overlapping the economic assistance programs at many points. Foreign economic assistance expenditures in the new budget should not exceed commitments already made, and therefore should be reduced under estimates for the current year by at least..... 3,500,000,000
- Total..... **7,600,000,000**

These suggestions should be regarded as the point from which further reductions should be considered. Even when they are substantially exceeded a third tax increase will be in immediate prospect.

I have confidence in Frederick J. Lawton, Director of the Budget, whom you have designated to make preliminary recommendations on reductions to be made. No man is more thoroughly versed in the complex Federal budget. I hope he finds that even greater reductions can be made immediately to strengthen our fiscal position without impairing the defense effort or damaging irreparably other aspects of national welfare.

I take the liberty of submitting my views to you and him in this letter which is written in a spirit of cooperation and constructive suggestion. The suggestions are supplemented by appended detail and tables.

Sincerely,

HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate.

ADDENDUM

The suggested budget reductions in the attached letter are in terms of broad expenditure categories.

The purpose of this addendum is primarily to expand domestic-civilian reductions first in terms of major expenditure functions, and second in terms of more specific expenditure programs.

In addition, further comment will be made on suggested reductions in expenditures for Military Establishment civilian employment, on expenditures for foreign economic assistance, and on the budget in general.

DOMESTIC-CIVILIAN

Figures in the following tables relative to domestic-civilian expenditures are exclusive of all military and related expenditure objects such as atomic energy, merchant marine, stockpile, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Panama Canal, Coast Guard, Alaska construction and transportation, and cemetery programs. They do not include any foreign military or economic aid expenditures. They do not include any veterans costs. They do not include any interest on the debt or refunds of erroneously collected taxes.

Expenditures for State-aid programs, now totaling nearly \$3,000,000,000, account for about 25 percent of the domestic-civilian budget. They are to be found running through virtually all of the so-called major functions in this category—public assistance and health, housing, education and research, agriculture, resources development and recreation, transportation (including highways and civilian airports), business promotion, employment, and so forth.

In this critical period the question of merit under ordinary conditions is not the paramount consideration. The degree to which they support the defense effort must be the controlling factor. These items must be reached if we are to reduce nonmilitary expenditures to the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort: Most of them are tied to long term statutory commitments, and most of them will require changes in State budgets. Wherever new basic legislation will be required to repeal, amend, or suspend these Federal commitments, legislative recommendations should be included in the President's budget proposals. The States are now better able than the Federal Government to finance the irreducible minimum of public assistance, public construction, resources development and public health within their borders. They

must be given notice immediately in order that they may conform.

The tabulated domestic-civilian material which is to follow is set forth under functional headings which are numbered. It should be considered in the light of the preceding general observations and the following specific explanation:

1. With respect to the social welfare, health, and security function and programs: most of the reduction proposals would be in public assistance, and institutional construction grants to the States. The contributory social security system of course would not be affected. The original purpose of other public assistance grants was to fill gaps in the social-security program. Social-security insurance has been broadened this year. The war effort will require the labor of all who are able to work. Scarcity of materials automatically will curtail or halt nondefense construction. After the reductions suggested in this item it would still be a quarter of a billion dollars higher than it was in fiscal year 1946 when World War II ended.

2. With respect to housing and community facilities (including mortgage purchases): Adequate war effort precludes nonessential housing construction. This program already has been curtailed. It should be eliminated with the exception of essential defense housing. No new money would be provided, but returns from previous loans should meet the cost of housing for the war effort. Repayments in these programs during fiscal year 1946, when the war ended, exceeded expenditures.

3. With respect to education and general research: This item includes an increase for scientific research directed to the war effort which is not evident in the rounded figures. Other items remain virtually unchanged from the present except a reduction in funds for the census.

4. With respect to agriculture and agricultural resources (including Commodity Credit Corporation): Reductions in this item are principally in Commodity Credit Corporation price supports and nonessential rural electrification construction. Price support receipts this year are exceeding expenditures. If food subsidies have to be imposed, such as they were in World War II, price support receipts should meet the cost as they did at that time. The reduced figure contemplates

expenditures for rural electrification construction essential to the war effort.

5. With respect to natural resources: Major reductions in this item would be in non-essential public works by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. But funds remaining for these projects would be 25 percent more than was available in fiscal year 1946 when we had both war and postwar conditions.

6. With respect to transportation and communication (including the postal deficit): Decreases in this item would be in nonessential highway, airport, and Army engineers' construction, and the postal deficit. As in other categories of construction scarcity of materials automatically will halt or curtail all nonmilitary effort construction. The postal deficit should be wiped out under any circumstances. Those who use the mails should be willing to pay for the service. It disappeared during World War II. It should be eliminated now. Increases are provided for navigation aids and facilities for regulation of transportation and communication necessary for the war effort.

7. With respect to finance, commerce, and industry: Reductions are made in expenditures for ordinary activities under this item, but increases would be provided for export and domestic controls along with others provided for in the general Government function.

8. With respect to labor: The figures in this item contemplate the 1946 level of activity with an increase provided for labor training.

9. With respect to general government: Provision is made for increased immigration control costs. It is assumed that some of the civilian controls incident to current conditions will be reflected in the cost of general Government functions. The suggested reduction takes into account increased costs of Federal civilian retirement.

It may be worthy of note that in fiscal year 1946 we were descending from peak military requirements. In the coming fiscal year we shall be ascending in military requirements. Under suggested reductions total expenditures for domestic civilian programs in the coming year would be approximately 35 percent higher than they were in fiscal year 1946.

Reductions in strictly domestic-civilian expenditures by major functions are tabulated and compared as follows:

Reductions in strictly domestic civilian expenditures, by major functions (compared with war, postwar, and new emergency years)

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories (strictly domestic civilian)	War peak, fiscal year 1946	Postwar period, fiscal year 1948	New emergency		Suggested budget, fiscal year 1952
			Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1951	
1. Social welfare, health, and security.....	1.0	1.9	2.2	2.3	1.3
2. Housing and community facilities (including mortgage purchases).....	-.2	.1	.5	.5
3. Education and general research.....	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
4. Agriculture and agricultural resources (including CCC).....	.8	.6	2.6	1.5	.8
5. Natural resources.....	.2	.6	1.2	1.2	.4
6. Transportation and communication (including postal deficit).....	.4	1.0	1.5	1.5	.4
7. Finance, commerce, and industry.....	.1	.1	.1	.2	.4
8. Labor.....	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
9. General government.....	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.3
Total.....	3.6	6.1	9.4	8.5	4.9

A more detailed presentation of the suggested reductions is shown in the following table showing domestic-civilian expenditures on a program-by-program basis within the so-called major Federal functions:

Reductions in strictly domestic civilian expenditures, by programs within major functions

(In millions)

Functions and categories	Fiscal year 1946	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1951 estimate	Suggested, fiscal year 1952	Functions and categories	Fiscal year 1946	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1951 estimate	Suggested, fiscal year 1952
1. SOCIAL WELFARE, HEALTH, AND SECURITY					4. AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES—continued				
Assistance to aged and special groups:					Loan and investment programs—Con.				
Federal Security Agency:					Department of Agriculture—Con.				
Public assistance.....	\$436	\$1,146	\$1,400	\$440	Rural Electrification Administration.....	\$11	\$362	\$350	\$50
Vocational rehabilitation.....	14	6	27	25	Other programs.....	-285	9	1	50
Other.....	50	83	83	83	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, loans to REA.....	74			
School lunch (Agriculture Department).....	14	2	2	14	Other financial aids:				
Retirement and dependents' insurance:					Department of Agriculture:				
Railroad Retirement Board.....	294	583	424	425	Conservation and use (including acreage allotments and marketing quotas).....	311	285	306	300
Federal Security Agency and other.....	24	10	7	7	Removal of surplus commodities.....	25	86	114	100
Promotion of public health:					Sugar Act Agreement.....	54	63	69	65
Federal Security Agency.....	169	259	207	200	International wheat agreement.....		82	76	75
General Services Administration and other.....	10	21	32	25	Food subsidies (Commodity Credit and RFC).....	1,634			
Crime control and correction (Justice and other).....	78	93	98	98	Other agencies.....	3			
Indian welfare (Interior) and other.....	10	29	35	25	Agricultural land and water resources.....	39	64	66	25
Accident compensation (Federal Security).....	10	18	26	25	Other development and improvement of agriculture.....	134	161	99	150
Total, social welfare.....	1,085	2,250	2,341	1,342	Total, agriculture and agricultural resources.....	701	2,671	1,552	830
2. HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT					5. NATURAL RESOURCES (NOT PRIMARILY AGRICULTURAL)				
Aids to private housing:					Land and water resources:				
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					Corps of Engineers (civil functions).....	89	486	538	90
Federal Housing Administration:					Department of the Interior:				
Current operations.....	-13	-34	-30		Bureau of Reclamation.....	62	300	303	75
Investments in United States securities.....		36	31		Bonneville Power Administration and Southwestern and Southeastern power systems.....	9	42	49	49
Home Loan Bank Board:					Tennessee Valley Authority (net).....	5	18	87	100
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.....	-275	-275	-134		International Boundary and Water Commission (and other State departments).....	1	7	13	1
Federal savings and loan insurance:					Other, Interior Department.....	10	43	35	5
Current operations.....		-16	-18		Forest resources:				
Investments in United States securities.....		17	18		Forest Service and other (Agriculture).....	40	76	79	50
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:					Department of Interior.....	3	3	2	1
Mortgage purchases.....	-45	562	865		Mineral resources:				
Loans to prefabricators and builders and other.....	2	52			Bureau of Mines and other (Interior).....	18	37	35	25
Loans to housing cooperatives.....		10			Navy Department and other.....	3	18	20	20
Department of Agriculture.....		20	21		General Resources Surveys (Interior).....		16	20	10
Public housing program:					Fish and Wildlife Resources (Interior and other).....	12	28	29	15
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					Recreational use of resources:				
Public Housing Administration:					Department of Interior.....	5	29	27	5
Low-rent housing.....	43	99	135		Baltimore-Washington Parkway.....		2	2	2
War housing and other.....	34	19	-3	¹ (500)	Total, natural resources.....	257	1,103	1,239	448
Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other.....	3	-118	-1		6. TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION				
General housing aids: Housing and Home Finance Agency.....		7	7		Proportion of merchant marine (Inland Waterways Corporation).....		1	3	
Slum clearance and community development, including community facilities:					Navigation aids and facilities:				
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....		11	42		Corps of Engineers programs.....	93	212	218	125
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	3	18	48		Other (including Interior).....		1	3	
General Services Administration and other.....	68	20	35		Promotion of aviation: Civil Aeronautics Administration programs.....	62	187	165	125
Disaster relief.....			5		Provision of highways:				
Total, housing and community development.....	-180	428	1,021	¹ (500)	Bureau of Public Roads programs.....	77	490	465	100
3. EDUCATION AND GENERAL RESEARCH					Forest roads and trails (Agriculture).....	13	2		
Promotion of Education:					Regulation of transportation.....	22	15	16	30
Office of Education (Federal Security).....	27	34	37	30	Other services to transportation:				
General Services Administration and Interior.....		8			Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	-43	2	6	¹ (-)
Elementary and secondary education:					Coast and Geodetic Survey and other.....	17	12	12	17
Surveys and emergency construction.....			22		Postal service deficit.....	161	593	555	
Children on Federal property and in emergency areas.....			7	10	Regulation of communication.....	11	7	7	12
Educational aids to special groups.....	13	7	12	13	Total, transportation and communication (including postal deficit).....	413	1,522	1,450	409
Library and museum services.....	6	11	12	6	7. FINANCE, COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY				
General-purpose research:					Business loans and guaranties (RFC).....	-111	53	145	100
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	34			50	Promotion and regulation of business:				
Department of Commerce:					Office of controls.....	184			225
17th Decennial Census.....		45	32	5	Department of Commerce:				
Other Census Bureau programs.....	8	7	7	5	Promotion.....	11	25	13	10
National Bureau of Standards.....			12	9	Export control.....		3	2	10
Other agencies.....			1		Other agencies (FTC, FPC, Justice, etc.).....	15	7	7	15
Total, education and general research.....	88	125	138	119	Rent control.....		12	16	20
4. AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES					Other.....		7	7	
Loan and investment programs:					War damage insurance (War Damage Corporation).....	-2			
Department of Agriculture:					Preferred stock of financial institutions (RFC).....			-6	
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	-1,329	1,533	450	21					
Farmers' Home Administration.....	30	26	21	15					

¹ From receipts in excess of expenditures.

Reductions in strictly domestic civilian expenditures, by programs within major functions—Continued

[In millions]

Functions and categories	Fiscal year 1946	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1951 estimate	Suggested, fiscal year 1952	Functions and categories	Fiscal year 1946	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1951 estimate	Suggested, fiscal year 1952
7. FINANCE, COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY—continued					9. GENERAL GOVERNMENT				
Control of private finance (SEC).....	\$5	\$7	\$7	\$5	Executive direction and management.....	\$8	\$8	\$12	\$250
Total, finance, commerce and industry.....	102	124	201	385	Federal financial management:				
8. LABOR					Internal Revenue Bureau.....	350	136	132	140
Placement and unemployment compensation:					Customs collection, debt management and other (mainly Treasury).....				
Department of Labor.....	71	137	170	75	General Accounting Office.....	Other central services:			
Railroad Retirement Board.....	13	13	9	9	Property management (mainly GSA).....	98	139	108	175
Federal Security Agency.....	75	37			Civil Service Commission.....	9	17	17	10
Mediation and regulation of labor relations.....	24	12	12	20	Legal services (Justice).....	5	8	9	5
Labor standards and training:					Special fund for management improvement.....		1		
Department of Labor.....	1	10	15	100	Government Printing Office.....		9	11	15
Department of Interior, mine safety.....		4	4	4	Government payment toward civilian employees general retirement system.....	245	301	305	305
Labor information, statistics and general administration.....	8	9	11	10	Public buildings construction (GSA).....	61	22	47	
Total, labor.....	192	222	214	218	Weather Bureau (Commerce).....	25	24	25	25
					Immigration control (Justice).....	30	32	32	40
					Other.....	64	68	37	37
					Total general Government.....	933	1,031	1,015	1,292
					Grand total, domestic-civilian ²	3,591	9,476	9,171	5,043

² Totals may not add precisely due to rounding.

GENERAL NOTE.—Substantial reductions in numerous instances, in addition to most State-aid programs, would require statutory legislation to be recommended along with the President's budget proposals.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

In my long study of Federal fiscal affairs I have watched especially for excessive civilian employment as a key to extravagance and inefficiency. I have observed in this connection that the Military Establishment, which is now employing a million civilians, or about one civilian for each two men in uniform, is the worst offender in extravagant and inefficient use of civilian personnel. The current ratio of civilian manpower to uniformed personnel is despite the fact that navy yard employment is still at a low ebb. At the peak of World War II the Military Establishment was employing one civilian to each five men in uniform. Civilian employment in the Military Establishment has been increasing for some time at the rate of 1,000 a day and published estimates indicate that a minimum of a quarter of a million more civilians are to be employed. A civilian payroll of one and one-quarter million employees would account for approximately \$4,500,000,000 of defense expenditures. Maximum utilization of civilian manpower in the Defense Establishment would reduce this employment projection by at least 150,000, at a saving of one-half billion dollars. This should be made a matter of immediate attention by the best experts available.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Since World War II we have authorized \$37,500,000,000 for foreign economic assistance. At present we are building up another multi-billion dollar program for foreign military assistance. Foreign economic assistance expenditures in the past 5 years have equaled expenditures for strictly domestic-civilian activities at home. This year's budget contemplated foreign economic assistance expenditures totaling \$4,000,000,000. Military assistance is overlapping economic assistance at many points. Economic assistance has been withdrawn from England. The economic assistance program is scheduled to expire a year hence. The new budget should provide for no new commitments. Expenditures should be confined to commitments already made. The reduction, by comparison with this year's estimate, should be \$3,500,000,000.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

In addition to the Military Establishment the Veterans' Administration, now employing nearly 200,000 is another excessive user of manpower. It has been my observation that its administrative costs could and should be reduced, and that could be accomplished without impairment of any services for veterans to whom the Government is obligated for bona fide war-connected sacrifices. Under terms of the recent single appropriation bill, the Director of the Budget has demonstrated the accuracy of this observation. More reductions in Veterans' Administration costs could and should be made.

The only major expenditure item in the Federal budget which is untouchable at this time is the interest on the debt and on erroneously collected taxes.

ONE HUNDRETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF OSCAR SOLOMON STRAUS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Saturday, December 23, will be the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of one of our country's most devoted and dutiful servants, Oscar Solomon Straus, of New York State.

During this week the Library of Congress has deemed it fitting to honor his memory with an exhibit of his writings. Here on the floor of the Senate it also seems fitting to recall and honor the memory of this American diplomat, Cabinet member, lawyer and author, one of New York's finest citizens. This was a man who, under six Presidents, faithfully served his country, and who worked unceasingly for better international relations and for the cause of world peace.

Oscar Solomon Straus was loved and respected by the men of his own day. The characterizations of him by his contemporaries are eloquent tribute. I quote a few of these phrases of acclaim by his fellow citizens: "Our most beloved companion—a wise and perfect spirited citizen—a Jew, many of whose most important services were for Christian causes—a man honored by both the North and the South—a Republican who served his country under four Republican and two Democratic Presidents—a patriot who never considered the call to

participate in public affairs a sacrifice but always a privilege."

I hope that recalling the selfless career of this citizen of yesterday will make us today aspire to ever greater magnanimity and unity of spirit.

DEDUCTIONS FOR WELFARE CLAUSES IN MARITIME CONTRACTS—ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO HOUSE BILL 8349

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to make an announcement, because many persons are interested in it. There is a bill on the calendar, House bill 8349, to authorize deductions from the wages of seamen for payment into employee welfare funds. The bill passed the House unanimously. It also passed through the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee unanimously, but was objected to at the last call of the calendar. Since that time the objection has been withdrawn but, because of a gentlemen's agreement that we will not bring up any of the bills to which objection has been made, in view of the further fact that it is very important to the stabilization of the whole maritime industry on the Pacific coast, and also the fact that I have discussed with both the majority and minority leaders the possibility of bringing this bill up on January 2, when Congress reconvenes, and inasmuch as I am sure there will be no objection on either side of the aisle, I want to make the announcement that I hope those who are vitally interested in the maritime industry which is so important on the Pacific coast will not become too excited about the matter, because the majority leader and the minority leader have agreed to bring the bill up on January 2, and we hope for its speedy passage.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a matter of personal privilege I ask unanimous consent to speak for about 2 or 3 minutes to correct the

interpretation in some newspaper accounts of a statement made by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In the newspapers of this morning I was reported to have disputed my friend of many years, a man for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, in connection with his recent address on the subject of our foreign affairs. The newspaper announced that I had said that I had disagreed with Mr. Hoover in regard to the question of whether putting Armed Forces abroad required action by the Congress. What I did say, Mr. President was, that I did not think legislation by the Congress would be necessary to authorize such action. I do not have certain knowledge one way or the other. It simply seemed to me that the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces would in the interest of security, have power, especially in view of the fact that we had not entered into peace treaties with Germany or Japan, to order our Armed Forces any place he might think the situation demanded.

Furthermore, I feel that since we have ratified the North Atlantic Pact, probably the President of the United States would have authority to collaborate with the other nations who are members of the pact, with regard to collective security in Europe. But I did emphasize that whatever legal questions were involved, and whether or not any action had to be taken by the Congress, I felt it vitally important that any program to commit substantial portions of our Armed Forces in Europe or elsewhere should be thoroughly explored by both Houses of the Congress in order that there should be a full understanding and a full agreement as to what we were doing, and in order that popular opinion in the country would be behind us.

I think that is all Mr. Hoover meant by his suggestions. I do not think he meant to imply that he felt legislation would be needed. But, because of the misunderstanding, I have prepared a brief statement which I should like to give to my colleagues respecting the whole situation, so that my position may be clear.

The world situation is gravely serious, but we must face it with a positive faith that the forces of freedom will prevail. I am not willing to move back from the faith that the forces of freedom are going to prevail.

What we have learned from Korea is that the threat to peace is worldwide. We must have a global strategy to meet it. We cannot have one policy in Western Europe and a conflicting policy—or no policy—in Asia.

A study of the speech which ex-President Hoover made two nights ago certainly brings out that any proposal to increase substantially our land forces abroad must be thoroughly explored by the Congress before any final commitments are made. I am entirely in accord with this construction of Mr. Hoover's speech. I think I am correct in making that construction.

Mr. Hoover is right in emphasizing the necessity of our maintaining sea and air supremacy. But certainly Mr. Hoover did not mean that we can withdraw from all responsibilities to the other freedom-loving nations of the world and seek only our own self-defense. That conception is not adequate for America which from the beginning has been the voice and spirit of freedom and which has always believed that in unity there is strength.

I cannot believe for 1 minute that, as some of the newspapers have implied, Mr. Hoover recommended that we withdraw from all these responsibilities.

There is no disgrace or defeat in strategic retreat and reorganization of our forces. I will say further it would be no disgrace or defeat, in my judgment, to withdraw our forces from Korea, if we find it necessary. But there is disgrace and defeat in any form of appeasement or compromise of principle. Under no conditions can we appease or compromise the flagrant aggression of the Moscow-directed Chinese Communists in Korea and their defiance of the United Nations. Their present government, the Peiping Government, Moscow directed, must never be recognized by the United States and must never be admitted to the United Nations. We must use the veto if necessary. I emphasize the statement that we must use the veto if necessary. We must strongly support the anti-Moscow forces in China in their effort to release the Chinese people from foreign bondage.

Our immediate responsibility is the exploration of the many proposals—and I have been exploring many of them with officials of the administration and with the leaders of our Armed Forces and others—for a new and dynamic strategy that can release and aid all the free people of the world to save themselves. We must all understand together the great truth that only united blood, sweat, and tears—yes, and prayers—can preserve the United Nations, save freedom, and establish peace on earth and good will to all men.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize again that in unity there is strength. We must have unity among all freedom-loving nations if we are to save freedom from destruction.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to know if the Senator from New Jersey is familiar with the press dispatches of today which indicate that the official Peiping radio said the Communist regime in China has rejected the cease-fire proposal, and also the dispatches from Tokyo which indicate General MacArthur's headquarters feels that the Communists are at the present time building up for an attack upon Seoul, which is, of course, south of the thirty-eighth parallel?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I anticipated that that would be the case, because it seems to me the cease-fire proposal could only lead to appeasement or else the kind of result to which the Sen-

ator from California called attention. I think we now have to concentrate on where we go from here, because it is conceivable that a great aggregation of force also would push us further. That is a matter for the military leaders to deal with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey be granted 1 minute in order to answer a question.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey to define a little more fully what he meant by the word "explore," when he said that Congress should "explore." He used that word several times. It seems to me that Congress must go further than that, particularly if it has in mind the appropriation of funds to raise armies.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. What I had in mind, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, is that it seems to me Congress has a responsibility, as well as has the administration, in exploring these matters that will call for appropriation of funds. Exploring is to find out what the facts are, and then we should develop and agree on policy after we thoroughly know the facts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that Congress, in the Senator's opinion, must act on these matters as well as simply to explore them, and not leave them entirely to the decision of the President alone?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think it may come to that. As I said earlier, I have stated, in response to inquiries from newspaper representatives, that I do not think legislation is required to authorize the President to send troops abroad. I do not know. Maybe appropriation features do require legislation. I have also thought that since we have ratified the North Atlantic Treaty, there were certain implied commitments of joint action which might justify the administration, in cooperation with other countries, in sending troops abroad. But such exploration may and should be made by the President, in conjunction with Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for a minute in order that I may ask the Senator from New Jersey a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator's request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey made the statement that, in his opinion, ex-President Hoover did not intend to withdraw our assistance or our participation in the defenses of the world other than in Korea. I wonder how the Senator explains the statement contained in ex-President Hoover's speech to the effect that he would urge that not a dollar of money or any manpower be sent to Europe until the European countries

demonstrated their own ability to withstand the aggression that was threatened from the Soviet Republic and its satellites? It would seem to me that if we waited in sending any additional manpower to the threatened countries of western Europe we would so discourage them that we could not possibly hope that they would take the necessary action in advance.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York that I was abroad this fall. I conferred with our representatives in London and in Paris. The whole question was whether we should send our boys to be a bulwark there while the European countries were organizing extra divisions, or whether we should have enough evidence that at least some of these extra divisions are already organized so that if and when our boys were sent there they would not be simply the first rank to be shot down. That was a very important question, and that I assume came up at Brussels in the past few days.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I am looking forward with interest to hearing Mr. Acheson on that point. I felt that Mr. Hoover meant that the European nations were dragging their feet, were not prepared to go ahead and do their part in their self-defense, and he did not want to send our men or money there until there was evidence that the European nations would do their part.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I arise today to note officially the imminent retirement from this honorable body of a distinguished Senator who has made an enviable and an outstanding record, and whose departure will take from the Senate one who will be sorely missed.

The occasion is one that affords opportunity to pay deserved tribute to our colleague, and to indicate to him the esteem and the admiration in which he is held by the membership of this body.

The reference is to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. It has been my extreme good fortune to be associated with Senator TYDINGS in many endeavors over the past quarter century. I can say without any reservations that he is a gentleman of the highest order, a patriot who needs yield place to no one on his military or public service record, and an extraordinarily capable, earnest, and fearless leader and legislator whose worth to the people of his State and the Nation has been demonstrated uncounted times.

His record, during his 24 years in this honorable body, session by session, vote by vote, is imprinted upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just as the forthright principles upon which he always has stood are recorded in the public

annals, for time to demonstrate their worth and their soundness. Here, as in his previous years in the House of Representatives, as Speaker of the House of Delegates of Maryland, and as a member of the Maryland State Senate, he has been an indefatigable worker in the public service, devoted to the welfare of his constituency and his country, and possessed of wide experience. A forthright protagonist, his position on controversial matters has ever been in accord with deep-seated principles.

Senator TYDINGS has been a statesman in the highest Maryland tradition of independence and dependability.

High among his principles is an unwavering insistence upon individual initiative and private enterprise. His defense of these principles has brought him often into conflict with present trends toward a form of socialism and away from the basic ideals upon which this country was founded and has prospered. He has stoutly opposed socialization of industry, socialization of medicine, and compulsory health insurance. He has consistently and courageously thought for himself. Whatever he has supported, or opposed, was in accordance with his firm convictions of the rightness of his stand.

Mr. President, the tribute paid him here this week by his fellow members of the Armed Services Committee perhaps brings most sharply into focus one of the most valuable contributions he has made to the work of the United States Senate, namely, that as a member and, later, as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The wording of the testimonial scroll, in which his record is reviewed and deserved honor is paid him for his long and distinguished service to his State and Nation, is no mere collection of words. Rather, it is a tribute from the heart, accorded by his colleagues of both parties who knew most intimately the worth of his leadership and his abilities because of their close and continuing association with him during the critical years which have preceded and those which are still with us.

It is with the most intense regret that we say adieu to Senator TYDINGS—a regret in which I am sure the other Members of the Senate join heartily. In wishing the distinguished Senator all possible good fortune and high success and satisfaction in the years ahead, I know, too, that my colleagues and his subscribe wholeheartedly as well. There is no greater consolation that this world affords than the sincere conviction of a job well done. This sincere conviction, Senator TYDINGS will always have and cherish. I know of no words that could more fittingly express the feelings that we here in the Senate and the great body of our Maryland citizens have for Senator TYDINGS than to quote the words of Scripture: "Well, done, thou good and faithful servant."

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CONFERENCE REPORT ON EXCESS-PROFITS TAX BILL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement of some impor-

tance with respect to the conference report on the excess-profits tax bill.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has advised me that the conferees will agree on a conference report sometime this afternoon, and that there are some questions of drafting which will take some little time before the conference report will be reported to the Senate. It is my understanding that the conferees on the part of the House have agreed that the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the conferees and as chairman of the Finance Committee, may bring the papers to the Senate to be considered here in the first instance. It may take some time. If we pass the civil defense bill and finish any other business before the conference report comes to the Senate, we shall take a recess until such time as the conference report can be submitted. It might be 5 or 6 o'clock before the conference report comes to the Senate.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that there is every hope that the agreement will be reached in a few minutes; and the draftsman has said that he probably could get through within 2 hours or 2 hours and one-half. So probably it will not be necessary for us to stay quite so late as the Senator from Illinois has indicated. On the other hand, of course, it might be necessary to do so; something might come up.

Mr. LUCAS. I was stating only what was reported to me.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say that if it is possible for the conference report to be acted upon before 4 or 5 o'clock, it certainly will be deemed a real privilege by some of the Members of the Senate who already have reservations to leave at 5:30 this afternoon. I wonder whether the majority leader can relay that information to the conferees, at least to those from this side of the aisle, because it means a great deal to Senators who already have reservations.

Mr. LUCAS. I respectfully suggest that the Senator from Nebraska get in touch with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and advise him of the situation of which he now advises me.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to do that. In fact, I have already advised the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LUCAS. I have given the information to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the conference report will not be delayed any longer than is absolutely necessary.

SEÑORA RIVERA ET AL.—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, referring to the bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, and others, which, in response to a request, was returned to the Senate yesterday by the House of Representatives, I ask the attention of the leaders on the other

side, particularly the attention of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON]. I ask unanimous consent at this time to take up and dispose of a motion to reconsider made by the Senator from New Jersey, with reference to which he has entered into a discussion with me here this morning. I think the Senator is now satisfied that the motion might be dismissed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the motion be withdrawn. It is the bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of Señora Rivera and others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey withdraws the motion to reconsider.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be complete, I wish to say that we have corresponded with the proper authorities. We have a copy of a cablegram, which I think the Senator from New Jersey has seen, which tells the story, as follows:

Ministry Defense states no indemnity has been paid to five widows of Bolivian Air Force officers killed in crash USAF C-54 September 19, 1947, near San Juan, Peru, pd. By Bolivian Army regulations each widow receives pension for life of same amount according to rank of husband at time of death, as if he retired at that date. Paid amounts per month are Señora Rivera, 7,000 Bolivianos; Señoras Raul Valle, Diaz Romero, Otto Beese, and Hugh Soria, 6,000 each. Paid parallel exchange rate 180 Bolivianos for \$1.

That means that they are receiving about \$537 a month. I ask that the motion to reconsider be disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey has the right to withdraw the motion, and he has done so.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the letter from the Department of the Air Force, dated December 21, 1950, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, December 21, 1950.

Mr. J. CARLISLE RUDDY,
Senate Judiciary Committee.

DEAR Mr. RUDDY: I refer to your recent telephone request as to whether the Government of Bolivia has paid any indemnity to the widows of five Bolivian officers who were killed in the crash of an Air Force C-54 transport plane near San Juan, Peru, on September 19, 1947.

The following message has been received from the United States air attaché in La Paz, Bolivia:

"Ministry Defense states no indemnity has been paid to five widows Bolivian Air Force officers killed in crash USAF C-54, September 19, 1947, near San Juan, Peru. By Bolivian army regulations each widow receives pension for life of same amount according to rank of husband at time of death as if he retired at that date. Paid amounts per month are Señora Rivera, 7,000 bolivianos; Señoras Raul Valle, Diaz Romero, Otto Reese, and Hugo Soria, 6,000 each. Paid parallel exchange rate, 180 bolivianos for \$1.

"BURNS."

Sincerely yours,

K. S. AKTATER,
Colonel, USAF, Deputy Director,
Legislation and Liaison.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an observation in connection with this matter. I am not objecting to what is proposed, because the bill

was passed with the understanding that a statement would be forthcoming explaining to the Senator from New Jersey whether the country from which these fliers came—Bolivia, I believe it was—had compensated them. It was my suggestion that the bill be passed, and that the time limit within which a motion to reconsider might be made be waived, in order that the explanation might be made. As I understand, the explanation has been made, it is satisfactory to the Senator from New Jersey, and he withdraws his motion. My reason for making this observation is that in order that it may be understood that we are not returning to the reconsideration of a bill. It was passed, and this takes it out of a class of bills that anyone might wish to reopen or to have reconsidered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1139) for the relief of Mrs. Robert P. Horrell.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 555) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4653. An act for the relief of the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc.; Merck & Co., Inc.; and Mallinckrodt Chemical Works;

H. R. 4803. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers;

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of Rev. Andrew Chai Kyung Whang;

H. R. 8973. An act for the relief of Archibald Walter Campbell Seymour;

H. R. 9145. An act for the relief of Tomoko Yamaya;

H. R. 9236. An act for the relief of H. Halpern and Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass.;

H. R. 9272. An act to amend the act of October 5, 1949 (Public Law 322, 81st Cong.), so as to extend the time of permits covering lands located on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 9893. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL CIVIL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4268) to authorize a Federal civil-defense program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, last night I made an explanation of the pending bill, which appears in the RECORD. The bill has been very thoroughly discussed. It has been gone over very carefully by the Armed Services Committee. Prior to that time, the entire problem had been studied very closely by the Joint

Committee on Atomic Energy, and a report submitted by that committee.

The bill which is now before the Senate, in general principle, I think, meets with the approval of the Committee on Atomic Energy. We have worked closely with the staff of that committee, and we have been in consultation from day to day with its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

There are three or four amendments pending. I desire to say that I have been advised by the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives that, at about 2 o'clock, or at any rate early this afternoon, the House may recess until after the holidays. I should like to expedite this bill, in order that the conferees may be appointed in both Houses, in case it is necessary to send the bill to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, S. 4268. This amendment was proposed by me yesterday, it has been printed, and it is now lying on the table. Before the clerk reads it, I should like to make a brief statement about it.

In brief this amendment would add to the pending bill in substance the provisions set forth in title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950, Public Law 774, of the Eighty-first Congress, having to do with the President's authority to requisition.

The major part of title II of the Defense Production Act was written into the bill by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and was adopted in conference and subsequently was enacted into law.

I believe that a reading of the amendment at this time would be useful. The amendment is self-explanatory. After it has been read, I shall continue my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following new section, and renumber succeeding sections of the bill accordingly:

COMPENSATION FOR NONGOVERNMENTAL PROPERTY ACQUIRED

SEC. 402. (a) Except in the case of property acquired pursuant to section 201 (h) of this act through judicial proceedings for condemnation, the Administrator shall promptly determine the amount of the compensation to be paid for any property (other than that of the Federal Government or any department or agency thereof) or the use thereof acquired pursuant to this act, but each such determination shall be made as of the time it is acquired in accordance with the provisions for just compensation in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If the person entitled to receive the amount so determined by the Administrator as just compensation is unwilling to accept the same as full and complete compensation for such property or the use thereof, he shall be paid promptly 75 percent of such amount and shall be entitled to recover from the United States, in an action brought in the Court of Claims, or,

without regard to whether the amount involved exceeds \$10,000, in any district court of the United States, within 3 years after the date of the Administrator's award, such additional amount, if any, which, when added to the amount so paid to him, shall be just compensation.

(b) Whenever the Administrator determines that any real property acquired under this act and retained is no longer needed for the purposes of this act, he shall, if the original owner desires the return of the property and pays to the Administrator the fair value thereof, return such property to such owner. In the event the Administrator and the original owner do not agree as to the fair value of such property, the fair value shall be determined by three appraisers, one of whom shall be chosen by the Administrator, one by the original owner, and the third by the first two appraisers; the expenses of such determination shall be paid in equal shares by the Government and the original owner.

(c) Whenever the need for the purposes of this act of any personal property acquired under this act shall terminate, the Administrator may dispose of such property on such terms and conditions as he shall deem appropriate, but to the extent feasible and practicable he shall give to the former owner of any property so disposed of an opportunity to reacquire it (1) at its then fair value as determined by the Administrator, or (2) if it is to be disposed of (otherwise than at a public sale of which he shall give reasonable notice) at less than such value, at the highest price any other person is willing to pay therefor: *Provided*, That this opportunity to reacquire need not be given in the case of fungibles or items having a fair value of less than \$1,000.

On page 2, in the table of contents, between the lines containing "Sec. 401." and "Sec. 402.", respectively, insert the following, and renumber succeeding section designations contained in such table of contents: "Sec. 402. Compensation for nongovernmental property acquired."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am aware that Senate bill 4268 contains a section, section 202, relating to the Defense Production Act of 1950 to civil defense, which reads as follows:

SEC. 202. The terms "national defense" or "defense" as used in title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950 shall be construed to include "civil defense" as defined in this act.

It is my understanding that it is the intent of the Committee on Armed Services to carry over title II of the Defense Production Act into the pending civil-defense bill. However, I am not satisfied that section 202 does in fact accomplish what the committee intended.

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

Mr. IVES. Please permit me to complete my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

If the Administrator exercised the authority to requisition granted in title II of the Defense Production Act, then the remedial language contained in the section for property owners would, of course, flow from the exercise of such authority.

However, if the Administrator acting under the emergency powers of this bill—section 303—were to exercise the authority contained in section 201 (h), I do not believe that in that case the provisions of title II of the Defense Production Act would attach. It is for that

reason that I offer this amendment. If it is the intention of the Armed Services Committee by section 202 of Senate bill 4268 to incorporate by reference title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950 with reference to any requisition powers, I cannot see that it would be harmful to incorporate it as provided in my amendment. I might say in passing that the substance of this amendment, which was drafted by the office of the legislative counsel, was thoroughly discussed with them, and the legislative counsel's office is in agreement with my views as stated above. I do not believe that the Administrator of the civil-defense program should have greater powers than those granted to the President under the Defense Production Act with respect to the authority to requisition property. I trust the manager of the bill, the able Senator from Tennessee, can accept this amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think the Senator is quite correct in stating that it was the intention of the Armed Services Committee to incorporate title II of section 201 of the Defense Production Act, Public Law 774. Title II provides, as the distinguished Senator has said, that the President shall follow certain procedures with reference to compensating or reimbursing persons for property taken. The only difference in the amendment presented by the distinguished Senator from New York is that under the Defense Production Act, title II, the President grants compensation. I believe that is correct.

Mr. IVES. That is what I pointed out as I closed my remarks.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator's amendment provides that it shall be done by the Administrator of the Civil Defense Act. It was, of course, intended that title II of the Defense Production Act be carried over and made a part of the law and that the procedures be incorporated in the Civil Defense Act.

I do not know of any particular harm in spelling it out fully, if it will clarify the matter in any way. But it was our intention to make the section which the Senator has offered as an amendment applicable by reference to section 202. If the Senator is insistent on having the matter clarified, I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay for a minute passage of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. There is certainly not a Member of this body, nor indeed any responsible person, who does not see the need for speedily enacting legislation to protect our country from a sudden attack.

I must, however, call the attention of the Senate to a viewpoint which was ably expressed to the Senate Armed Services Committee by the mayor of New York City, Vincent R. Impellitteri.

Mayor Impellitteri, speaking for an area which would certainly be one of the primary targets of any enemy air attack, strongly urged in his statement that funds for bomb shelters be used to pay part of the cost of permanent projects. It is his feeling and that of many others that these projects would be useful not only for defense but also for peacetime purposes. Yet the bill as reported out by the committee has provided that such dual purpose projects might be aided only through an RFC loan program.

Mayor Impellitteri pointed out that the cost of the project sites in a congested community like New York City, with its understandably high property values, would be a major portion of the cost of the shelter. Not only New York City but many other American cities can demonstrate a crying need for more adequate Federal financial assistance in the bomb-shelter program. The pending legislation, however, prohibits the use of Federal funds to purchase the sites for bomb shelters.

Mr. President, I have not had time to read the voluminous hearings and to become acquainted with all the testimony that was presented before the Armed Services Committee on this point. There are many ramifications in legislation of this kind. I do not know them all.

Moreover, this is emergency legislation and, under the conditions today pertaining, must be rushed through. I would certainly have confidence, however, that the chief executive of the city of New York has no selfish motives in the position he has taken, but speaks only from a desire to advance and further this entire program. The city of New York is eager to contribute its full share to the civilian-defense program, as well as to the entire over-all defense program of this country.

I do not think, however, that the city of New York should be placed in a position where it will be unable, due to its concentration of population, to make adequate preparation for the protection of its civilian population. New York should not suffer unduly because it stands as the first target of an enemy's attack.

I trust that when the new Congress convenes, civilian-defense legislation, as well as much of the other emergency legislation that we have hurriedly passed, will be reviewed. I hope that at that time Mayor Impellitteri's views will be given reconsideration. I hope such changes can be made as are justified by reexamination of the financial formula set forth in this bill.

I know that the important consideration of the moment is the commencement of this vital program. Nothing must interfere with the earliest possible passage of this bill. I therefore do not propose to introduce any amendments or to delay the Senate any further.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement made by Mayor Impellitteri on December 15 before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

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

CIVIL DEFENSE—NEW YORK CITY

(Statement by Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri to Senate Armed Services Subcommittee, Washington, D. C., December 15, 1950)

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee to outline to you the importance to New York City of establishing a permanent civil defense program on a national level for the whole of the United States. We realize the importance of being prepared for any eventuality in case our country is attacked. New York City, in our opinion, would become a prime target and we are determined to be ready if such an attack should come.

We are approaching this problem without hysteria and with the knowledge that New York City, like other energetic and advancing communities, must be kept functioning regardless of the possibility of attack. We reject the take to the hills and make for the caves philosophy. We shall not adopt a policy of dispersion and decentralization. We propose to do everything within our power to see that our city continues as a major port and as the greatest industrial, financial, business and transportation center of the country. Any other approach would give aid and comfort to our enemies, and impede all out mobilization of our full strength.

We are happy that a report is being made by your committee looking toward the enactment of Federal legislation to coordinate and aid States and local governments in the civil defense program. The main issues are clear. The strategists are available, and no prolonged, time-consuming studies are necessary. Lack of a definitive, authoritative Federal policy, implemented by Federal law and appropriations, has to date severely handicapped the cities and States. Washington must come forth with policy, leadership and help.

IMPORTANCE OF NEW YORK CITY TO THE WAR EFFORT

New York City is the greatest city in the world largely because of its port, which in turn has brought great industries to the area. In peace and war, the New York port, which is at the crossroads of the world shipping lanes, sends more ships of all varieties to more world ports than any other harbor in the world. The great part played by the New York port of embarkation during the last war is well known to all. We are proud of that record and ready to renew and expand it if we are told what is wanted and when.

New York City is the nerve center of far-flung industries and business. It is the financial center of the world and our most important gateway. Moreover, many great industries are concentrated within the city upon which millions of people depend for their livelihood. Ours is the center of management and finance.

New York's unique geographical situation requires many bridges and tunnels to connect its various boroughs and provide communication with the surrounding area to the north and south. These bridges and tunnels are part of an expanding, modern arterial highway system. Our population is approximately eight million and our rapid transit carries to and from Manhattan Island below Fifty-ninth Street approximately two and one-half million people each day. Our bridges, tunnels, and arterial system move millions of people in and out of the entire metropolitan district with a population of fifteen million.

Anyone familiar with the factors which make a city function smoothly, including water supply, utilities, transportation, industry, and communications, will not take seriously suggestions that we prepare to

evacuate 8,000,000 people. There is no rhyme or reason in such thinking. It would be impractical to reproduce in the open country the public utilities and other services necessary to accommodate the millions of people in this and other large cities. New York will not be abandoned nor can our operations be suspended even for a day.

APPROPRIATIONS

Virtually all State and city officials are looking to the Federal Government to establish the mobilization policy and program to be followed throughout the country. These decisions must be made federally and be guided by a Federal agency, and implemented by Federal appropriations allocated fairly to the States and municipalities on the basis of estimated strategic dangers and needs.

There must be sharp differentiation between emergency disaster relief and long-range permanent construction so planned as to be usable for public purposes in peace as well as for civilian defense in war.

New York, like other cities, must operate on an intelligent budget for operating and capital expenditures. Our powers to levy taxes and incur debt are sharply defined, and limited. The State also is limited in its resources. We cannot plan and budget our program intelligently until we know what is going to be done on the Federal level.

CONTROL AND CARE OF BOMBED AREAS

We cannot make a really accurate estimate of the cost of housing, clothing, feeding, and providing medical attention for bombed areas. If we could predict accurately when and where attacks would be made, our Armed Forces could stop them, and our civilian defense problem would be simplified. Obviously, medical and other supplies required for the care of disaster areas must be stockpiled at various strategic points. These must be rushed to disaster areas as required, much as our Government and the Red Cross handle disasters in peacetimes. The cost of stockpiling must be borne by the Federal Government, and we in our communities must organize to use these materials when they are needed. We have attempted to estimate how much money will be required in our community for this purpose, and the results have varied greatly, depending upon the assumptions made by the estimator. We are not sufficiently familiar with the civilian defense needs to make accurate forecasts, and look to Washington for advice.

We do know that certain materials will be required and should be purchased promptly. The newspaper reports advise that the National Security Resources Board recommended to Congress an appropriation of \$632,000,000, subdivided into three separate categories for the purchase of special equipment to augment fire, engineering, transportation, communications, stockpiles of critical materials and medical supplies and for communications and control centers. If our preliminary checks of possible requirements in New York City prove to be anywhere near accurate, this amount will be inadequate if several communities are attacked at once.

SHELTERS

I do not know what type of shelters your committee will recommend. I feel very strongly that it would be a distinct waste to spend \$2,250,000,000, as suggested in some quarters, on shelters which would have no peacetime use. It would be impossible for municipalities even with State aid to finance the share of the cost of these expensive projects in the proportions suggested. States and cities cannot stretch their credit to 50 percent of the cost of such work. I strongly urge that you change this provision so that 80 percent of the funds are provided by the Federal Government with 20 percent contributed by the State and city governments. This is a more realistic approach. I also urge that any bill authorizing such shelters

enlarge the definition to include places of assembly, parking garages, hospital additions and other related facilities which will serve a permanent, public use.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES

The city of New York has a substantial hospital expansion program under way. However, the funds available within the exemption from the debt limit granted by the State of New York will be inadequate to complete even part of the program. Should an emergency occur today, New York's hospitals could crowd in a substantial number of injured persons on an emergency basis. We could not, however, cope with a disaster. Were we on the other hand to expedite our entire planned hospital program and expand it so as to meet the immediate future needs of the city of New York, the emergency needs in case of disaster could also be met. Obviously, as we increase the capacity of our permanent hospitals, we also increase our ability to handle emergency cases. More money must be made available for this program if we are to expedite it and have it serve our people after an attack. Our plans and finances must be adjusted now if we are to meet this emergency.

MASS TRANSPORTATION

Plans have been virtually completed for large-scale additions to New York City's subway system. These plans include a new subway in Second Avenue in Manhattan, a low-level express subway in Sixth Avenue, and other extensions. Funds are not now available to build these subways. It would be entirely feasible to excavate substantial sections of these subway extensions and to use these excavations as bomb shelters. Once the emergency is past, subway sections can be completed and returned to their intended use as extensions of the existing rapid transit system.

PARKING GARAGES

One of our greatest concerns is traffic congestion. This problem is serious, anyway. In the light of a possible atomic attack on New York City, it is frightening. I have recently appointed a city parking authority, and they are now finding ways and means of financing construction of parking garages to get vehicles off the streets. Parking garages can be designed and built to serve as air-raid shelters. There are other important uses to which these garages could be put in connection with civilian defense. Among them is use as temporary accident wards and hospitals. Great flexibility is possible in buildings of this type and they could be located at points of greatest congestion. We need parking garages in New York, having 12,000,000 square feet of floor space. We must have Federal help on this program.

I am in complete disagreement with those who have urged that the construction of combined parking garages and shelters be left entirely to cities. If this is done, no program which will meet the need is remotely possible. Funds needed for schools, hospitals, and other essential city services cannot be made available for the construction of parking garages and reduction of traffic congestion. It makes much more sense to build all-purpose buildings with shelter funds.

ARTERIAL PROGRAM

All studies by administrative officials, police, and engineers concerned with emergency transportation have shown that the express highway and parkway system constitutes the best means of ingress, egress, and rapid travel. These arteries can be controlled by proper officials and restricted to military and civil defense vehicles. We have a substantial program, including strategic expressways leading in and out of the city under way and the completion of these arteries is a defense requirement. Additional Federal defense funds should be made available to speed up this arterial program and push

it to an early completion. Our contracts are ready to let. We need funds and priorities.

PRIORITIES

Some dislocation of labor working in the construction industry is inevitable. Everything possible should be done to keep this at a minimum. In this connection, I urge you to take the steps necessary to insure that equipment and materials will be available for the defense program once the national administration has fixed it. I am sure you will find that Gen. W. H. Harrison, Administrator, National Production Authority, will agree that if the civilian defense program is approved as essential to the war effort, priorities must be determined accordingly. This will provide relief to labor which is in danger of unemployment, which will shake morale and seriously impede both mobilization and defense.

Additional information on the military and economic importance of New York City is attached.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to me by Mayor Impellitteri.

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

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y., December 19, 1950.
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR: I am attaching copies of the statement I made before the Senate Armed Services Committee in connection with the proposed civilian defense bill.

The last draft of the bill available before I left Washington last Friday still contained a clause prohibiting the use of any of the Federal funds for the purchase of sites for bomb shelters. It also limited Federal participation to 50 percent of the cost of such projects. In a congested community like New York, the cost of the site alone will be between 25 and 50 percent of the total cost of the project. This automatically reduces the Federal participation far below 50 percent of the actual cost. I doubt very much if the States will find it possible to provide adequate shelters if these provisions are not changed to increase the Federal share of actual cost.

You will see that I strongly urged that shelter funds be used to pay part of the cost of permanent projects that will be useful for defense and in peacetimes. Referring the combined parking garage and shelter program to the RFC is not the answer. Some form of subsidy or grant is essential.

I hope that you will help adjust this law to make it workable in New York.

Cordially,

VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I understand that the senior Senator from New York wishes to make a very brief observation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I merely want to associate myself with the remarks which have just been made by my distinguished colleague [Mr. LEHMAN]. I feel that he has hit the nail on the head, and that it is most essential that the matter of which he spoke be attended to at the earliest possible time.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Massachusetts has

a brief statement which he wishes to make at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand that the proposed Federal Civil Defense Act contains a provision granting congressional consent to interstate civil defense compacts.

I am particularly interested in this provision, having introduced, last September, Senate Joint Resolution 204, the so-called Lodge-McCormack resolution, which also provides for prior congressional assent to interstate cooperative efforts and mutual assistance compacts in this vital field of civil defense. In States of relatively small area, which are thickly populated, it is impossible to limit civil defense to State lines. In Massachusetts, in fact, throughout the industrial eastern seaboard, this provision has vital importance.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a telegram from Harold C. Ostertag, chairman, Northeastern Regional Conference on Civil Defense, dated September 22, 1950, enthusiastically endorsing this proposal, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

NEW YORK, N. Y.
SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Regional Conference on Civil Defense, sponsored by the New York Interstate Cooperation Committee and the Council of State Governments, and attended by State administrators, civil-defense directors, and legislators from the 10 Northeastern States, unanimously adopted today a resolution strongly recommending immediate passage of pending Lodge-McCormack resolution granting consent to the States to enter into interstate compacts for developing maximum of mutual aid in civil defense among the States. The States of this region strongly believe immediate action on Senate Joint Resolution 204 and House Joint Resolution 542 by Congress is imperative.

HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Chairman, Northeastern Regional
Conference on Civil Defense.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield so that I may make an observation?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The interstate compact provision of this bill is substantially the same as the one proposed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. This is one of the most important parts of the bill, and I know that the governors are extremely eager that the proposed act be in effect so that the States can legislate accordingly when their legislatures meet early in January. I am glad that the Senator from Massachusetts brought the matter to the attention of Congress and to the attention of the governors at an early date, because it is one of the most important parts of the civil-defense program.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Connecticut.

EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER'S SPEECH

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, before beginning my rather brief remarks

on the pending bill I wish to say that along with every other citizen of the United States I have given consideration to the message delivered by ex-President Hoover night before last. There will be many analyses made of the speech, and I intend to make my own close analysis of it and comment on it at some length after more reflection and deliberation. However, the importance of the speech is such and the necessity for pointing out to the American people some obvious things about it is so immediate that I shall venture to make some observations about the speech.

Mr. President, there was a specific denunciation of appeasement in Mr. Hoover's speech, and then a proposal was made to commit a most monstrous act of appeasement. Ex-President Hoover suggested that we turn away and retire to our own shores. In other words, says he, Turn the whole world over to the Communists except the Western Hemisphere. I would call the attention of the American people to the fact that the ex-Vice President of the United States, Mr. Henry Wallace, made substantially the same proposal in 1946. As a result he was driven from the Cabinet and denounced in unmeasured terms.

I would also call attention to the fact that in a treaty which we ratified in this very room within the past 12 months, this Nation pledged its sacred word to regard an attack on any of the treaty nations as an attack on ourselves. I do not believe the American people are going to waver on it. There is plenty of room for debate as to how we shall implement or fulfill that obligation, and I for one have some questions in my mind as to how we should implement it, but the world should be told that we do not intend to waver on our word, because that is not the spirit of the American people. It goes without saying that the obligation which we assumed is not unilateral. The Atlantic treaty nations—none of them—can contemplated waver on their obligations. I was happy to hear the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] announce today that so far as he was concerned he, too, denounced appeasement, and that he would have no part of it. However, I call his attention to the fact that the program enunciated by the ex-President constitutes nothing else but appeasement.

How many soldiers we should place in Western Europe for our own security I do not pretend at the moment to say. I think we shall have to study that question, and consider it very soon. I am not one of those who believe that the entire strategy of this situation can be settled in the Pentagon, and in the Pentagon alone. As a Senator of the United States I propose to have something to say about it myself, because it is partly my responsibility.

I notice, too, that the ex-President of the United States assured the world that the atomic bomb did not amount to very much. I do not know exactly the words he used. I do not know what information is available to him which is not available to me. I do not believe he should give that kind of assurance to the American people, and sing that kind of siren

song. That brings to mind the observations of another gentleman who has some reputation in this field, Dr. Vannevar Bush, who, I am told, has suggested recently that we could not successfully penetrate defenses with our atomic bomb. That must be good news to the Kremlin, the Soviets, and bad news to our friends in Europe. I do not think he knows what he is talking about. He is the gentleman who wrote a book in which he stated many theses and enunciated many propositions. I am reliably informed that in the book he made the prediction that the Soviets would not achieve an atomic bomb within 10 years. While the book was being printed the news of the Soviet achievement came out, and they had to stop the presses and he had to rewrite that portion of the book. After that I think no one took too much stock in the book. Therefore I do not think the Kremlin would pay too much attention to Dr. Vannevar Bush.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4268) to authorize a Federal defense program, and for other purposes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have tried to keep in close touch with the hearings on the civil defense bill. I think the Senator from Tennessee who served as chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee for this purpose and his colleagues and the staff are to be congratulated for the wisdom and sense of urgency which they have brought to their task. They have done an effective job and have met a rigorous time table.

I think that praise is also due to the National Security Resources Board; its Chairman, Mr. Symington; its acting Civil Defense Director, Mr. Wadsworth; and its legal adviser in this field, Mr. Sabin. They, too, through their recommendations, have contributed to the formulation of the bill which is now before us.

This bill is not presented to us as the embodiment of perfection. Indeed, perfection would be impossible, no matter how much time was spent in consideration, because the problem is so new and the field is so new that only concrete operating experience can tell us how the bill might later be improved.

Nevertheless, I am satisfied that this legislation is sound in principle, that it reflects the best that can be accomplished at this time, and that in the interests of national security it should be speedily approved.

I want particularly to congratulate the Civil Defense Subcommittee of the Armed Forces Committee for its accomplishment on three counts. The committee rewrote the original bill so as to place emergency powers under a separate title and so as to segregate these powers from the authority to be exercised during periods less dangerous and extraordinary than the time in which we now live. I feel that this recasting of the bill not only conduces to clarity but also helps keep the powers to be created more cleanly and effectively in line with the job that needs to be done.

Second, I want to congratulate the Civil Defense Subcommittee for its contribution in section 102 (a), which creates a Civil Defense Advisory Council. The Council can materially assist the Civil Defense Administrator and lend him both the value and the prestige of its advice. Furthermore, the Council is related to unofficial organizations without whose cooperation no sane civil defense program could succeed. I think the day will come when the Civil Defense Administrator will be grateful indeed for this provision in the bill.

In passing, incidentally, I wish to express my great satisfaction with the appointment made by President Truman as regards the top position in the existing civil defense agency created by executive order. Gov. Millard Caldwell, of Florida, is well known to all of us as an able, vigorous and public-spirited man, whose sole concern is with the security and safety of the United States.

Finally, I desire to congratulate the committee which reported out this bill for its wisdom in defining the conditions under which a civil defense emergency may be declared. It is only a recognition of objective truth to say that we are in an emergency today—a civil defense emergency, as well as other kinds of emergencies. The Soviet timetable does not appear to permit a rate of speed on our part short of our best effort.

For the sake of the record, I should like to offer several comments which I think may well form the subject of future consideration by the Congress. These comments reflect my own thinking based upon more than a year of study in the field of civil defense.

The bill makes no provision for federally organized mobile aid battalions which could move into areas so badly stricken that the State concerned and its neighboring States could not meet the emergency. The experience of World War II strongly suggests that expertly trained, full-time forces under the control of the National Government are an essential component in a realistic civil-defense program.

Second, the bill makes no provision even for limited reduction in vulnerability. A vital new defense plant could be constructed alongside an important old plant, thus making both a highly tempting target. Nothing is said about building codes that would require blast-resisting material in certain new construction. Although the spatial concentration of hospitals and fire-fighting apparatus in Hiroshima cost many lives that might otherwise have been saved, the bill is silent as to any move toward intracity dispersion of critical facilities. Nor does the bill contain language relating to the partial elimination of certain obvious "choke points"—such as telephone trunk lines concentrated in Washington, D. C., and railroad bottlenecks in Chicago. Needless to say, I am not talking about any widespread or major dispersal program. On the contrary, I would recommend powerfully against any such approach. But strictly limited steps—as simple as choosing a plant site a few miles from an existing plant rather than alongside, or locating a new

hospital away from other hospitals or constructing a new office building with reinforced materials—these steps may become highly important in meeting enemy attack.

In the same connection one of the more serious dangers that confronts us relates to radio stations, television stations, newspapers, and other media of communication under conditions of enemy attack. It is quite possible that Communists are even now organized to seize a radio station when an enemy attack may occur, and to broadcast messages generating panic and chaos among the populace. An irresponsible and reckless use of communications facilities could greatly impair our capacity successfully to withstand a surprise assault. I think the gravity of this problem is apparent simply by mentioning it. The bill before us has nothing explicit to say on this score.

The authority to be conferred upon the Administrator, even so, is so immense and so rife with poverty and criticality that I think at some time the Congress will want to consider the concept of a congressional "watchdog" committee charged with continuous scrutiny of civil defense. The checks and balances established in our Constitution are liable to be thrown out of kilter unless this great increment in the power of the executive branch is associated with stepped-up activity in the legislative branch. Furthermore, the Administrator ought not to be hamstrung by excessive statutory restrictions—but the very granting of such latitude, so necessary to his urgent task, demands that elected representatives of the people keep abreast of his actions through the "watchdog" mechanism. I do not need to remind Senators that the bill provides no appeal from the Administrator's decisions, even though he may conceivably aggrieve great States and millions of people. This factor underscores the eventual need for a congressional "watchdog."

I may say in passing that the civil defense subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, able though it is, headed as it is by the great and distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and having among its membership the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], to whom I have paid just tribute for the work he has done, is not equipped to do this job, because the work which is pouring into that committee—and I know a little about it—is such as to inundate the committee and its staff.

In this context I must also express concern over the fact that, as between listed critical targets, no provision is made for the possible necessity of priority treatment—even though a materials shortage, for example, might require that several areas receive special attention in the interests of national survival. I therefore suggest the future possibility of furnishing the option of priority treatment in certain cases—whereby the Administrator, on written request of the Secretary of Defense, would be empowered to grant priority to certain areas on the critical target list.

In this context Senators know how thoroughly I approve the civilian control principles which underlie the bill now before us. These principles are right and indispensable. At the same time, closest connections with the military must clearly be maintained, and we may therefore wish to consider the desirability of a statutory military liaison committee.

I offer these comments for the record only. The importance of speed in passing the bill before us is so great that I do not wish to make any issue of the points I have raised. At the same time I am reasonably certain that these points will figure in future congressional deliberation concerning civil defense. Indeed, they should be and must be considered. It is my hope that the Civil Defense Administrator and the executive branch may see fit to come forward with legislative recommendations dealing with what I believe to be the important issues which are essentially omitted from the present bill.

However, I do suggest one amendment at this time. It relates to the provision that would vest in the Administrator—a man appointed from civilian life, and without military knowledge or background—almost complete and exclusive legal responsibility for rendering what in essence is a military judgment, namely, the selection of critical target areas. Moreover, since the selection of those areas is to require the allocation of hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal funds, the Administrator might well find it easier to execute the decisions made if the decisions rested not only upon his judgment of the situation, but upon the considered advice of the Secretary of Defense, who, of course, will be in consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In the meantime, while I still leave it with the Administrator to make the final legal determination of the critical target areas, I have suggested that he be required, before he fixes these areas, to consult with the Secretary of Defense, and he in turn shall consult with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] that if the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] should be adopted in its present form, it seems to me it would involve the danger of the Administrator being able to make recommendation or make his decision on critical target areas only after receiving recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense, following consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That seems to me to throw the matter back into the lap of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and might very unnecessarily and excessively alarm the people of the communities where the areas are located.

I wonder if the Senator from Connecticut would not accomplish the same objective if, instead of using the word "recommendation," he would simply say "after consultation with the Secretary of Defense." That would leave out even

the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What we want to do is to establish the critical target areas, so as to divide the shelters among them and provide the necessary protection, but I do not think it wise to scare unnecessarily the people in the communities affected.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not know how one would scare the people more than the other, but I would be glad to accept his modification of the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment now pending be considered as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts, beginning on line 8 and continuing on line 9, to strike out "as determined by the Administrator" and substitute therefor "as determined by the Administrator after consultation with the Secretary of Defense."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At least once every year.

Mr. McMAHON. I was somewhat intrigued by the suggestion that it would be better not to say that the Department of Defense had anything to do with the critical-target areas, because then when we became active in an area our potential enemies would know that the military considered that to be a critical area. That is the greatest venture into fantasy I ever heard of, because at least we must give the enemy credit for common sense enough to know that if we start spending a great deal of money and taking considerable precautions in a particular area it is done after consultation with the Secretary of Defense.

I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have another motive in offering this amendment. Perhaps it is just as well that I state it. I look for a great many delegations to be descending on the Administrator asking that their particular areas be named critical areas, or that the critical areas he has drawn be enlarged. There will be a civil-defense activity proposed in a place—well, I had better not name any particular place, because it might be within the constituency of some Senator with respect to which it would be perfectly obvious there would be no sense in spending taxpayers' money to fortify it. So I would like to have the people know that when they come here to beat on the Civil Defense Administrator to put a shelter, we will say, in their town, he has an obligation to both himself and the Secretary of Defense. I think that will give some prestige to his decisions which might be very helpful and might save the taxpayers some money.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to understand the language exactly as the Senator has agreed to have his amendment modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the clerk state the language as modified.

The ASSISTANT JOURNAL CLERK. On page 12, beginning on line 8 and continuing on line 9, it is proposed to strike out "as determined by the Administrator" and substitute therefor "as determined by the Administrator after consultation at least once each year with the Secretary of Defense."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the language "once each year" may indicate that he is to consult only once a year.

Mr. McMAHON. I will drop the "once each year" out of the amendment because I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The language would be, "as determined by the Administrator after consultation."

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; "after consultation with the Secretary of Defense." That is its final form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the wording has been agreed to, let us have it read, so we may have it cleared up. Let the clerk state the amendment as modified.

The ASSISTANT JOURNAL CLERK. It is proposed to insert "as determined by the Administrator after consultation with the Secretary of Defense."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the language be so modified? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is so modified.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has the right to modify his own amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is correct. The amendment has been so modified.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, while we are considering this amendment I think a word or two about the legislative history would be pertinent at this point. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, in my opinion, is a good amendment in that it clarifies what is expected of the Administrator in selecting target areas, that is, that he will consult with the Secretary of Defense, and he undoubtedly will consult with other officials, because there are also other considerations, but, of course, he would consult with the Secretary of Defense, and the Chiefs of Staff would be the main ones from whom he would receive information and suggestions which would be of determinative value to him in making his selection.

I think it should be pointed out that on page 64 of the hearings Mr. WADSWORTH, to whom I join the Senator in paying high tribute for the work he has done, was asked a question. I read a part of it:

As I understand the legislation, it is your intention to utilize the military for * * * making target evaluations and supply that information to you which will then become an inherent part of your planning; isn't that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is correct, and I would like to make another statement along that line.

Then he went on to talk about the National Security Resources Board.

At the time the bill was being marked up in the full Committee on Armed Services, the following colloquy took place:

Senator KEFAUVER. May I call your attention to this fact, Senator SALTONSTALL, that the maps of the critical areas as gotten up by the Administrator have been sent to the Governors of all of the States. I believe there has not been one complaint about the selections made.

Senator RUSSELL. Did he get them up or did the Joint Chiefs get them up? When you

start bringing the Joint Chiefs in, of course, that is bringing in strictly the military.

Senator KEFAUVER. How were they gotten up, Mr. WADSWORTH?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They were gotten up after consultation with other agencies, including the Joint Chiefs. The list of the Joint Chiefs was only critical military installations. We had to add some on the population basis.

Then he proceeded with his testimony.

With respect to the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut not to put the burden on the Joint Chiefs, in the first place, we do not want to get the military into that part of the picture. In the second place, it would result in an inordinate burden if civilians and Governors and mayors were to feel that on this matter they had to come here and have consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There are other considerations. But I think the way the Senator from Connecticut has the language now drawn, which follows what they have already done in listing the critical areas, and their intent for the activities in the future, the provision is clarified, and does give direction as to what will be done. And I think it will lessen some of the pressure on the Administrator.

So, Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I very happily recommend that the Senate adopt the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, as modified. Without objection, the amendment as modified is agreed to.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I think both of us have accomplished our objectives. I want the local delegations, whom we wish to keep from bothering the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to realize that there is a necessity for the Administrator to go into very serious consultation with the Secretary of Defense, and that he simply cannot reach down and parcel out \$100,000,000 for this shelter or that shelter.

Mr. President, I shall close by again making a reference to the recent address delivered by the ex-President of the United States, who assured the American people that if they would just withdraw to this continent and wait for a break they could balance the budget; that is the promise he held out to them. Mr. President, if we follow that advice—and let me interpolate that Mr. Hoover must have been looking at a fiat map, instead of a globe, when he reached that conclusion—we shall spend three times as much on civil defense in the United States in the next decade as we propose to spend in protecting our security by keeping our word and retaining our allies. If we really wish to bankrupt the Nation in implementing this bill and in digging holes in the ground all over America, we should adopt the thesis of the ex-President for the defense of our Nation.

Mr. President, there never has been a piece of legislation which should be put into effect any quicker than that now pending. There are things which urgently need to be done, and we shall not be true to the best interests of the secu-

arity of our people if we delay unnecessarily a moment.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think all Members of the Senate are in total agreement with the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut about the necessity of enacting civil defense legislation. However, the final disposition of this measure depends upon how it will be handled in conference. I did not quite understand all the Senator said. I have been trying to arrange for some sort of recess or adjournment which will be agreeable to all Senators. I ask this question because I am interested in having constructive action taken: Does the Senator have in mind anything except the present plans about which we have been talking, or does the Senator believe we should remain here until the conference report on this particular measure is ready and until we take final action on it?

Mr. McMAHON. This morning I talked to the Senator from Nebraska, and I know what his disposition is. However, I have not heard of the result of his efforts to obtain an agreement to vote on the conference report on this measure during this Congress. Can the Senator inform me about that?

Mr. WHERRY. I think we are ready to report. I have contacted Members on both sides of the aisle, and I believe arrangements can be effected so that action will be taken on the conference report on this measure before the present Congress terminates. However, that probably will not be done until the 1st or 2d day of January.

I wonder whether the Senator from Connecticut has in mind anything different, relative to having the Senate take speedier action than that.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not anticipate that we could obtain quicker action than that on the conference report. Certainly I do not wish the present Congress to expire and have this measure die.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Because then we shall have a new Congress and there will be new committees, and it will be necessary to go through the hearings on this measure again; and that would delay getting these procedures under way. Of course, they should be gotten under way promptly.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that I now have a complete understanding of the observations and judgment of the Senator from Connecticut in regard to the handling of the conference report, and I believe it can be worked out accordingly.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; anything which can be done to assure that this measure and the conference report on it will not die will be quite satisfactory to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks which were made earlier today by the

distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in dealing with the peculiar and distressing problems of the major large cities of the United States in connection with civil defense. It is well known that the chief targets will be cities such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and so forth, and that the need is concentrated primarily in those cities. The acquisition costs for shelters will be high. The cities already are in great financial difficulties. I hope it will be possible to make arrangements whereby the Federal Government's share of the appropriations for these major cities will be greater than will be the case on the average for the country as a whole.

I also hope that arrangements may be made so that the Federal Government will deal directly with these cities, and will not be compelled in each instance to proceed through the States. I hope all these problems may be worked out.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to the civil defense bill, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, it is proposed to strike out line 1 and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "have been conducted by the Civil Service Commission and a report thereon shall have been evaluated by the Administrator. In the event such full field investigation by the Civil Service Commission develops any data reflecting that such applicant for a position of critical importance is of questionable loyalty or reliability for security purposes, the investigation will be discontinued, referred to the Administrator for evaluation whereupon the Administrator may refer such data to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conduct a full field investigation. The results of such latter investigation by the FBI shall be furnished to the Administrator for his action."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there are now in the bill provisions for handling the security angle. The amendment I now offer will, however, clarify those provisions; it is a little more specific in regard to carrying them out.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether he will accept the amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement before accepting the amendment, so that the position of the Administrator and the process through which this matter has gone, in order to reach the point where the Senator from New Hampshire has presented his amendment, can be clearly understood.

The bill as originally presented by the Administrator and as originally introduced in the Senate and in the House of Representatives provided that all Federal employees having to do with civil defense would have to be individually checked by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Section 409 of the bill, on page 27, also provides that everyone working for the Atomic Energy Com-

mission will have to be checked, just the same as is now required.

During the hearings on the bill, as appears beginning on page 118, Mr. Cozier, representing the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, came before the committee and said, in substance, that the work of the FBI had been so greatly increased by various laws which have been enacted that over a period of 3 months, for instance, the pending work of the FBI had been increased to the almost incredible extent of 63 percent, and that during that period the work assigned to investigative personnel had increased the workload per agent about 54 percent. He says that the personnel of the FBI was already on a 6-day week, and that it simply could not assume the responsibilities set forth in this bill.

Following that, we had a consultation with Mr. Caldwell, who feels that everyone ought to be screened; with Mr. Wadsworth and with Mr. Cozier; and the language which now appears in section 403 was agreed upon, which provides that employees shall go through the usual civil-service investigation, that the files of the FBI and other investigative agencies of the Government shall be checked, and that if anything shows up in any of those the FBI shall make an investigation, but that the FBI shall make an individual check of such employees who shall occupy "any position determined by the Administrator to be of critical importance from the standpoint of national security." Mr. Nichols and others of the FBI have informed the chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that even as it is, this gives them a workload which they simply cannot assume. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether that is correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am not very happy about agreeing to this amendment because I should like to see as many of the employees checked by the FBI as is humanly possible. But I am sure that, with the excellent Administrator we have, if there is any question at all about them from any source, or if he has any doubt about them whatever, he will exercise the right which he has under the Senator's amendment to require the FBI to make an individual check, and that is in addition to anything that may show up in a civil-service examination. So in order to try to satisfy the necessities of the situation in the FBI, I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference; but I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire I hope that in conference, if the House does not agree to the amendment, we may find some method whereby we may obtain a little bit more in the way of a check than is provided for by the Senator's amendment; but I think this is the best we can do at the present time. So, Mr. President, I accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, my colleagues, the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Florida, are about to draft certain language regarding a matter which pertains to the question of when the emergency powers go into operation, which is one of the vital points of this bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, it is proposed to strike out the word "the" in line 10, and all of lines 11 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

(a) The existence of such emergency may be proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, if the President in such proclamation, or the Congress in such resolution finds that there is imminent danger of an attack on the United States (as defined in paragraph (f) of section 3 hereof) by bombing or otherwise and that the national safety therefore requires the invocation of the provisions of this title. Any such proclamation of the President shall only be issued after he transmits notice of his intention to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as has already been stated, there has been some informal discussion of this particular provision of the bill, and I hope that the settlement of this question, as worked out by the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Florida, will prove acceptable to the Senate. It is agreed, as a matter of general procedure that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is wisely designed to prevent any general resort to the powers of this act on an emergency basis. It is agreed that there should be no power to resort to the provisions of this act in general throughout the United States, its Territories and possessions, except after Presidential proclamation based upon the stated conditions or the enactment of a concurrent resolution of the Congress, either of which would secure the widest possible publicity to the action taken. However, I think it is agreed, at least among the four Senators, whom I have just mentioned, that it is entirely conceivable that there may be great danger evident as to an exposed area or even areas of the United States, as defined in this bill, which includes the Territories and possessions, which danger may not be established with such certainty, or may not exist on such a clear scale as to require or justify at that particular time, the invoking of emergency operation of this law by either of the two methods just mentioned; that is, by Presidential proclamation, which will call into existence all of these emergency powers throughout the Nation, or the passage of a concurrent resolution by the Congress, which would create the same result.

However, the danger might be so imminent in the exposed area or areas, as, for instance, in Alaska, Hawaii, or at the Canal Zone, or at other places which

might be suggested, that it might be apparent that ordinary wisdom would require the creation of such a situation that these emergency powers could be quickly utilized in the threatened areas; as, for instance, by making available, to the civilian defense authorities in that particular area, of all of the transportation facilities owned by all the branches of the United States Government in that particular area, or by making available all the medical supplies, or by turning over all of the supplies of gasoline or of various other substances which can be thought of, which would have a direct bearing upon the ability of the civilian defense agencies there immediately to assist the civilian population to survive an attack, if such an attack should even-tuate.

And so this proposed language has been drawn, and I hope it will prove sufficient. It is thought that by this language the giving of the power to the President to invoke the emergency powers under title III and to furnish the rights to the civilian defense authorities which are given only by title III, without a Nation-wide proclamation or without the enactment of a concurrent resolution here, shall be confined to the exposed area or areas on the perimeter of our system. We believe that this amendment so confines it and so localizes any occasion in which these emergency powers would be utilized, without general proclamation or without the passage of a concurrent resolution.

My proposed amendment, therefore, would read:

(b) Such an emergency shall exist, as to a localized area or areas only, when the President determines that the national safety requires the invocation of the provisions of this title as to any exposed area or areas of the United States, and, after transmitting notice of such determination to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, directs the Administrator to proceed pursuant to the provisions of this title, as to such exposed area or areas of the United States, but not elsewhere.

Mr. President, I offer this as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to accept the amendment of the Senator from Florida, but I merely want to say a word as to the reason for the amendment.

On page 15 the committee very wisely has separated the general establishment of the defense organization in the entire bill into two groups of power, namely, one power that should go into effect at once so the whole thing can be organized; the other, the rather extraordinary power that would be exercised in the event of an actual attack on the United States.

The committee has done an excellent job in dividing those powers. I think the powers in the second part of the bill are not too great for an emergency, but I feel that under the language of the bill the manner of stepping into this emergency is almost too easy. Emergencies nowadays come pretty cheap, and already one of the requirements is that the President may declare the existence of a state of civil-defense emergency

only under certain conditions, one of them being a declaration of war and the other the existence of a national emergency declared by the President. We already have that. So that part of the bill is already obsolete.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have read the amendment of the Senator from Ohio and I hope the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will accept it. However, I invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Tennessee to the use of the word "imminent." The House bill uses the words "in the event of an enemy attack," which might be all over before we knew about it, or "the anticipation of an imminent enemy attack."

The distinguished Senator from Ohio also uses the word "imminent." That is the only word in his amendment to which I would call especial attention, having in mind whether there is not some other word that would apply a little more clearly to the problem we are trying to solve. Something that is imminent can be right now, or it can be a few hours from now; and yet an attack may come very suddenly and we might know nothing about it except through the CIA, or something else.

Mr. TAFT. I do not happen to think of any other word at the moment. I do not think the emergency powers should go into effect in the entire Nation and suspend all rules regarding contracts and a great many other things unless someone is willing to say that an attack is imminent. If he is willing to say that, and is a responsible person, I do not think we should wait until the bomb falls. I think we must leave that question to someone. One might be willing to say that an attack is imminent when the statement is not quite true. But I cannot think of any better word at the moment. If the Senator has one in mind, I shall be glad to consider it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I speak only for myself and not for the Senator from Tennessee. I think the word used by the Senator is better perhaps than any other.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Florida says, in general effect, that he agrees to that proposition. We should not allow these powers to be suspended everywhere until there is some imminent danger of attack. But he points out that there may be localized areas in Alaska, or elsewhere, throughout all the possessions of the United States, where it might be desirable, if such a state of emergency exists, not to commit the entire Nation to the suspension of all ordinary safeguards over the powers of the Executive. So the Senator from Florida has offered an amendment which seems to me to be entirely proper.

I would suggest that he might change the words in the first part as well as in the last line. Otherwise, I am glad to accept the amendment of the Senator from Florida and to modify my amendment to include his amendment immediately following the end of my amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, with reference to the legislative history of this matter, I desire to say a few words.

First, it was determined by both committees to try to separate the regular powers from the emergency powers, and, of course, to put into effect only the great emergency powers in the event that it becomes absolutely necessary for the protection of the country. In section 301 of the House bill it is provided that in the event of an enemy attack or the anticipation of an enemy attack, the President may proclaim an actual emergency for civil defense purposes.

The Senate bill provides, in section 301, that upon a declaration of war, or upon a declaration of a national emergency by the President, or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, certain things shall be done. If those things, or any one of them, should happen, the President may declare a civil defense emergency. The Congress may be asked to declare war, but that would not automatically put into effect the provisions of the bill, because the emergency might be in some remote place, and it might not be so substantial that we would want to have the great powers given the Administrator put into effect. Even after the declaration of an emergency such as the one which the President proclaimed recently, he might not necessarily put into effect the provisions of this bill.

Those are two of the ways in which this bill could be placed in operation.

The Administrator was particularly anxious that we write some section similar to subsection (c). A situation might arise in an area of the United States, including the Territories, but the Administrator might not want to alarm the whole country as it would be alarmed by a declaration of war or by the declaration of a complete civil-defense emergency. The Administrator and the President might not want to give information which would be of value to the enemy by making a proclamation that we had information that the enemy was massing for an attack, for instance, on one of the Hawaiian islands.

It was provided in subsection (c) that when the President determines that the national safety requires it, the provisions of the act may be put into effect by transmitting notices to the Committees on Armed Services, and directing the Administrator to proceed.

The subject was discussed in the full committee, and the subcommittee was authorized to try to draft language that would not be quite so broad as the language of subsection (c). I think the language which has been worked out by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other Senators is an improvement.

I should like to make it clear that we do not concur in the feeling that an attack may be localized. It is very difficult, of course, to tell where it might come. So that under the language "area or areas" the President may have a right to declare a civil-defense emergency,

under the latter part of the section, in a substantial area and not merely in some little island or some particular section. I understand that is the intention of the authors of the amendment.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not understand that the language requires that the President make a public declaration that the provisions of the act are being put into effect as to a particular area or areas, without doing it as to the whole United States. I wonder if there is any disagreement on that point. I think it would be unfortunate, in some circumstances, if the President had to make a public declaration in order to put into effect civil-defense powers in some remote territory.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the understanding of the Senator from Florida in offering his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was that under that particular provision, that third method of invoking, in some threatened area or areas only, the emergency provisions of the act, the amendment would not require any public proclamation by the President, but, instead, it was built upon the thought that it is quite conceivable that the warning of a threatened attack may not be later actually realized and that the situation may not justify either the expense of the national confusion, excitement, and apprehension which would result from a public proclamation either throughout the Nation or at any point in the Nation. We felt that, under that last provision, the President could proceed effectively after having made his determination and after having advised the Armed Services Committees of Congress, without any further conditions being placed upon his invoking, in that specific area only, the emergency powers of the proposed act. Is that the answer the Senator desires?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very glad to have the answer of the Senator from Florida. I think the legislative record should show what the sponsor of the amendment to the amendment has in mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to invite comment from the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. TAFT. I agree fully with what the Senator from Florida has stated. I understood that to be one of the purposes of his amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe also that all of us are clear as to the meaning of "imminent." Some of us may have wanted to use a stronger word, and apparently we could not agree on a weaker word.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I brought up that question so, if the word were changed in conference, the Senator from Ohio would be on guard, so to speak.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am certain that we all realize, in this atomic age, with airplanes able to fly through the air at such tremendous rates of speed, that the word "imminent" would not necessarily mean that an attack would have to be on the way before the proclamation

could be made, but would include reasonable grounds for believing that preparations were being made with the intent to bring about an attack on the United States.

Mr. President, with that explanation of the amendment, as modified, I think we have brought about an improvement in the language of the section, and have brought it nearer to what the Armed Services Committee wanted to do. I am deeply grateful to the Senators for the thought they have given and the work they have done on this most difficult point in the entire bill. I accept the amendment as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO MILLARD F. CALDWELL ON APPOINTMENT AS ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not want the occasion to pass without expressing my very great appreciation of the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut a few minutes ago in complimenting the President of the United States upon his selection of a person to serve as Administrator of Civilian Defense. The person who was chosen, of course, is a very distinguished Floridian and a former Governor of Florida, Millard F. Caldwell. I wish the RECORD to show that, speaking for the people of Florida, we are grateful for the selection of one of our outstanding citizens to carry this heavy load of responsibility on behalf of our Nation, and we are grateful, also, to the Senator from Connecticut for his gracious remarks. Because of his essentially high character and his great and proven executive ability, because of his distinguished career for 8 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, and his outstanding service for 4 years as Governor of Florida, during which time he was honored by his fellow governors by being chosen to serve as president of the National Governors' Conference, it seems to the people of Florida that the selection of Governor Caldwell is peculiarly fitting, and that his service should demonstrate again his executive ability, as well as his ability to work cordially with the Congress of the United States and the governors of the several States in a position which will certainly require sympathetic and cooperative action on the part of both Congress and the governors of the respective States. I again thank the Senator from Connecticut.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4268) to authorize a Federal defense program, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert:

Sec. . . After June 30, 1953, or after the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the Congress which declares that the powers conferred on the Administrator under the provisions of this act are no longer necessary, whichever shall first occur, none of the functions authorized under such provisions may be exercised.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the House bill contains the provision set forth in my amendment, except that the date is June 30, 1954, instead of 1953. In this time of emergency, when we are asked to enact a great deal of legislation which is not desirable in ordinary times, I think it is very wise, if we can do so, to establish a precedent by which a date termination is put on the various powers which we grant. The Committee on Finance has placed a date termination on the excess-profits tax, as an emergency tax. I think the date finally agreed upon with the House is July 1, 1953. It seems to me in the case of this bill that this is the proper time to fix a termination date, and that we should set the time for 2 years. The Eighty-third Congress will then have an opportunity during the first 6 months to extend the powers if it wishes to do so. Of course, if the emergency continues no doubt they will extend the powers. However, I think it is very important that the proponents of a continuation of emergency powers shall bear the burden of proof, instead of having the burden carried by those who wish to repeal emergency powers, after an emergency has passed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly to do so, but, representing the committee, I must very vigorously oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. In the first place, Congress at any time by the passage of a bill can terminate the legislation. It is no more possible to build up civil defense establishments on an interim basis than it is possible to build up our Military Establishment on an interim basis. The reason why the pending bill has been separated into three sections covering a long range of governmental powers, with emergency power granted in only one section, is to have established on a permanent basis a skeleton organization which could be activated at any time over the years when the situation demanded it. Of course, it is contemplated that Congress at any time could either repeal the legislation, or the Committee on Appropriations could reduce the appropriations, and thus reduce the size of the organization. At least, the organizational administration and the functions should be kept on a permanent basis, so that the organization would be ready to be activated in the event we entered another period of cold or active war or difficulty with another nation. The whole bill, with the exception of section 3, is based upon and written with the idea that it would be in effect until Congress terminated the act, as Congress has already terminated other war powers during recent years, but that we would set up a permanent organization to be used if necessity called for it.

In the first place, Mr. President, the bill allows the States to make compacts which are based, and intended to be based, on a long-range basis. The stockpiling of materials, the training of personnel, and all that sort of thing are expected to be on a permanent basis.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we could hardly ask the cities and States to put up the amount of money which would be necessary under this legislation in order to do a first-class job and to get personnel of the caliber necessary to carry on in a satisfactory manner, if it were known that in any event this activity would be terminated June 30, 1953.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator a question. If an emergency should exist in 1953, 6 months prior to the date set by the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, does the Senator from Tennessee have any idea that Congress would be reluctant to continue the law?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Not at all; but neither do I have any question that if we were at a time of complete peace and did not need the stand-by provisions of the law, the permanent provisions, Congress would repeal the act.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is simply a matter of opinion. My inclination is to go along with the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, because if an emergency should arise I am positive that Congress would continue the law. If there were no emergency, and the law should be repealed entirely, there is no reason why that should not be done. There is no reason why we should not say that it should end in 1953. Of course, it is a matter for argument. Personally I do not like to give continuing or perpetual power to any agency of the Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we do not wait to build our fire departments until we think there may be someone in town who is going to set fire to a building. We do not wait to start legislation about the hoof-and-mouth disease until after the disease becomes prevalent. We try to prevent the spread of the disease.

I should point out also that the pending legislation has not been conceived as emergency legislation, for only this period. The National Resources Security Board, under the chairmanship of a very able and distinguished public servant, Mr. Symington, started consideration of this program a year and a half or two years ago. Perhaps at that time the Board was under the chairmanship of someone else. This question was under study for a long time before the situation became more critical during the past 3 or 4 months. The so-called Hopley board was appointed, of which Mr. Hopley, who passed away recently, was chairman. It made an investigation and recommendations concerning civilian defense. That study started several years ago, before any immediate emergency arose. The Atomic Energy Committee has also been considering the subject.

At this time we are living in a world of emergencies. I think there is no reasonable expectation that by 1953 we shall have reached the period when we shall not need to have on the books at least the framework for the organization proposed by this bill. The fact that we are determined to keep the framework of the organization until such time as there is peace in the world may have some little persuasive value among those with whom we are in disagreement today. It may tend to persuade them that we are ready to go all the way, and are going to present our cause and protect our people so long as those with whom we are in disagreement want to upset the peace of the world.

Mr. President, the British tried the very thing which has been recommended by the Senator from Ohio. At the end of the war they had a fine civilian-defense organization, one of the most remarkable in the history of the world. The Armed Services Committee and the Atomic Energy Committee had the benefit of the studies which had been made, and what had been done by the British in connection with civilian defense.

After the cessation of hostilities the British abandoned the civil defense organization, together with its facilities. The personnel were completely dispersed. They left no organization around which to build when they started again, sometime before we did. They had to go through the task of reorganizing. They had to spend a great deal of money to rehabilitate facilities which they could have maintained over a period of years. I know that the British feel that it would have been much more in the public interest of their nation if they had had at least some kind of an organization to build around, and if they had not let everything be dispersed.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of the committee, I know that this subject was discussed in the committee room. After some discussion the provision referred to was left out of the bill as it was reported.

I invite the Senator's attention to a fact I am sure he knows, namely, that the House bill has a provision, section 412, which ends the act after June 30, 1954. In accelerating the discussion, and perhaps getting the matter into conference, I wonder how the Senator would feel if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio were offered to the emergency title only. I can see a great deal of argument along the lines which the Senator is discussing, in favor of continuing the permanent organization. I can see also what the Senator from Ohio means about giving Congress an opportunity to review the emergency powers and making the Administrator sell the arguments in favor of those powers, rather than the other way around. I wonder how a suggestion of that character, for the purpose of taking the entire question to conference, would appeal to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. With the House

providing that the act shall cease after June 30, 1954, and in view of the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts to apply the House provision to title III of the bill, the emergency section, there may be a very good opportunity for a compromise in the conference. But if we were to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Ohio we would not have anything upon which to compromise, except that the termination date would be somewhere between 1953 and 1954. I would very much prefer that the bill not have a termination date. However, I would recommend to the conferees that we agree upon the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts as a compromise of the difficulty.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I feel that I am right. However, I do not wish to delay the bill at this point.

In view of the statement of the Senator from Tennessee that he will follow in conference the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts and attach the suggested date to the emergency sections, I withdraw my amendment.

What I picture is this: We are setting up a new Federal department, with an Administrator at a salary of \$17,500 a year and a Deputy Administrator at a salary of \$16,000 a year. There will be 5,000 employees before one can say "Jack Robinson." This activity is going down through the halls of time with another Federal department. If I were sure that there would never be more than a dozen people doing a little planning, I would not object. But I think it is a mistake to set up a permanent bureau. I hope that the Senate conferees may agree to the House provision as it is.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why is the Senator withdrawing his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I have tried to reach an agreement with the Senator from Tennessee on other questions. He has been most reasonable. I do not want to press this matter to a knock-down and drag-out vote.

Mr. WHERRY. As one who listened to the debate, I was deeply impressed by the attempt that was being made by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Florida to have accepted what I thought was a very constructive amendment. I am wondering what is the serious objection to the amendment. If the Senator from Tennessee is willing to take it to conference, just what is wrong with it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I gladly accepted the amendment prepared by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has been adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for that statement. I was called off the floor in an endeavor to try to work out a unanimous-consent agreement. When I left the amendment to which I have just referred was under consideration. I felt that it was a very constructive amendment, and I am glad to hear that it has been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has withdrawn his latest amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment for the purpose of raising a point and asking the Senator from Tennessee a question about it. I think I can withdraw it in time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27 at the end of line 9, it is proposed to insert:

It is intended that the powers granted by this section shall only be used to finance projects deemed by the Corporation to be self-liquidating in not more than 50 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the report of the committee states very clearly that the power of the RFC to lend money up to \$250,000,000 is intended to be used only for self-liquidating projects, garages or other arrangements that may pay out the expense. But I did not find that statement in the bill itself when I read the bill. So I suggest the amendment. The Senator from Tennessee has told me that even without the amendment, under the RFC law loans can only be made which are in fact considered by them to be sound, and therefore, self-liquidating in one way or another.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, section 4 (a) (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation law provides that no loan shall be made unless there is a reasonable possibility of repayment and collecting the loans, unless they are sound investments, and so forth. That is not affected by this provision. The RFC still goes through its normal loaning activities, and requires the same security as is required under section 4 (a) (3) of the law, the only thing being that it may amortize investment for 50 years on civilian defense projects instead of 40 years as ordinarily provided in the RFC law. The hearings and everything we have had in the RECORD show that the intention expressed by the Senator is what the RFC would carry out.

Mr. TAFT. So the only purpose of the section, as I understand it, is set forth on page 7 of the committee report where it is stated:

These self-liquidating projects might require Federal financing. Accordingly, the bill authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for such purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. At the bottom of page 12 of the report, the Senator will find this reference to section 408:

This section is aimed in encouraging the development of self-liquidating projects to provide civil defense facilities, including shelters, utilities, hospitals, and so forth. It merely modifies existing law to permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to grant loans for such purposes with a maturity period of 50 years instead of 40 years as contained in present law.

Mr. TAFT. In view of the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has withdrawn his amendment.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering Senate bill 4268, to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I draw the Senate's attention to some startling provisions in the bill. I refer to page 19, section 304:

SEC. 304. During the period of such emergency, neither the Federal Government nor, except in cases of willful misconduct, gross negligence, or bad faith, any officer or employee thereof while complying with or attempting to comply with any provision of this act or of any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to this act shall be liable to any person, whether or not such person is engaged in civil defense, for death, injury, or property damage resulting therefrom.

Mr. President, I challenge the constitutionality of that provision. It takes from individuals the right of action against other individuals. I doubt not only the advisability but I challenge the constitutionality of it. And remember that the next section below, section 305, is as follows:

SEC. 305. During the period of such emergency, the functions and duties exercised under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

Mr. President, the individual is thereby deprived of the Administrative Procedure Act. We are setting aside the Administrative Procedure Act. There is not a scintilla in the bill which provides for tort action at all. What is more, by the language of section 304, which I just read, an individual is deprived of the right to sue when, as a matter of fact, his property rights may be involved in a case. I do not think the bill should receive the sanction of the Senate in its present form, and I hope it may not be considered. This is the first time these provisions have been brought to my attention. I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for a review of the whole bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senator will observe that section 304 comes into operation only during time of great national emergency when it is necessary to protect the lives of our people through the civilian defense.

Mr. McCARRAN. We are in an emergency now, Mr. President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We are not in the kind of emergency, I say with due respect to the Senator from Nevada, that action would have to be taken in the event we put into operation the emergency powers of this section. An attack would have to be imminent. During a time of attack I think the federal tort claim law, which was in the Legislative Reorganization Act, would have to be waived, if the employees of the Federal Government, under some circumstances, were going to be able to do a good job. The substance of section 304 is the waiver of the Federal Tort Claim Act. We discussed the matter at great length in committee and decided that during such a time as this, except in cases of bad faith, gross negligence, or willful misconduct—that is if they are following the instruc-

tions given them in the absence of those three things—the Federal Government should not assume the responsibility it has under the Federal Tort Claim Act. That act, of course, is supposed to be in operation during normal times and covering normal operations of the Government.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The emergency authority is granted under title III, is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. It is provided there that—

The existence of such emergency may be proclaimed by the President—

(a) Upon a declaration of war by the Congress;

(b) Upon the declaration of the existence of a national emergency by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

And then follows the third contingency.

Has the provision with respect to the second contingency been amended?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; by the Taft-Holland-Saltonstall amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the language?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The language in substance is "in case of imminent danger of attack."

Mr. WHERRY. So that in answer to the observation raised by the distinguished Senator from Nevada the provision still would be:

Upon a declaration of war by the Congress;
(b) Upon the declaration of the existence of a national emergency—

But now it is amended to make it only operative in case of imminent national emergency.

What is the difference between a national emergency and an imminent national emergency?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The words are "in case of imminent danger of attack."

Mr. WHERRY. For the purposes of the RECORD, what is the difference between that and subsection (b), as it now stands?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the Senator that a mere declaration of war does not put this emergency authority into operation; there still must be imminent danger of attack.

Mr. WHERRY. Do all three of the stated conditions have to exist before the emergency authority will go into operation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; the idea is that we might be at war and still might not put it into operation.

Mr. WHERRY. I wished the Senator to answer that question along with the question I already have asked.

At the present time a national emergency has already been declared.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But this emergency authority does not go into effect with the declaration of a national emergency.

Mr. WHERRY. But it would, as originally intended, would it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean to say that the original provisions of the bill, under subsections (a), (b), and (c) were that

the emergency authority would go into effect upon the declaration of a national emergency. Is that not correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; the Senator must read lines 8 and 9, to see what kind of national emergency is referred to in the bill. I read two lines of section 301:

The provisions of this title shall be operative only during the existence of a state of civil defense emergency.

That is the kind of emergency referred to in subsection (b).

Mr. WHERRY. Beginning in line 11, on page 15, in section 301, we find these words:

Existence of such emergency may be proclaimed by the President—

(a) upon a declaration of war by the Congress;

(b) upon the declaration of the existence of a national emergency by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress; or

(c) at any time when the President determines that the national safety requires the invocation of the provisions of this title and, after transmitting notice of such determination to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, directs the Administrator to proceed pursuant to the provisions of this title—

And so forth and so on. Now subsection (b) has been amended has it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; both subsection (b) and subsection (c) have been stricken out.

Mr. WHERRY. And new language has been inserted has it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] discussed that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will read the new language, I believe he will find it covers the point he has in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have that language read into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well; I shall be glad to have the Senator from Massachusetts do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The language proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which was accepted by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] as an amendment, reads as follows:

(a) The existence of such emergency may be proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress if the President in such proclamation or the Congress in such resolution finds that there is imminent danger of attack on the United States (as defined in paragraph (f) of section 3 hereof) by bombing or otherwise and that the national safety therefore requires the invocation of the provisions of this title. Any such proclamation of the President shall only be issued after he transmits notice of his intention to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress.

That is subsection (a).

Then the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] proposed an addition to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and it also was accepted, in the form of a new subsection (b), which reads as follows:

(b) Such an emergency shall exist, for a localized area or areas only, when the President determines that the national safety requires the invocation of the provisions of this title as to any exposed area or areas of

the United States and, after transmitting notice of such determination to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, directs the Administrator to proceed pursuant to the provisions of this title as to such exposed area or areas of the United States, but not elsewhere.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would as soon ask the question of my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, now that he has explained the amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That amendment puts the question of an emergency in a different category, I agree.

Let me ask this question: How is immunity from suit handled under the Holland amendment, since it relates to a localized emergency, as I understand? The Holland amendment reduces the emergency to local areas, first, and then—if necessary—deals with a national emergency. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under the Holland amendment, if an attack on Pearl Harbor were imminent, and the President did not want to set this machinery into operation for the entire United States, he could apply the emergency powers to that particular area.

Mr. WHERRY. Then would immunity from suit apply only to that area?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; then it would apply only to that area.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if I may answer a further observation of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], let me say, in regard to the section about which he spoke, that the Administrative Procedure Act, which he said would be waived in time of great emergency, provides for the orderly system of procedure, by means of allowing witnesses to be present, for instance. That provision and the other provisions which have been included in the Administrative Procedure Act can be complied with really only during normal times, but not during the kind of situation we are discussing in connection with the pending measure. I refer also to findings of fact, the right of appeal, and so forth, as set forth in the Administrative Procedure Act.

Our country got along without any Administrative Procedure Act at all until about 1946, as I recall; I think that is when the Administrative Procedure Act was passed.

Certainly during a time of great emergency, as is contemplated in connection with the pending measure, we should not apply the Administrative Procedure Act to things which may be done by the Administrator of the act now proposed or by his employees.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have been hopeful that this bill would not reach a vote today. It is a very important piece of proposed legislation. It is more sweeping in its terms than any which ever before has come to my attention. There are questions in my mind in reference to this measure.

Frankly, Mr. President, it contains provisions which I simply do not understand.

For instance, I call attention to the provision the Senator from Nevada discussed a moment ago, namely, that in regard to immunity from suit. I think I understand what was intended or what is intended by that provision; yet I wonder whether that will be its effect when it is placed in effect and is construed.

That section begins as follows:

SEC. 304. During the period of such emergency, neither the Federal Government nor, except in cases of willful misconduct, gross negligence, or bad faith, any officer or employee—

And so forth, under certain conditions—

shall be liable to any person, whether or not such person is engaged in civil defense, for death, injury, or property damage resulting therefrom.

I wonder whether that immunity is one which will be dissolved when the emergency is dissolved. That is one question.

I wish to ask several questions, and then I hope I may hear at length from the Senator from Tennessee in regard to some of the questions which are in my mind.

I also wonder about the provision in the bill with respect to the powers under title III; I refer to the emergency powers provided in section 303. I do not know whether any amendment has been made to that part of the bill, for I have been off the floor. The section in question, as it appears in the printed copy of the bill, reads as follows:

SEC. 303. During the period of such emergency—

I interpolate to say that means as civil defense emergency, as distinct from any other—

the Administrator is authorized to—

(a) Exercise the authority contained in section 201 (h) without regard to the limitation of any existing law, including—

Then certain specified laws are listed. That provision would appear to me to nullify every law on the statute books that protects the right of property. Section 201 (h) is the provision which gives to the Administrator the right to acquire property. It provides that he may acquire property by condemnation or otherwise. Of course, Mr. President, one way of acquiring property is by simply forcibly seizing it. We have laws providing compensation for the taking of property; but, under the terms of section 303, as I read them, all of those laws are nullified, and there is nothing left in the way of an obligation on the Administrator or the Government with respect to any property taken, not even the obligation of payment of compensation, because all laws are nullified. The language is "exercise the authority contained in section 201 (h) without regard to the limitation of any existing law." The provisions for the application of the right of eminent domain are limitations upon the Government. So far as I can see, they go out.

I go back now to the forepart of the bill, where there is provision for the creation of a Civil Defense Advisory Council,

and for any other advisory council the Administrator may desire to establish. Then, at the bottom of page 7, I find this provision:

(c) The members of the Council and the members of any other advisory committees, other than the Administrator, may be compensated at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be paid actual travel expenses and not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence.

That language is sufficiently broad to clothe the Administrator with the power, and it does clothe him with the power, to appoint advisory committees and pay them 365 days out of the year at \$50 a day. It is a pure delegation of absolute, uncontrolled authority, with no standard whatever to guide him in any action.

Certainly we want adequate civil defense, and I am not criticizing that. I understand what a tremendous job the committee has had in working out the bill. I have read as much of the hearings as I could. I just came from my office, where I had been poring over them again. I have not had an opportunity to read them through. I have had to pick out here and there some matter which I deemed of more pressing moment than a complete consideration of the entire bill or of the hearings, which, after all, to a very great extent, explain why the proponents of the bill desired certain provisions to be written into it. I should like to have had the opportunity to study them thoroughly. I think the Members of the Senate ought to have the opportunity to study them thoroughly.

I would hope, Mr. President, that we could discuss the matter, and I should like to hear from the Senator from Tennessee at length and have an opportunity to pose certain other questions to him; and then I could hope that we could let this bill go over until we return just before the close of the year or the close of the session, at which time other Members of the Senate, who I know are vitally interested in this matter, would have an opportunity to come equipped to understand what the bill seeks to do.

The report indicates—and I am sure that those who prepared the report believed, and do believe—that the philosophy of the proposed legislation is simply to make the Government of the United States a guiding authority to aid the States in the primary job of civil defense. It is so stated; and yet I have never seen a bill which so completely subordinated the States and their subdivisions to the arbitrary rule of an administrator. He prepares the programs. He presents the programs to the States. Certainly, the State can adopt or reject; but the State rejects at its peril; and if the program which it sets up, which it feels is a sound program, does not meet with the administrator's approval, then that State is out, and its people are without any protection under this proposed act.

With respect to the furnishing of financial aid, the administrator writes the terms; he writes the conditions. If he feels that the operation of the State

is in any wise unsatisfactory to him— not according to some standards of the Congress—he can refuse further aid, and nothing can be done about it; it is a final decision; and that ends it, until the Congress can act to correct what I feel is ill-advised legislation at the moment.

I call attention to the provision which I have just been discussing. On page 11, among the general powers of the administrator, to be exercised continuously and not the extraordinary powers in the case of a declaration of a civil defense emergency, we find that the administrator has the power to—

(1) make financial contributions, on the basis of programs or projects approved by the administrator, to the States for civil defense purposes, including, but not limited to, the procurement, construction, leasing, or renovating of materials and facilities.

That, Mr. President, is absolute authority. It is without limit. He may make contribution without limit for any purpose he may desire. The bill includes specifically certain uses for which the money is to be had, but there are the words "but not limited to," which make the sky the limit. Further, we find this:

Such contributions shall be made on such terms or conditions as the administrator shall prescribe—

And again—and we are now speaking of the terms and conditions—

including, but not limited to, the method of purchase.

He can tell them how to buy, and from whom, if he wants to and whether by bid or by privately negotiated purchase. He is there empowered to tell them what they may do with respect to any purchase that is made with this Federal contribution.

I read further:

But not limited to the method of purchase, the quantity, quality, or specifications of the materials or facilities, and such other factors or care or treatment—

And this is the only standard we find— to assure the uniformity, availability, and good condition of such materials or facilities.

Mr. President, that is not putting a primary responsibility on either the State or its political subdivisions. It is leaving the primary responsibility in the Federal Government's Administrator entirely. He does the directing, he writes the rules, and he requires the performance.

There is another question which is bothering me with reference to purchases with such funds. The bill is not clear on that point. I hope I have the attention of the Senator from Tennessee, because I realize how valuable, in time to come, in the construction and interpretation of this proposed act, the positions of the sponsors, including the chairman of the committee, are. If a contribution is made, I assume that with respect to any article or thing purchased title thereto vests in the States. I hope that may be the view of the committee. If it is not, then there are several other knotty questions arising.

On the next page of the bill we find language with reference to contributions to the States for shelters and other pro-

TECTIVE facilities. That, as I understand the philosophy of the bill, Mr. President, represents the most important single feature of the bill. It represents bomb shelters and security when bombs are falling. The language is as follows:

That financial contributions to the States for shelters and other protective facilities—

And so forth. I assume again, Mr. President, and I hope the Senator will put into the RECORD the views of the committee on this question, that as to such shelters and protective facilities for which there is a Federal contribution, title to them vests in the States. If it does not, then we run into the knotty questions of ownership by the Government of certain facilities on a piece of real property and ownership of the land by the State with certain powers of the Government to dispose of them if they are found either unsuitable for defense or inadvisable for use in the program.

Mr. President, there are a number of questions which, it seems to me, should have more attention than can be given to them here. I believe the submission of the bill to the Judiciary Committee would be helpful solely because it has a highly qualified staff in the field of legal draftsmanship, well versed in the rules of statutory construction, and so forth. Of course, the answer can always be made, "If we find it wrong, we can amend it." But it seems to me there is not at this minute a compelling necessity to act today. A waiting period of 7 or 8 days cannot affect the operation of this bill. That will be soon enough to go forward under it, particularly when we now have a defense establishment, established by Executive order.

Mr. President, I have received complaints from municipalities which feel that the bill, while, as some of them have said, gives lip service to the primary responsibility of local subdivisions, actually gives them none but places all the control at the top level, in the Federal Government, and as to any association they might have, or any dealings with the Government, they feel that they are going to be compelled to go through the State government. In that respect I want to say, in all fairness, that the committee has, I believe, been helpful in its draft in including the power, at least, to deal with subdivisions to a greater extent than was provided for in the House bill, as I hurriedly read it, but it seems to me those matters are very important. It is a cooperative thing. We must get cooperation at the local level, and there is need for confidence in the minds of those who represent the local level that they can go direct to the Administrator, if that be necessary.

I invite attention, Mr. President, to another matter which has just entered my mind. There is a provision in the bill for education by the Administrator and for a training program. The report of the committee indicates that it is believed this educational and training program will cost approximately \$10,000,000. If there is some figure that is reasonable, I should like to see a limitation as to the expenditure that could be made for that purpose written into the

bill. After all, this is the Congress of the United States. We are spending other people's money, and we want to do adequately and completely the thing that needs to be done, but in doing it we do not want to grant any authority on any page, sentence, phrase, or word of the bill that is not needed anywhere.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not want to prolong the debate, but the remarks of my distinguished friend from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] called my attention to the fact that in the matter of civil defense there has been issued by the Government Printing Office—and I invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to it—a very comprehensive and lucid booklet on how to prepare for an atomic attack. It tells certain things which a citizen can do and which a community can do. The only unfortunate thing about it is, speaking about expense, that it suggests that a copy of the booklet may be obtained by sending 10 cents to the Government Printing Office. I was hoping that through the civil defense bill those booklets might be made available to citizens free of charge, or for a stamp. The 10 cents is not important. The booklet is a good one. It is very concise. It is almost in the so-called primer class. It might be necessary for some of our citizens to know what to do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, referring to the question raised by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I believe 60,000 or 70,000 of the booklets were sent to States and cities for free distribution, but when anyone writes in for a copy he has to pay 10 cents for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But any citizen can receive one free of charge?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are, of course, important. However, the issues he raised have been discussed back and forth in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and in the Armed Services Committee, and also to a considerable extent on the floor of the Senate. I think the Senator will find in the hearings and in the report the answers to most of the questions which he so ably raised.

Let me say, in the first place, that the mayors and other representatives from his own State, and particularly from the city of Portland, have been among the most urgent in asking that Congress immediately enact this proposed legislation. The time is already late if the cooperative program envisioned in this proposed legislation is to be carried out, and it is absolutely imperative that the bill be finally passed by January 1 in order that the 44 State legislatures which meet in January can formulate their program, can enter into compacts with other States, as provided for in the bill, and can carry out the part of the program which is theirs and which is a large part of it.

Governors of States, mayors of cities, and associations comprising local officials have blamed Congress already for our great delay in passing the bill, and they are urging prompt action. The

problem has been fully considered. Everything in the bill may not be perfect, but in view of the urgency of the matter we have spent a tremendous amount of time on it, and we have tried to prepare a bill which would be satisfactory. In our opinion it is in good shape. Of course experience may show that certain improvements should be made.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to answer some of the questions raised by the Senator from Oregon, unless he wants me to yield on this particular point.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to ask the Senator to yield for a question with reference to the position of the mayors.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We have had, generally speaking, four groups of witnesses who have testified as representatives of cities, States, and municipalities. The Conference of Governors insists that the plan set forth in the bill should be followed. It is the Federal principle of dealing with States and letting the States deal with their local communities. Generally, that has been the way the Federal program has been handled in the past. The Conference of Governors urges that it be done in that way.

Witnesses for the American Municipal Association urge that the contact be on a sort of dual basis, that is, that the Federal Government deal simultaneously with the cities and the States. How it would be possible to work out a program to deal simultaneously with both the States and the cities, the witnesses were not able to say. The distinguished mayor of Portland, Oreg., Mrs. Lee, testified to that effect. I believe difficulty would be encountered if we were to get away from the principle of having the Federal Government deal with the States, and letting the States deal with their own political subdivisions.

Another practical difficulty is presented by the fact that in some instances one city runs into another city. For example, the incorporated city of Detroit completely surrounds two other incorporated cities. Mrs. Lee, the mayor of Portland, testified that some of the large industrial areas of Portland were located in counties outside the city of Portland, and even in other surrounding cities. In the case of Los Angeles, 5 or 6 cities run one into another. Therefore, how it would be possible to have one person to look to in situations of that kind cannot be explained. It seems to me that it would have to be left to the States to work out such problems with their own local communities on the basis of local cooperation. Furthermore, I think it is a good principle to try to keep the Federal Government on the basis of dealing with States, and not letting the Federal Government, through its agents, get into the hair, so to speak, of cities and municipalities, with all the resulting troublesome reactions.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Tennessee 100 percent in what he has said. As

I see it, the whole concept of the bill is directly contrary to what the Senator from Oregon has said, although I always have the utmost respect for his opinion. The problem starts with the individual. It works from the individual through the community to the State and from the State to the Nation. The whole principle of civilian defense, as I see it—and I worked on the problem for 5 years during World War II—is to stimulate voluntary action in communities. Without volunteers we cannot have civilian defense.

One of the great problems which developed during World War II was brought about by the Federal Administrator, the late Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, who, when called upon by a municipal, or other local official, would sometimes say things and make understandings and agreements which would completely upset the whole program developed with the State. The result was that one community would get one idea, another community would get another idea, and at the same time the State would be trying to encourage still another idea through municipalities and communities.

If the Senator from Oregon will read the policy declaration on page 2 of the bill he will see that it is the policy and intent of Congress that the responsibility for civil defense shall be shared by the Federal Government and the several States. The Federal Government must deal through the States. We have had a great deal of discussion on this subject, and we decided that it would be absolutely necessary to require the Federal Administrator to deal through the States. Furthermore, the Federal Government would provide cooperation in planning, and it would provide certain necessary equipment. Certain equipment would be paid for entirely by the Federal Government. The cost of other equipment would be shared by the Federal Government and the States. It seems to me that if the States are not sufficiently interested to put up their share of money for necessary civilian-defense equipment, the Federal Government should not put up a penny. I do not say that because we do not want to protect the States, but it seems to me that the impetus for wanting to protect their people must come from the States.

I can assure the Senator from Oregon from my experience of 5 years—and we started civilian defense in Massachusetts in February 1940—that people are afraid; that they want to cooperate if they have good leaders, and they will do their utmost. It must be done on a voluntary basis. It is not possible to buy civil defense.

I agree heartily with what the Senator from Tennessee has stated in response to the query of the Senator from Oregon. I believe the whole concept of the bill must be based on the individual. If it is not, I am not for the bill, and civil defense will not work, in my opinion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator, and he is exactly right. It has been urged all the time that it is the individ-

ual, the local community, the city, and the State through which the problem must be handled. All the Federal Government can be asked to do is to guide, suggest, and direct. I invite the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the bottom of page 2 of the committee's report, where it is stated:

It is a problem of survival to be solved by the individual, the community, and the State, under the guidance and coordination of the Federal Government. It is not intended that this program will be operated and controlled by the Federal Government, but rather that the Government furnish the necessary guidance and cooperation along with certain assistance in financing the program.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I feel more strongly than I can say the importance of passing this bill at this time. As one who has had a great deal to do with the handling of defense measures in New York State during the early stages of World War II, and the years spent in preparation, it is my opinion that we were further advanced in civil defense for a year and a half before we actually got into World War II, in December of 1941, than we are today, even though a shooting war is going on.

I handled civil defense in my State from the time the Defense Council was organized by me as Governor in 1940. I know that the coordination must be through the States. We cannot possibly be successful in our efforts unless the coordination springs from the State and the State is the responsible unit which deals with the Federal Government.

We had no difficulty in New York, and I am sure that my colleague from Massachusetts, who was Governor of his State at the same time I was Governor of New York, will testify that he had no difficulty in coordinating the activities of the various municipalities and counties. We coordinated the cities. We coordinated the police forces of the State. We coordinated the fire-fighting forces of the State. We made arrangements so that one city would help another city if the need should arise. It was all carried out under the encouragement and direction of the Federal Government.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The State of New York and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts had very distinct understandings between them.

Mr. LEHMAN. We certainly did. As a matter of fact, the State of New York had distinct understandings with other neighboring States.

Mr. President, I could not go back to New York and acknowledge that I was willing to have the Congress adjourn while a measure of this importance was pending. The minds of the people of New York—and I do not think they are different from the people of other States—are definitely fixed on the idea that we must develop our civilian-defense machinery and be ready to defend our people if the need should unhappily arise. In justice to the people whom we represent, I think we must enact at this time a civil-defense program which will

at least be reasonably adequate. I do not claim that this bill is perfect. I read a statement earlier in the day, upon which I commented. I stated that there were certain things in the bill which I believed could be improved. I spoke not only for myself, but for the mayor of the great city of New York. I hope and expect that when the Congress meets again next year, whatever weaknesses there may be in the law will be removed and we can have a more perfect law. But the bill before us at least will tide us over. It will start the ball rolling, and will make it possible to give reasonably adequate defense to the people of the country.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me to propound a question to the Senator from New York?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Has the Senator from New York studied the bill before the Senate?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have studied it with some care.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator from New York vote for a bill which he felt and knew contained provisions which were directly contrary to the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. LEHMAN. If I knew that they were directly contrary to the Constitution of the United States, of course I would not vote for such a bill. But I am not at all convinced that the provisions of the pending bill are contrary to the Constitution of the United States. I understand that the committees in both the House and the Senate have carefully studied the situation. Certainly, there is no indication that there are any provisions which are definitely contrary to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not wish to yield the floor at this time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield for as long a speech as the able Senator from New York has just made?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to make an inquiry of the able Senator from Tennessee. I invite his attention to section 201 (h), in line 19, on page 10. Under this paragraph the Administrator is authorized, not merely in a time of emergency, but during the life of the bill, whether there is an emergency or not, to—

(h) procure, by condemnation or otherwise, construct, lease, transport, store, maintain, renovate or distribute materials and facilities for civil defense, with the right to take immediate possession thereof.

There is nothing in the bill that says what he shall pay for them, or how he shall pay for them. There is nothing in the bill which provides that such properties must be returned to their original owners when they are no longer needed in the program.

I believe that the Administrator of Civil Defense should have the right to take such action during an emergency, that is, when the President has declared

the emergency or when we are at war. But this provision would give the Administrator the right to do such things in the normal operations under the act. I do not know why we should give the Administrator more power than we gave the President of the United States under the 1950 Defense Production Act. Under title II of the 1950 Defense Production Act, section 201, we established a formula under which the President could acquire, condemn, and take over property; also a formula under which, when the Government had finished with the property, it was to be returned to its original owner. Here it is proposed to give the Administrator a blank check, not in time of emergency. I think he ought to have such authority in time of emergency, but we are proposing to give him a blank check during the life of the bill, and the life of the bill might well be 50 years.

I am one of those who feel that we should always have on our statute books legislation dealing with civilian defense, but the pending bill would give the Administrator—not the President of the United States—the right to take over property and keep it forever. There is nothing in the bill which requires that when the Government no longer needs the property it shall be returned to its original owners. There is nothing in the bill as to the method of disposition of the property.

Mr. President, I propose to offer an amendment before we are through today, to substitute the language of section 201 of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think that I can save the Senator a little time in that connection. I fully agree with the Senator from Indiana. The Senator will observe, on page 14, section 202, that it was the intention of the committee to put into operation title II of the 1950 Defense Production Act and make it applicable to this act, so that the same procedure would be followed as would be followed in the amendment which the Senator is about to propose. The hearings sustain the idea that that is the purpose of section 202. However, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] had some misgivings about it, and did not think it was quite as clear as it should be, so he submitted an amendment which contains title II of the Defense Production Act. It is the same as the language of the Defense Production Act, with the exception that the Administrator is substituted for the President. So that part of the Defense Production Act is now explicitly made a part of this bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. If we are to do that, does not the Senator believe that it will be necessary to eliminate subsection (h) from section 201?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not understand the situation. What does section 202 mean?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Subsection (h) of section 201 is the normal language applying to any agency which has the right to procure anything. There are several ways in which property can be procured. It can be procured by condemnation. It

can be procured by filing with the district attorney a notice of entry and taking over, paying for it later. It can be procured by rental, by purchase, and, of course, in many other ways. That language is the usual language which is found in any statute by which any administrator is given the right to procure property. It does not waive any of the requirements of condemnation or any of the protections which are usually provided. That language will be found in the case of any corporation or administrator given the right to procure property.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I find that we did adopt an amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York which apparently covers the situation. Does it fully cover what we have been discussing?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, I think it does.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall study it and try to ascertain if it does. If it does not I shall talk about it a little later.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR DONNELL

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me to pay tribute at this time to my colleague from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, if I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Tennessee yielding for that purpose? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words, inadequate though they be, about my distinguished colleague from Missouri who will not be with us in the next Congress.

I wish to express the deep sense of personal satisfaction I have had in serving in the Senate with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. During that time, and before, he has rendered outstanding service to his State and to his country.

I need not tell his colleagues here that he is a brilliant scholar and a tireless worker. His high sense of honor, his scrupulous honesty, and his intellectual integrity are proverbial. If a thing is right to the senior Senator from Missouri it is right, and if it is wrong, it is wrong and that is all there is to it.

In the Senate he judged with the fear of God in his heart. The truth is his Bible and he carries it with him always. I believe I express the sentiment of all his colleagues when I say that we wish him continued health and happiness and good luck in whatever he undertakes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am most happy that the junior Senator from Missouri rose and uttered the kind words he did in behalf of his colleague [Mr. DONNELL]. Everyone knows that I do not happen to subscribe to his political philosophy, but I have observed him in committees and in the Senate Chamber, and I wish to say amen to all that has been enunciated by the junior Senator from Missouri respecting his colleague.

I am very devoted to the State of Missouri. As the Senate knows I happen to be of Spanish extraction. The first contacts my ancestors had with the Anglo-Saxon civilization of the United

States of America was through Missouri. The American flag was raised in the Mexican Territory by Missouri troops who left Independence, Mo., in 1843. Since statehood we have had two governors who were natives of Missouri. Our basic law in New Mexico is still the Spanish Code.

I believe I know the history of Missouri. From early days to this moment Missouri has had great men to represent her in the Senate. But I can say in all sincerity that Missouri has had no better man to represent her in the Senate than the senior Senator from Missouri, who is to leave us when the present Congress adjourns.

Again I say amen to all the junior Senator from Missouri has said respecting his colleague.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to join in the laudatory remarks which have just been made relative to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. I join with the Senator from New Mexico in expressing my appreciation to the junior Senator from Missouri for the glowing tribute he has paid to his colleague, who is in every way a man worthy of membership in the United States Senate. No one here will dispute the statement that we all agree that the senior Senator from Missouri ranks among the highest of our citizens for ability and integrity. He is very able, influential, and studious. His character is above reproach.

I wish to join with other Senators in extending to him best wishes for his happiness wherever he may go, and to say to him that we shall greatly miss him, especially because of his industry and energy in the committees of the Senate and on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add about three sentences to what has been said about our colleague, FORREST DONNELL. I have served with him as a colleague in two capacities. We both served as governors of our respective States simultaneously, and we have now served together as Senators of the United States.

I have never known a man who has been more courteous, who, when I visited his State, was more hospitable, or who has been more sincere and conscientious in his work for the government of Missouri, and more lately for the Government of our whole country.

I shall greatly miss him as a friend and as a colleague in this body.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me to pay tribute to our colleague the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose under the same circumstances as I yielded previously.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to read into the body of the RECORD the following tribute to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, subscribed to

unanimously by the members of the committee:

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, TRIBUTE TO ELBERT D. THOMAS

In these closing days of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, we, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, are saddened by the forthcoming departure from our group of our respected chairman, ELBERT D. THOMAS. In recognition of his distinguished record of public service and as a token of our warm personal regard for him, we, his colleagues on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, are honored to pay him this tribute.

His great vision and his unselfish devotion to the welfare of the American people have materially contributed to a permanent record of legislation serving their interests. Included in this legislation are such important landmarks as the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, the Science Foundation Act, and many other important measures designed to improve and serve the welfare of the people of this country. His record, which is written in the history of legislation before Congress during the period of his service, more than any statement we could make, reflects the outstanding public service which this great American, for whom we have a deep and affectionate regard, has rendered.

His unique personal qualities, his sympathetic understanding, his unselfishness, and his high character have made of each of us a warm and personal friend. It is in token of this friendship and out of regard for his statesmanlike qualities that we, his colleagues, set down our signatures.

JAMES E. MURRAY, LISTER HILL, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, MATTHEW M. NEELY, ROBERT A. TAFT, FORREST C. DONNELL, WAYNE MORSE, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, CLAUDE PEPPER, GEORGE D. AIKEN

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4268) to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me inquire of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether it is true that sections 304 and 305 are in the House bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; it is true that they are in the House bill.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the intention of the Senator, is it not, to have the text of the Senate bill substituted for that of the House bill, as an amendment after the Senate bill, as amended, is passed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the fact that there has been so much colloquy about sections 304 and 305—colloquy engaged in by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and other Senators—would it in any way jeopardize the final action on the bill if we were to strike sections 304 and 305 from the Senate bill, and then pass it? Under those circumstances, inasmuch as those sections are in the House bill, the subject matter of those sections would then be before the conferees.

I make that suggestion in view of the fact that there has been so much debate in the Senate in regard to those two sections. How does the Senator from Tennessee feel about removing those two sections from the Senate bill, and then

letting the bill go to conference? Under those circumstances, those two sections would be in issue before the conferees, and that matter would be a subject for consideration by us when the conference report comes back to the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In answer to that question, let me say that the provisions of this bill in regard to procurement and many other matters—

Mr. WHERRY. I am speaking of sections 304 and 305. They contain provisions with regard to immunity from suit and waiver of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator will find the same general principles covered by Public Law 875, a law to give Federal assistance to State and local communities in case of major disasters.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not dispute that, and at this time I am not disputing the merits of those provisions. I am simply asking whether it is true that section 304 or a provision similar to it is contained in the House bill. Is it also a fact that the provisions of section 305 of the Senate bill are to be found in the House bill? If so, in view of the fact that considerable colloquy seems to have developed in the Senate in regard to those provisions, I would suggest that those two sections be omitted from the bill as it is passed by the Senate. That action would not jeopardize the passage of the bill, and thereafter it would be up to the conferees to determine whether to include or exclude those sections.

Would not it expedite the procedure to have us omit those two sections from the bill, and then let the conferees act on those matters in accordance with their best judgment, in connection with drawing up the conference report?

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the text of the Senate bill, as amended, is substituted for all after the enacting clause of the House bill, by unanimous consent, at the conclusion of the debate, will not all parts of the bills be in dispute? In other words, the conferees could then rewrite any section.

Mr. WHERRY. They could if the language were omitted. But if this language is written into the bill, and if it also is written into the House bill, nothing will be in dispute, so far as that language is concerned. Is not that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under the rule laid down at one time by former Senator Pitman, who at that time was acting as Presiding Officer, if the Senate bill constitutes an amendment, I think the conference may rewrite the entire bill, so long as what is inserted is germane.

In any event, I say to the Senator that I know there are at least some differences between section 304 as contained in the Senate bill and the similar section of the House bill. I have not examined section 303 in detail.

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely making the suggestion. I have been very much interested in several of the questions asked during the colloquy—for instance, questions about the authority provided by sections 304 and 305. Nevertheless, I am quite satisfied that if those two sections were dropped from the Senate bill,

inasmuch as similar—if not identical—provisions are contained in the House bill, these provisions then would be before the conference.

I make that suggestion at this time in order to expedite the procedure in connection with the handling of the bill.

On the other hand, if these sections are included in both bills, there will be nothing on that subject to come before the conference, because those issues will then be settled.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the suggestion very much.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, with the understanding that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota, with the understanding that the Senator from Tennessee does not thereby yield the floor. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute, Mr. President; unanimous consent must be obtained for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Perhaps the Chair did not understand the request.

Is there objection?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have some questions about this bill answered.

Of course, the Senator from Tennessee is not required to yield, and I do not want him to yield if he does not wish to do so. Nevertheless, I wish to ask some questions about the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also wish to ask some questions about the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have reserved the right to object to the unanimous-consent request, and I am speaking on that subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not hear the Senator, unfortunately.

Mr. CORDON. I am sorry if I did not speak loud enough.

Mr. President, let me say that I will not object if I correctly understand that the Senator from Minnesota does not intend to take too long in making his remarks. I wonder whether the Senator will indicate how long he intends to speak.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was going to ask a question or two about the pending measure.

Mr. CORDON. Oh, very well, then.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I am not objecting to the proposed unanimous consent, but there is no need for such unanimous consent if the questions which are to be asked relate to the pending bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I ask what is before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Was unanimous consent requested?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was, and it has been granted. The bill

is open to further amendment; no amendment is pending at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my inquiry of the Senator from Tennessee is in reference to what provision is made in this measure for further consideration by the Congress of some of the problems which might arise under the administration of a civil defense act. In other words, there has been some conflict here today as to the committee jurisdiction of this measure. It has been suggested that the bill should go to the Judiciary Committee. The bill has been reported by the Armed Services Committee.

I believe that the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] spoke about the necessity for the creation of a special committee to watch over the activities of civil defense. For the purpose of the RECORD, I should like to have the observation of the Senator from Tennessee as to what he thinks would be the procedure or the machinery for further consideration on the part of the Congress of civil defense activities. Where would mayors come, where would governors come, where would interested local groups come, to obtain further information?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has asked the question, because certainly no one claims that this measure will be the final answer. I said in the beginning that this measure is only one of the bills which will have to be passed in connection with civil defense.

Of course, it is contemplated that it will be necessary for the Congress to enact a compensation law. Perhaps it will be necessary for the Congress to pass a bill—which might be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee—in regard to the financing of certain kinds of self-liquidating projects.

However, this bill contains provision for a 12-man advisory council to be appointed, and to be known as the Civil Defense Advisory Council. Section 102 of the bill deals with that Council, which is to be appointed by the President, with half its members to be taken from a slate submitted by the Council of State Governments, the Governors' Conference, the American Municipal Association, and the United States Conference of Mayors. It is expected that the Administrator will advise with this council a great deal.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield further for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the observation of the Senator from Minnesota, and it is, I believe, expressly written in the language of the bill, that it is a Federal-State-local Government relationship as outlined and projected under the terms of the bill. I merely say by way of suggestion, that we have had many special committees in the Congress which have taken up subject matters of importance, such as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Senate Select Small Business Committee. While I believe in using the straight line committees, that is, the normal committees of the Congress, it may be necessary in the days to come to establish

a special committee to review the tremendous powers which are authorized under this bill.

I make the further observation that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has a subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. It appears to me that some difficulties will arise in connection with the Federal-State-local Government administrative relationships, and that it would possibly be proper for the full committee to give some consideration to those problems.

I wondered whether the Senator from Tennessee, as he has studied this bill, would find any objection, for example, to an intergovernmental relations committee to give careful scrutiny to the operations of this act, and possibly if in the foreseeable future the necessity should arise, of having a specialized committee—a joint committee, possibly, or a special committee of the Senate—to give further study to civilian-defense operations and administration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, answering the inquiry of the distinguished Senator, I think there might be some merit in such a committee, but we are establishing a good many committees to watch over various activities, and I believe it would be better to go along and see how the administration of this bill is going to operate, and, for the time being at least, let the normal Senatorial committees, plus the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, try to handle the problem. I am sure, if something of that kind becomes necessary and urgent, the advisory council, which is provided for, or the Administrator, will bring it to the attention of Congress, so that we can adopt appropriate legislation and act on it; but, for the time being, I should rather not commit myself as favoring a special committee to oversee the operations of the act.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield further for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely want to say to the Senator that the observations which have been made here today as to the urgency for this legislation are surely pertinent and to the point. I had the privilege of meeting with the municipal officers of my State, and they are desperately concerned about the confusion which now exists in the whole field of civilian defense. I believe the Committee on Armed Services, and particularly the Senator from Tennessee, has performed a distinct service by bringing about the consideration of this bill, and I know it is going to do much to clarify the situation and to point a way.

I hope that the Senate will act expeditiously upon it. It seems to me it is vitally important that this proposed legislation be passed within the next 2 or 3 days—or today, I would hope—so that we can assure the governors and the local officials and the State legislatures and city councils as to what the relationship of responsibility is between Federal, State, and local government. I merely wanted to urge the favorable consideration and speedy passage of the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator. I want to say that all the mayors and the governors feel that it is very urgent that the bill be passed; in fact, they feel that it should have been passed many, many months ago.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator from Oregon will let me answer some of the questions he has already asked, I should like to do that first. I am afraid there may be so many questions that I cannot answer them, anyway.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question relating to a matter to which the report of the committee does not seem to advert?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question.

Mr. CORDON. What is the view of the Senator from Tennessee as to the legal effect of the language found in paragraph (f) on page 18, beginning in line 21? It reads:

And to incur obligations on behalf of the United States for civil-defense purposes as authorized in this act.

The question is, Does the Senator construe that to be an unlimited, unqualified delegation of contract authority to bind the United States during the emergency period?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the Senator has asked that question. This is a statement of what all war agencies have a right to do; that is, they can employ temporary employees to meet an emergency, without regard to civil-service law, but, before they can become permanent, such appointees must qualify under civil-service law. It is only to meet an immediate situation. The Senator will see that that provision comes under title III of the act. In other words, if it were necessary to get additional employees to help out in an emergency, it would be too slow a process if we were required to go through the civil service, without making some temporary appointments.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question on the same matter?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is it the Senator's view that the language, "and to incur obligations on behalf of the United States for civil-defense purposes as authorized in this act," is limited only to obligations for the temporary employment of additional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, I did not intend that. The second part of subsection (f) means that the Administrator can incur an obligation to build an emergency shelter, or to remodel a subway, or something of that sort, under his emergency power, to take care of people who may be in jeopardy.

Mr. CORDON. Does not the language, however, grant him the unqualified and unlimited authority to contract and bind the Federal Government in any field within the purview of the act?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, that is correct within the purview of civil defense, so long as it is operated for the purpose

of protecting people, as provided by the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has not answered the question asked by the Senator from Nebraska about sections 304 and 305.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the Senator, I do not think that is a proper way to legislate. Sections 303 and 304 are in the bill. If any amendments are indicated, we shall be glad to join in accepting any amendments which in our opinion represented an improvement; but I think it might be setting a very bad precedent merely to omit sections of the bill on the idea that they would be in conference.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not asking the distinguished Senator to mutilate the bill. All I am stating is that those provisions are in the House bill, and that the thing the Senate is working toward is a deadline for the passage of the bill, and there has been a great deal of objection. I am not even going to put my suggestion in the form of a motion, because, after all, I must leave it to the wisdom of the manager of the bill on the floor. But it is one way by which we can preserve any right which the conferees may have to look this thing over and bring it back through a conference report, according to their best judgment, and still not delete provisions which are found in the House bill which cover the subject matter of sections 304 and 305. It is one way to expedite it without getting into difficulty about the passage of the bill at this time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If this bill were, by amendment, substituted completely for the House bill, could any part of the bill then be rewritten in conference, provided the portions so rewritten were germane?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that paragraph 3 of rule XXVII be read. The clerk will read it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Rule XXVII, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, reads as follows:

3. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I would rather go along with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I interpret the rule, it would be a germane subject, and the conferees could do what they chose with reference to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Everything will be in conference.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Do I correctly understand the Chair to mean that if the amendment is adopted everything will be in conference?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in answer to the questions asked by the Senator from Oregon, let me say that he first asked about compensation for any property taken by the Administrator under the act. It was and is the intention of the committee, as set forth in the hearings, to provide in section 202 that the provisions of title II of the Defense Production Act be applied to this bill. That provides methods of arriving at compensation. But, in order to clarify it entirely and to remove any doubt about it, the committee and the Senate accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] which makes it very clear. It deals with compensation.

In that connection the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] was also going to propose a similar amendment. He has advised the chairman of the committee that the amendment meets the point he had in mind and that it is acceptable to him.

The next question asked by the Senator from Oregon was as to what would become of the property involved. The title to property acquired by full contribution on the part of the Federal Government, such as the communications system or any property for which the Federal Government pays the entire amount, belongs to the Federal Government.

With reference to shelters on a 50-50 sharing basis, the title is in either the State or the local community, depending on what the legislation of the State provides for, or depending on the arrangement between the political subdivisions. Most of these things are provided by executive order, and the States want to pass on the subject, but they cannot do so until this bill is passed.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] fully answered the inquiry as to where the primary responsibility lies. In the declaration of policy, in the whole history of the legislation, and in the report the primary responsibility is in the community or State, and the only thing the Federal Government is trying to do is to give suggestions and directions, so that we can have uniformity in practice. Of course it rests upon the Federal Government with reference to the imminence of attack, the approach of planes, or the imminence of bombing, and matters of that sort.

The Senator from Oregon also asked with reference to section 303. The only purpose of section 303 is to exempt the Administrator from the operation of certain statutes which would make it impossible for him to operate quickly enough in case of a great national emergency. The statutes are set forth on page 10 of the report. The first one is 610 United States Code 278a, which pro-

vides that in the leasing of buildings to the Government the maximum rental shall not exceed 15 percent of the fair-market value.

The Administrator, in a time of emergency, would have the right to lease a building without going into the question of whether it exceeded 15 percent of the fair-market value.

The next statute listed is 41 United States Code 5, which provides that all purchases and contracts for supplies and purchases of services must be advertised.

We thought that could be waived during the exercise of these emergency powers.

The next one is 40 United States Code 259, which provides that no money shall be paid for a site for a public building in excess of the amount appropriated.

That is a peacetime provision. It might not be possible to have any amount appropriated at all for the purchase of a building or a site.

I am sure the Senator would agree that that restriction should be removed in case of an emergency.

The next statute referred to is 40 United States Code 267, regarding restrictions on buildings, the approval of sketch plans, with a limit on the cost, and what not. The architectural plans must be approved under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

In other words, Mr. President, we are trying, during a time of emergency, not to tie the hands of the Administrator with restrictive provisions about advertising and what not which apply to other Federal agencies and which would apply to the Administrator during a time of normal operations.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Permit me to preface my question with the statement that I have no objection whatever, insofar as the section provides for the relieving of the Administrator from any obligations under the statutes mentioned. The thing that bothers me, with reference to which, frankly, I intend to offer an amendment to the bill, is the phrase in lines 5 and 6 "any existing law." That is found on page 17 of the bill. This would relieve the Administrator of any limitation of any kind, including a requirement to pay reasonable compensation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the usual language employed when emergency power is given. The intent is that if some other statutes, such as those which I have mentioned, which old line agencies have to deal with, are applicable, the Administrator will not have to act under them. But if it makes the Senator any less concerned about the matter if he wants to study it over further, I should be willing to accept an amendment clarifying that part of the bill.

Mr. CORDON. I would suggest, if the Senator will permit me, that if we eliminated the words "any existing law", then we would have the authority which is found in section 201 (h), but there would be no limitation with reference to

those set out in the several acts described.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then we would be confronted with the problem as to whether it would be possible to pick out all the laws relating to advertising, and so forth. If we find we can do it, we shall do so. But if it is going to hamper the work of the Administrator, we may have to put the language back in conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I have studied the situation more recently, I think the Senator from Oregon has done well to call these points to our attention. As I interpret section 303, subdivisions A through F, the situation would exist only when an actual emergency had arisen.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let us assume that city X has been bombed. If we were to try to place any limitations in this provision it could tie up all the assistance which the Administrator wanted to give. If it is desired to control the Administrator I would suggest that we place the matter in the discretion of the President. I was going to suggest the Budget Director or the Secretary of Defense, but I think the President is the proper person who should exercise discretion in a matter of this kind. If Chicago and New York were to be faced by a sudden emergency, it would be unwise to have the Administrator's hands tied with respect to what money he would be able to spend until Congress acted or until he got further authority. That is the way I interpret the section.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the observations of the Senator from Massachusetts. I may say that it would involve the Food and Drug Act, some sanitary provisions, the Public Health Act, and many other acts. It would relate back to the matter of procurement, construction, maintenance and use of some facilities. Is the Senator from Oregon satisfied with the explanation given by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is concerned with the language. It appears to him that the inclusion of the language clearly would render the provision without effect, because it would have no constitutional standing. If the Senator would permit the Senator from Oregon to suggest, the reason it assumes the importance it does is because it would affect the right and power of the Government to take property without compensation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The compensation provision is taken care of in section 202, which carries the Defense Production Act into this bill, and it is also taken care of by the so-called Ives amendment. Therefore, ample compensation would have to be paid. That subject is already taken care of.

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX OF 1950—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may bring up the conference report on the excess-profits tax bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield

to the Senator from Georgia for the purpose of bringing up the conference report on the excess-profits tax without displacing the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It being a privileged matter, it would not displace the pending bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9827) to provide revenue by imposing a corporate excess-profits tax, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see proceedings of the House of Representatives, January 1, 1951, pp. 17025-17027.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

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

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia desires to ask for a quorum call. We have not had a quorum call all day, and perhaps this would be a good time to have one, unless the Senator from Georgia would like to proceed without having a quorum call. I shall be glad to accept the Senator's judgment.

Mr. GEORGE. I would rather proceed without a quorum call. I had hoped that a quorum would be present, or that a quorum had already been developed.

I wish to make a brief statement regarding the conference report.

The conference, on the whole, was very satisfactory. The House agreed to practically all of the Senate amendments. However, there were some provisions which we had to amend, or upon which we had to make compromises or to recede. I will discuss briefly the changes made in the Senate amendments by the conference.

First, as to the termination date for the excess-profits tax: The Senate bill provided a termination date with respect to taxable years beginning after January 1, 1953. The House bill had no termination date. The conferees agreed to terminate the tax with respect to taxable years beginning after June 30, 1953.

Second, as to the ceiling rate: The Senate bill had an over-all ceiling on normal tax, surtax, and excess-profits tax of 60 percent. The House had an over-all ceiling rate of 67 percent. We compromised on an over-all ceiling rate of 62 percent.

Third, as to the rate of return to be allowed on borrowed capital: The Senate amendment permitted borrowed capital to be counted at 100 percent in computing the credit for invested capital and in computing net additions to capital under the average-earnings basis. That is, under the Senate amendment, borrowed capital was treated the same as other forms of capital. The House bill allowed a credit for borrowed capital measured by the interest paid on the

borrowed funds. The conference accepted the Senate formula but allowed only 75 percent of the borrowed capital to be included in computing the invested-capital credit instead of 100 percent. However, one-fourth of the interest payments on this borrowed capital is to be deductible in computing excess-profits net income. This was not allowed under the Senate bill.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate bill increasing the corporate surtax rate by two percentage points.

The House conferees also agreed to the Senate amendments relating to public utilities, and the provisions relating to minerals with two exceptions:

First. The House conferees refused to agree to the Senate amendment exempting trona from the excess-profits tax as a strategic mineral.

Second. Beryllium was also eliminated by the conferees. It was pointed out that this last mineral was a derivative from "beryl," which is exempted as a strategic mineral.

I regret to report that we were unable to reach an agreement on that part of amendment No. 75, offered by Senator KERR, which gave the benefit of the growth formula to a taxpayer commencing business in the base period but prior to May 1, 1946. Under the growth formula before this amendment a taxpayer had to commence business before the beginning of the base period to secure the benefit of the growth formula. A corporation commencing business after the beginning of the base period is entitled to be treated as a new corporation, and the House conferees were unwilling to give such a corporation the benefit also of the growth formula.

The amendment of the Senate bill relating to the handling of deposits under the Merchant Marine Act was disagreed to by the House conferees. It was vigorously opposed by the Treasury. The Senate conferees receded on this amendment with the understanding that it should have further study next year.

The House did not agree to the Senate floor amendment which was intended to provide relief in cases where two or more corporations consolidated their operations during the base period and an increase in their combined incomes resulted from the consolidation. The amendment provided in effect that the increase in net income attributable to the increased efficiency resulting from the consolidation be added to average base period net income. The House conferees believed that this type of relief provision would involve very difficult questions of proof and make impossible the type of automatic relief which this bill employs. The House conferees believed that to give relief in this area and in the manner which the amendment provided, would depart from the basic principles of automatic relief followed elsewhere in the bill.

The amendment, offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] relating to the amortization allowance for facilities certified for defense purposes, was not agreed to by the House conferees. The Senate conferees receded on this

amendment with the understanding that the matter would be brought up in connection with the next revenue bill.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], providing for a minimum base period credit based upon the years 1936 to 1939 was opposed by the Treasury, and we were forced to recede.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to exempt Government payments to encourage exploration, development, and mining from the income tax was agreed to, as well as the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to clarify the utility amendment where the unregulated rates of a utility are substantially as favorable to users and consumers as are the regulated rates.

The House conferees also accepted the Senate amendment giving sewerage disposal services subject to regulation the benefit of the utility treatment, treating perlite as a strategic metal, and the Senate amendments providing relief in the case of mines.

In connection with abnormalities in income in the tax period the Senate conferees receded on a House bill provision which would give the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to prescribe classifications in addition to those specified in the bill.

The Senate bill contained a special relief provision for corporations which experienced an unusually rapid growth during the base period. Qualified taxpayers were permitted to use a substitute average base period net income computed from their income in 1949, or the average of their income in 1948 and 1949, or the average of one-half of their 1949 income and 40 percent of their 1950 income, or the average of the income in the last half of 1948 and 40 percent of the income in 1950. The first two options were contained in the House bill; the third was added by the Committee on Finance; the fourth was the result of a Senate floor amendment.

The conference restricted the option to use the income of the last half of 1948 and 40 percent of the income of 1950 in order to confine the use of the option to cases in which the company's income for the calendar year 1949 was 25 percent or less than for the calendar year 1948.

As reported by the Committee on Finance a company qualified for growth treatment by establishing that its payroll in the last half of its base period was 130 percent or more of its payroll in the first half or its gross receipts in the second half were 150 percent or more of its gross receipts in the first half. Moreover, a company could qualify for the growth options only if its total assets in January 1, 1946, did not exceed \$20,000,000. These limitations proved unduly restrictive and the committee offered a floor amendment which permitted a taxpayer to avoid the \$20,000,000 limitation if it complied with the following tests:

(a) The taxpayer's net sales for the period January 1, 1950, to June 30, 1950, multiplied by two is at least 150 percent

of its net sales for the calendar year 1948; and

(b) Fifty percent of the net sales in 1949 were attributable to a product or class of products not generally available to the public prior to January 1, 1946; and

(c) The taxpayer's net sales attributable to such product in the calendar year 1946 is not more than 5 percent of the net sales of the product for 1949.

The conference liberalized these rules in the following manner:

(a) The comparison of the taxpayer's net sales for 1950 is to be made with the average net sales in 1946 and 1947 instead of 1948.

(b) The product not generally available to the general public prior to 1946 need constitute only 40 percent of the taxpayer's net sales for 1950 instead of 50 percent of 1949 as provided in the Senate bill.

(c) The benefits of the option were made available not only to products of which the product marketed after January 1, 1946, is a principal component, as was provided in the Senate bill, but also to articles which are components of such products or classes of products.

The bill as approved by the Senate was estimated to yield \$3,200,000,000 in a full year of operation. The conference agreement will increase this by about \$100,000,000. This increase comes mainly from the reduction in the amount of borrowed capital allowed from 100 percent to 75 percent, and the increase on the over-all rate limitation. Of course, if the upward trend in corporate profits continue the bill will yield between \$4,000,000,000 and \$5,000,000,000 next year.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4268) to authorize a Federal civil-defense program, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 4268 is before the Senate. Are there any further amendments to be offered?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a companion bill, House bill 9798, is on the calendar. It is Calendar No. 2681. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill; that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the language of the Senate bill, as amended; that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is the bill still open to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move to strike out sections 304 and 305, on page 19, of the bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has moved to strike sections 304 and 305 from the Senate bill and has suggested the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn, and that the further proceedings in connection with the call of the roll may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in order to get the matter before the conference and studied there, I have agreed to accept the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have an amendment which has been prepared by the Senator from Oregon. I offer it and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "incur", and to insert "such obligations on behalf of the United States as may be required to meet the civil-defense requirements of an attack or imminent attack."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO FUTURE PROCEEDINGS AT THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, out of order, I should like to have the Senate consider a proposed unanimous-consent agreement which is extremely important. In view of the fact that we have just almost completed a quorum call, I think we might try to have this agreement entered now.

I have conferred with the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and also with Members on this side of the aisle, and I know that the Senator from Nebraska also has conferred with various Senators, in respect to the proposed agreement.

I shall now read it, and ask that it be adopted, if possible. I hope all Senators will listen carefully to the reading of the proposed agreement, because some Senators may wish to object or may wish to ask a question about it:

Ordered. That at the conclusion of its business today the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, December 26, 1950; that immediately after the convening of the Senate on said day the Presiding Officer shall, without debate and without

the transaction of business of any nature, declare the Senate in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday, December 29, 1950; that immediately after the convening of the Senate on said day of Friday, December 29, 1950, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate and without the transaction of business of any nature, declare the Senate in recess until Tuesday, January 2, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

Ordered further. That on said day of Tuesday, January 2, 1951, a motion shall be in order that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference reports on the following bills, namely:

H. R. 9920. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes;

S. 4266. An act to amend and extend title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 9798. An act to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes.

Provided. That not to exceed one hour's debate shall be permitted on each of said conference reports, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing said reports, and controlled as follows: In the case of H. R. 9920, by Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. BRIDGES, respectively; in the case of S. 4266, by Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. TAFT, respectively; and in the case of H. R. 9798, by Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. SALTONSTALL, respectively.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the proposed agreement means that no other conference reports can be considered?

Mr. LUCAS. It does not. It does mean, however, that any other conference report which might be considered would not come under the limitation of time stated in the proposed agreement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois to read once again the part of the proposed agreement referring to a limitation on debate.

Mr. LUCAS. That part reads as follows:

Provided. That not to exceed 1 hour's debate shall be permitted on each of said conference reports, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing said reports, and controlled as follows—

And so forth.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. We are asking that the Senate convene at 11 a. m. on Tuesday, January 2, because about 2 weeks ago the Democratic conference agreed to hold a further conference on the afternoon of January 2, at 2 p. m. I think all Senators understand why we have to do that; it is because, as everyone knows, the Senator from Illinois will not be a Member of the Senate the following day. Consequently, it is necessary for the Democratic conference to meet at that time and make decisions as to the leaders of the Senate, who will take over when the new Congress convenes.

I yield now to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I respectfully call to the attention of the majority leader that there is included in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement a provision in regard to a confer-

ence report on the civil-defense bill. Of course, that bill has not yet been passed; and if it is not passed, such a conference report would not exist, and such a provision would not appear.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, then that portion of the agreement would automatically be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the Senate withhold action on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement until we ascertain whether the civil defense bill does pass. Frankly, I am very much in doubt as to whether I would concur in the proposed agreement unless that bill passes.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The proposed agreement provides that when the Senate recesses today, the future program shall be thus and so. Such a provision means that the Senator from New York and all other Senators if they desire, can remain here until the civil defense bill is passed. The meaning is that when that bill is passed, the proposed agreement will control the time in the future.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well. However, I would not agree to the proposed agreement unless the civil defense bill does pass.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that, so far as the proposed agreement is concerned, it would make no difference whether the bill is passed or is not passed.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, Mr. President, the only difference is that the Senator from New York has just made the suggestion that in the event the civil defense bill is not passed, he will object to the entire proposed unanimous-consent agreement. Do I correctly understand the Senator from New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, I would object to any recess, in such case. I think the civil defense bill is so important that we should remain here all next week, if necessary, in order to pass that bill. I think we should remain here until it is passed.

Mr. LUCAS. I think we may be able to pass it at once. I shall withhold the proposed unanimous-consent agreement for the moment, because I think the civil defense bill is about to be passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4268) to authorize a Federal civil-defense program, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a companion bill to Senate bill 4268 is House bill 9798, Calendar No. 2681.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9798.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

9798) to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I now ask unanimous consent that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the language of Senate bill 4268, as thus far amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time; and the bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Chair appoints the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as conferees on the part of the Senate.

Without objection, Senate bill 4268 is indefinitely postponed.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO FUTURE PROCEEDINGS AT THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I now renew the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, under the terms and conditions stated a moment ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Including the reference to the bill which has just been passed?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The agreement as reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That at the conclusion of its business today the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, December 26, 1950, that immediately after the convening of the Senate on said day the Presiding Officer shall, without debate and without the transaction of business of any nature, declare the Senate in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday, December 29, 1950; that immediately after the convening of the Senate on said day of Friday, December 29, 1950, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate and without the transaction of business of any nature, declare the Senate in recess until Tuesday, January 2, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

Ordered further, That on said day of Tuesday, January 2, 1951, a motion shall be in order that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference reports on the following bills, namely:

H. R. 9920. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes;

S. 4266. An act to amend and extend title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 9798. An act to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes.

Provided, That not to exceed 1 hour's debate shall be permitted on each of said conference reports, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing said reports and controlled as follows: In the case of H. R. 9920, by Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. BRIDGES, respectively; in the case of S. 4266, by Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. TAFT, respectively; and in the case of H. R. 9798, by Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. SALTONSTALL, respectively.

STUDY OF MENTAL AND PHYSICAL SEQUELAE OF MALNUTRITION AND STARVATION SUFFERED BY CERTAIN INTERNEES OF WORLD WAR II—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 8848) to provide for a study of the mental and physical sequelae of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II, and I submit a report (No. 2699) thereon. The committee this afternoon unanimously recommended the passage of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 555) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may ask a question of the majority leader?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before Senators leave, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader when he proposes to call the calendar. Some Senators are very much interested in it.

Mr. LUCAS. We agreed to call the calendar immediately following disposition of this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. As soon as we can clear the way, we can proceed to the call of the calendar.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish very humbly to suggest that I have been waiting 2 days to make some remarks, and I intend to seek recognition by the Chair as soon as the Senator from New Mexico concludes. I hope I shall not take long, and that Senators will indulge me for a few moments so that I may make some remarks I have been waiting for some time for an opportunity to make.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield, on the same condition.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that there are several other Senators who are also waiting; there is no doubt about that. But there are many Senators who are interested in having a call of the calendar. It is only two and a half pages long, and I am satisfied it will

take only a few moments, because its consideration is to be limited to unobjectioned-to bills. I am satisfied that, if we could call it, we could complete it within a very short time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

A FOREIGN LEGION FOR FREEDOM

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, today, only 3 days before Christmas, it is a sad commentary on Christian people and on present-day civilization that, instead of praising God on high and asking for peace and good will to men, we find it necessary to discuss matters having to do with the destruction of God's creatures. One can readily understand why that is possible, when even those of our friends with whom we are associated in the United Nations do not implore the guidance of God in their deliberations upon what purport to be noble efforts in the interest of humanity and peace. It appears that we have reached the point in our civilization, especially in this country, where, after the Chaplain has led us in prayer each day, we find it necessary at times to discuss matters having to do with destruction, with death, with blood, with suffering, and despair.

A few days ago I made a short statement to the Senate, trying to give this body and the American people and the Congress a plan of action to be followed if we are to carry on and not have the sad experiences we are undergoing in Korea. It was on December 6 that I made the statement, declaring that the United States should not recognize communistic China, and that in furtherance of the efforts of the United States to oppose the communistic world, and in the interest of liberty and freedom, it was my opinion it would become necessary for this country to sponsor a foreign legion composed of men from all nations who believe in a free world and who are willing to fight for such freedom. Today I desire to elaborate on the main objective.

I understand a conference was held in Europe within the past few days, in which our leading foreign officer participated. I do not believe that the American people are convinced that the governments represented at that conference want to cooperate with us to the full extent that is necessary, though I am satisfied in my own mind that in those countries there are thousands, yes, millions of people who are willing to fight for freedom and liberty. I have faith in the millions of people in Europe and in Asia, who are willing to fight on our side, but I have no confidence that certain governments will do their utmost in that behalf.

The main objective, as I see it, is to utilize the youth of the world in an appropriate division of the armed forces of the United States. This program is based on the world-wide faith in religion and in the worthiness and dignity of the individual—things which are inherently and diametrically opposed to communism. Communism is paganism. It denies the existence of God. It preaches that there is no hereafter. I do not believe that, and I do not think the

American people do, either. Communism worships power for the sake of power alone, vested in the state, and it is interested only in the use of that power for the exploitation of individual men and women. The youth of the world will enlist to destroy this pagan menace. All that is needed is a rallying point and a practical, common-sense program. I suggest to those who attend conferences such as the one recently held in Brussels, to which I have referred, that the legion of the world would be recruited first, under the United States Army, with the consent and cooperation of other governments, limited to a fixed number from each country. Recruiting may be limited to men between the ages even of 18 and 21.

Second, notwithstanding my feelings toward the United Nations as a result of its stand with respect to religion, but recognizing that they have certain laudable purposes in mind, if they will only carry them out, I would say that that army should be made available to the United Nations. They could be recruited, trained, fed, housed, and equipped as a branch of and on a par with United States troops; otherwise, they would not fight. Rates of pay may be adjusted. However, an attractive basic minimum rate of pay, including insurance benefits, family allotments, and other benefits should be provided.

Mr. President, only a short time ago Mr. Joseph Kennedy, who had been Ambassador to Great Britain, made, at the University of Virginia, what was in many respects an outstanding talk. Mr. Kennedy suggested that a start can be made among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. Night before last a similar suggestion was made by former President Hoover. In that particular respect I agree with him. Remember, I have said "in that particular respect." I think we have been missing the boat by not taking care of the Western Hemisphere from Hudson Bay to Patagonia. It is the only place that can grow; it is still young.

Mr. President, the cost of the program will be paid for by industrial production.

Only last week Mr. Edward Miller, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, issued a call to the 21 nations south of the American-Mexican border. I am glad that call was issued. I am in favor of it.

Approximately 2 or 3 weeks ago the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and I were in Central America. The people of that area are our friends, but I received the impression, in many instances, and I know the other two Senators received the same impression, that, notwithstanding the desire of those people to send their boys to fight along with ours and to help out and be friendly and neighborly, they felt that about the only time any attention was paid to them by official Washington was when there was a so-called emergency.

A large proportion of the moneys used to pay the soldiers of the Legion of the World, including the benefits to their families, would inevitably go to the foreign countries involved, and would, in turn, be used to buy American goods. This means that the program would be

largely paid for by industrial production, conserving our gold and silver reserves and our technical skills.

In turn, our industrial capacity must be expanded sufficiently through Government aid, if necessary, to meet the military needs and also to provide sufficient quantities of goods for export to satisfy the foreign demand created by the program. Of course, provision should be made for the importation of necessary raw materials. With sufficient Government encouragement for the expansion of industrial capacity, no one need worry about possible overexpansion. The times are too critical.

Only yesterday a bill was passed authorizing the expenditure of \$1,800,000,000 additional for General Services for the procurement of raw materials.

Moreover, Mr. President, in order to meet the increased stress on our international-credit structure, necessarily caused by the exigencies of war, we must increase our metallic reserves. The only practical way to do that is to subsidize the production of gold and silver, as Canada has already done in the case of gold, both here and abroad, and, again, purchases of gold and silver abroad could be paid for with civilian goods.

My next suggestion is fighting communism with the weapon of hard money.

The rule of communism, everywhere, is largely based on the use of paper money, backed only by force. A study of the history of the financial operations of the Communists in Asia discloses that they are largely based on the use of paper money. What is there in Communist China now except a few I O U's which the people of the country are obliged to take at the point of a gun?

The competition of hard money would go far to disrupt the whole financial and economic structure of Communist rule, and, indeed, to undermine its entire foundation. We could do more in China today with Roosevelt dimes than we could with many other things.

Thus, hard money, silver in small coin denominations, should be infiltrated among the people of the many Communist countries where silver is acceptable—and in China silver is acceptable—through whatever means may be available. They might not know anything about an American bond, but they do know an American silver dollar and a Mexican peso. Such small coins should be distributed in the largest volume possible, because, with their very small denominations, by our standards, only a relatively small amount of our reserves would be involved. These small coins would naturally inspire confidence and would provide devastating competition with paper money; indeed, an influence infinitely greater in importance, because of the psychological effect, than the mere dollar value involved.

We can fight communism with the picture of democracy. We must hold out an ultimate hope for something better than communism, and that can be done through a public-relations campaign. A contemporaneous public-relations campaign should therefore be undertaken to portray what can be done. We should dramatize what can be done with a stable currency and loans for develop-

ment, such as power and irrigation. Assistance along the lines of point 4 and the strikingly successful program of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, to marshal the resources of labor and raw materials of such countries should be provided. The people should be bombarded with pictures of dams, industries, and so forth, and pamphlets and other orthodox media should be used consistently and intensively. Who knows but that we may, sooner or later, be dependent upon the raw materials of these countries for our own existence?

A NATURAL SUPPLEMENT TO THE MARSHALL PLAN

The Marshall plan has awakened the world to the menace of communism and has built up tremendous good will for the United Nations and also for the United States. But apparently political conditions preclude any attempt at large-scale induction by these foreign countries, in the absence of an obvious threat of imminent invasion. That has been the history up to the moment. Yes, they took the money, and we were glad to give it to them. They have progressed economically and financially. When it comes to the question of what they are going to do in the way of military personnel, their answer is, "Not anything." In addition, these foreign countries cannot offer, at the present time, attractive terms of enlistment for large numbers of troops.

Hence, in enlisting the youth of the world, the program described would capitalize on the results of the Marshall plan and lead the way toward world reconstruction. I believe it would work if only we would give it a chance to work.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MALONE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. McFARLAND, and Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the Chair's list of Senators, the junior Senator from Nevada is to be recognized. The Senator from Nevada.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether it is his intention to call the calendar today. I understand several speeches are to be made. Senators who have expressed themselves as wishing to address the Senate are the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Florida, and the Senator from Utah.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was not my understanding that the Senator from Nevada intended to make an address.

Mr. WHERRY. I refer to the junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McFARLAND. I had hoped that we could call the calendar and dispose of measures listed on the calendar to which no objection is made. Extensive investigations have been made with respect to the measures on the calendar, and it is quite an expense to put measures on the

calendar. I hope the Senate will be willing to stay in session and dispose of the calendar. Of course, if it gets too late, we will not be able to dispose of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I submit that if we start on the scheduled speeches—and I will be present to hear them—in all likelihood we will not be able to get a quorum. I submit the thing to do is to wait until January 2 to call the calendar. Furthermore, I understand the Executive Calendar is to be called today.

Mr. McFARLAND. It may not be possible to call the legislative calendar on January 2. Some of the bills may have to go to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to disagree with the acting majority leader. However, my opinion is that if we do not have a quorum present most bills will be objected to, and we will not accomplish anything.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Nevada has the floor.

DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield provided I may do so without prejudice to my right to the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a resolution submitted by me has been acted upon by the Committee on the Judiciary, and reported favorably by unanimous vote of the committee. I wonder if it would be agreeable to the junior Senator from Nevada to have the resolution considered at this time. I refer to Senate Resolution 378. Its consideration would not take more than 2 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield provided I may do so without prejudicing my right to the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. If consideration of the resolution takes more than 5 minutes I shall withdraw my request. The purpose of the resolution is to set aside a national day of prayer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that this resolution was on the calendar when the calendar was called the last time and that the House passed a similar resolution. In view of the circumstances involved, I have no objection to having the resolution considered at this time. However, it must not be considered that a precedent is set thereby and that the doors are opened to permit consideration of every measure that is not passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is slightly in error. The resolution was not on the calendar on the last call. I submitted the resolution after the call of the calendar. It was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the committee reported the resolution yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand a similar resolution is on the calendar of the House of Representatives. That is the

resolution I was referring to. A House Member had offered the resolution, and he suggested to the Senator that a similar one be introduced in the Senate. I said I would not object to it. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 378) to set aside a national day of prayer was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas our country is in an hour of dire danger in which hostile forces, acting without conscience and guided by a godless ideology, threaten the very survival of our cherished institutions; and

Whereas, while we must mobilize our material resources to meet this threat, we are also deeply conscious of the fact that the moral and spiritual resources of our people constitute the Nation's great bulwark in times of national crisis; and

Whereas the churches of the Nation, of all creeds and faiths, are the instruments through which our moral and spiritual resources can best be marshaled and given strength: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate suggests that the churches of the Nation, of all creeds and faiths, set aside and dedicate, Sunday, December 24, 1950, as a time for prayers and supplication for divine guidance of the men and women, elected and appointed, civilian and military, on whose shoulders rests the responsibility for leadership in this time of great crisis, and for strength and unity to enable our people to persevere, with other freedom-loving people, in the effort to bring about peace and justice in the world.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would the junior Senator from Nevada and the senior Senator from Florida please yield, provided it is agreeable to the leadership, so that we may consider the Executive Calendar at this time?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in the 14 years I have been a Member of this body, I have always endeavored to be considerate of the rights and interests of my colleagues. I am willing to defer delivery of my address until later. I should be glad to defer delivery of it even until such time when no one is present in the Chamber but a substitute for the Chair. I am perfectly willing to defer delivery of my address until after the calendar is called, if the Senate desires to call the calendar.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the senior Senator from Nevada give some indication as to how long it would take to consider the Executive Calendar?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think it would take more than 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator refer to nominations on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. McCARRAN. There are two nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield for that purpose, provided I may do so without depriving me of my right to the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McCARRAN. 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Col. William R. Shuler, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank J. Parker, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there has been reported today the nomination of Ben Ivy King, of Tennessee, to be a United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee. I have conferred with the members of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is agreeable to them, and I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Mr. King be confirmed by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, out of order, I should like to report, the nomination of Cornelius F. Reardon, of Billings, Mont., to be collector of customs for the customs collection district No. 33, and ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed. The nomination was ordered reported unanimously by the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary or the acting majority leader whether the nomination of former Senator Leahy is on the calendar, or whether it is to be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary? The reason I ask the question is that I understand the former Senator is desirous that this body, in which he served, confirm his nomination. I should like to have the RECORD show that, if it is the desire of the Senator from Nevada or of the acting majority leader to bring up the nomination at this time, I would have no objection to its consideration.

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter of former Senator Leahy's confirmation to a judicial position was brought to the

attention of the Committee on the Judiciary yesterday. Former Senator Leahy is to be appointed to fill a place which must be vacated and which is not vacant at the present time. It must be vacated by promoting the present occupant of the bench to another position. The Committee on the Judiciary was not content to take action on the latter nomination without some knowledge of the individual and reports from the bar association.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator expect that that may happen between now and January 2?

Mr. McCARRAN. We have published the notice which is required under the rule so as to bring the nomination forward as soon as the opportunity is presented.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Cornelius F. Reardon to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 33?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion with reference to the call of the regular calendar. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in his usual friendly spirit, has offered to postpone his address until after the calendar is called. I wonder if the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would be willing to do likewise? It will not take more than a few minutes to complete the call of the calendar.

Mr. MALONE. Let me say that it will take only about 5 or 6 minutes to complete my address. I am sure that it will take much longer than that to call the calendar.

ABANDONMENT OF AMERICAN FORCES IN KOREA ON THE EVE OF CHRISTMAS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on page 4 of the Times-Herald of this morning is written a tragedy of the ages.

FIRST TIME IN HISTORY OF NATION

For the first time during the 175 years of this Nation's existence there is recorded the complete abandonment of an American Army by this Nation on the eve of Christmas eve. The two news dispatches are side by side.

TOTAL CASUALTIES TO DECEMBER 12, 42,992

The first records the total of American losses in Korea up to December 12 as 42,992. They are probably much greater at this time. Those represent the dead, wounded, and missing. Eleven thousand nine hundred and sixty-four of these accrued in the 18 days preceding December 12.

THE UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE CABLED THREE TIMES

During that period the committee appointed by the United Nations to bring

about a "cease fire" in Korea has cabled to the Chinese Communist Government in Peking three times requesting them to halt the war in Korea.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator spoke about the losses in Korea. Does the Senator have the apportionment of the losses as between casualties from wounds, casualties by death, and casualties by loss?

Mr. MALONE. The number stated represents the dead, wounded, and missing—I do not have the exact number of each.

THE THREE-MAN COMMITTEE OF UNITED NATIONS

The three-man committee is made up of the United Nations representatives from India, Iran, and Canada. Two of these nations have themselves recognized Communist China, and the third is a part of the empire of a nation which has recognized Communist China.

THREE REQUESTS—ONE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The second news dispatch records that today the committee has sent the third request to the Communist capital of China requesting them to cease fire. The committee is called the "cease fire" committee.

THE PRESIDENT WASHED HIS HANDS OF AMERICAN ARMY

Mr. President, the President of the United States sent the American boys into the so-called police action on June 26. On June 27 the United Nations passed a resolution supporting that action, by request of the President. The President promptly washed his hands of all responsibility for the American boys engaged in that bitter warfare in the cold, stormy, mountainous regions of central and northern Korea.

UN HELD MACARTHUR ON THE THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL

The United Nations held MacArthur on the thirty-eighth parallel for 10 days, while the North Koreans re-grouped and called the Chinese Communists to their assistance.

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

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Do the figures which the Senator has given include the casualties of the Turks, the Australians, the British, the French, the Indochinese, and other members of the United Nations?

Mr. MALONE. They include the American casualties only. We have 90 percent of the troops in that area, and more than 90 percent of the casualties.

Mr. KILGORE. I am not disputing the statement of the Senator. I simply wished to know if the figures were all-inclusive, and whether or not they included the total casualties within the area, among all the forces engaged.

Mr. MALONE. The figures are for American troops only. We have 90 percent of the United Nations troops in Korea and it is reported more than 90 percent of the casualties.

We have completely abandoned our troops. If the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has any other information, the junior Senator from Nevada would be very glad to hear it.

Mr. KILGORE. I am seeking information.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada is very glad to furnish it.

Mr. KILGORE. I merely wished to get it.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator has it now, I believe.

Mr. KILGORE. My information is to the effect that the heaviest casualties have been among the Turks.

Mr. MALONE. I have just stated that the total casualties for American troops were 42,992—the Turks alone may have had heavy losses—I do not know the exact figures, but altogether the American losses are reported heavier in proportion to the remainder of the United Nations forces.

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the Senator from Nevada that I am asking if he includes the battle casualties, by death, by wounds, and by capture, along with the frostbite casualties, and if he has any information about the losses within the various Allied arms. There are some Allied arms. There is a British brigade; there is a Turkish brigade, and there are two or three other battalions.

Mr. MALONE. The entire United Nations troops in addition, I am informed make no more than 10 percent—the Americans 90 percent.

Mr. KILGORE. I was just wondering if the distinguished Senator from Nevada has those figures to place in the Record.

NINETY PERCENT UNITED NATIONS ARMY AMERICANS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have answered the question of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia twice. I shall now answer it a third time.

The total losses of American troops to December 12 is given as 42,992 dead, wounded, and missing. The figures include all of the American armies in Korea. Ninety percent of the personnel of the United Nations armies in Korea is made up of Americans, and more than 90 percent of the casualties are said to be represented by Americans.

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

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask this question—

Mr. MALONE. I decline to yield further to the Senator from West Virginia on account of the press of business before the Senate and the desire to complete my address.

Mr. KILGORE. I merely wished to know from the Senator from Nevada—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order? The Senator from Nevada has declined to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from Nevada information—

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I believe that we have answered the question of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada declines to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President—

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The question which was raised in my mind by the answer of the Senator from Nevada is this: Does the total number of casualties include also the casualties of the South Koreans, the Republic of Korea?

Mr. MALONE. It represents the American casualties alone.

Mr. WATKINS. Were there only forty-two-thousand-odd for all the forces?

Mr. MALONE. The American dead, wounded, or missing since the outbreak of the Korean War are 42,992.

Mr. President, I wish to correct a misunderstanding with the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia. The figures include only American losses.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the point I am getting at.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. MALONE. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] until we complete this particular colloquy. Then I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WATKINS. I had understood that the casualties for the South Koreans far outnumbered all the other casualties of the United Nations put together, and that the figures which the Senator was reading a few moments ago included only the American casualties, and not those of any other nation.

AMERICAN ARMY ABANDONED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, that is true and the point I am making is that our American Army is abandoned in Korea tonight. No word has been sent to them by the President of the United States, that they are receiving reinforcements, that they are to abandon Korea, or that they are being furnished reinforcements or help of any kind whatsoever.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the distinguished Senator has brought this matter to a crux.

Mr. MALONE. I hope so.

Mr. KILGORE. After a considerable amount of questioning, the Senator has given us the total American casualties; is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. From what source is that derived?

Mr. MALONE. From a United Press dispatch dated Tokyo, December 21. It reads:

THE UNITED PRESS DISPATCH

United States forces in Korea suffered 11,964 casualties in their first 18 days of heavy fighting with Chinese Communist troops, General MacArthur's headquarters disclosed today.

The toll for November 24 through December 12 raised American dead, wounded, or missing since the outbreak of the Korean War to 42,992.

That does not include the losses suffered in the last 11 days which, under the conditions, may have been heavy.

Mr. KILGORE. I hope the Senator realizes I am trying to simmer this down to our own losses.

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. And the distinguished Senator from Nevada says he has simmered them down so they include the total losses from the first day we went into Korea.

Mr. MALONE. From June 27 to December 12.

Mr. KILGORE. Until a certain date. And what is that date?

Mr. MALONE. From the beginning until December 12 the total is 42,992.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Can the Senator break the figures down. We have had some naval losses, marine losses, Army losses, and Air Force losses. Does the total the Senator has given include the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps?

Mr. MALONE. This dispatch gives the figure of American Army losses through December 12 to 42,992. I read:

By divisions, American casualties in part total: First Cavalry, 443; First Marine, 2,891; Second Infantry, 4,131; Third Infantry, 650; Seventh Infantry, 2,097; Twenty-fourth Infantry, 146; Twenty-fifth Infantry, 1,605.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator read Third Infantry. That infantry division is stationed at Fort Myer. Does not the Senator mean the Third Division?

Mr. MALONE. I am reading from the dispatch.

Mr. KILGORE. Can the Senator give us a list of losses of other soldiers, Koreans, Turks, British, and others of the United Nations soldiers?

NEVER BEFORE UTTERLY ABANDONED OUR ARMY

Mr. MALONE. We do not have the exact list. I am concerned with the American Army, which has been abandoned in Korea on the eve of a Christmas eve for the first time in 175 years. We have never before utterly abandoned an Army.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, does the Senator say we have abandoned the American Army in Korea, and if so, upon what is that statement based? Has it been abandoned by the Commander in Chief, General MacArthur, by the Nation, or by the Congress?

Mr. MALONE. By the Commander in Chief. The Commander in Chief is in the White House.

Mr. KILGORE. No; the only man who can abandon an army is the commander in chief in the field. Is that not right?

Mr. MALONE. What I said is that we in Washington have abandoned the Army to its fate.

Mr. KILGORE. When the Senator says, "We in Washington," may I ask the Senator from Nevada exactly what he means by the words "we in Washington"?

THE PRESIDENT ABANDONED THE AMERICAN ARMY

Mr. MALONE. I mean the President of the United States who is the Com-

mander in Chief of all of the armies of the Republic.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator mean the Congress?

Mr. MALONE. I mean the President of the United States sent those armies first into Korea in the so-called police action, and started the war with Communist China and almost immediately completely abandoned them to that helpless, inept organization known as the United Nations.

Mr. KILGORE. Then may I ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if his use of the word "we" is the editorial we? Does the Senator from Nevada charge the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, with abandoning the Army in Korea?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the President of the United States sent these troops into Korea as Commander in Chief, and then washed his hands of all responsibility, by turning them over to the United Nations. He has done nothing since.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say that the Senator from Nevada begs the question. Let me ask the Senator again if he charges that the President of the United States has abandoned the American troops in Korea.

Mr. MALONE. Is that the Senator's question?

Mr. KILGORE. That is the question. Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I shall answer the question by saying that he has done nothing since he ordered the so-called police action which resulted in the war with Communist China.

Following his police-action order on June 26, he promptly turned them over to the United Nations. The United Nations has done nothing but send telegrams. We have had no promise of reinforcements; we have had no promise of supplies. The soldiers in Korea have not been told to stand and fight or to get out of Korea.

The President and the United Nations combination have done the unpardonable thing—they have done nothing—they have left the armies on their own while they fiddled around.

Mr. KILGORE. Then the distinguished Senator from Nevada says that the United Nations has abandoned our forces in Korea along with the other forces, is that right?

THE UNITED NATIONS HELPLESS BLUNDERING

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the United Nations could not abandon anything because they have no responsibility and cannot of course direct an army. But the President of the United States did have a responsibility for our troops and he has not discharged it—nor directed anyone else to do so.

The United Nations, Mr. President, held MacArthur on the thirty-eighth parallel for 10 days while the North Koreans could regroup and call up Chinese Communists to their assistance.

That same United Nations, Mr. President, held MacArthur on the boundary of Manchuria on the theory that by avoiding any destruction of bases beyond the Manchurian border Communist China would stay out of the fight.

Also MacArthur was forced to let the Communist Chinese regroup behind the lines without interference and to try to stop them on the line of scrimmage—like a football team.

MR. MARSHALL'S AGRARIAN REFORMERS

During this period Communist China came in a million strong and we found ourselves fighting a combination of the North Korean and the Chinese Communist Army. We were at war with Communist China—those agrarian reformers discovered by Mr. Marshall in China early in 1946.

Mr. President, no positive action has been taken by the President or by the United Nations during this time. The President sent the boys into Korea in the first place, but has taken no further action while 43,000 boys have been killed, wounded, or have been lost, American boys.

ABANDONED OUR FIGHTING MEN—FIRST TIME IN HISTORY

Mr. President, we find now on the eve of a Christmas eve we seemingly have abandoned our fighting men for the first time in history. The President has not said, "Stand and fight." He has not said, "Reinforcements are coming." He has not said, "Get out of Korea." He has said nothing.

The United Nations of course are incapable of taking action. So, Mr. President, we have done the unthinkable and unpardonable thing. We have abandoned our boys at this time to their fate.

THE FESTIVITIES IN WASHINGTON GO ON

The festivities in Washington go on as usual. It would seem impossible for a real American to enjoy such a procedure.

SHAMEFUL BLOT ON AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. President, it is a shameful blot on American history. Remember that 90 percent of these boys are ours, and that more than 90 percent of the losses have been suffered by them.

THE "POLICE ACTION" IRONY—HOME BY CHRISTMAS MYTH

They are the boys who thought they were going into a police action and be home by Christmas.

A grand Christmas it will be for them when they realize that their fathers and mothers paid the taxes that armed the Communists through the Marshall plan through the nearly 100 trade treaties that the 16 ECA nations have made with Eastern European nations and Russia. When they finally realize that the two principal European nations, England and France, have separate nonaggression pacts with Russia reading startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact, and are ready to take their choice when the fight really starts—that they never really had a chance.

THE TOKYO DISPATCH

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed two dispatches. The first is a United Press dispatch from Tokyo dated December 21, outlining the loss of 42,992 American boys up to and including December 12, and 11,964 suffered by the United States troops in their first 18 days of heavy fighting with Chinese Communist groups.

XCVI—10c9

THE AMERICAN LOSSES DISPATCH

I ask the United Press dispatch from Tokyo may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ELEVEN THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR CASUALTIES SUFFERED BY UNITED STATES IN 18 DAYS

TOKYO, December 21.—United States forces in Korea suffered 11,964 casualties in their first 18 days of heavy fighting with Chinese Communist troops, General MacArthur's headquarters disclosed today.

The toll for November 24 through December 12 raised American dead, wounded, or missing since the outbreak of the Korean War to 42,992.

Other United Nations units, exclusive of South Korean, reported 1,011 casualties during the 18-day period for over-all Allied losses of 12,975. Communist casualties in the same period were put at nearly 130,000 men.

ESCAPE LOSSES INCLUDED

The figures covered the fighting from the start of MacArthur's ill-fated "win-the-war" offensive in northwest Korea to the escape of 60,000 Communist-encircled United States marines and infantrymen into the Hungnam beachhead in northeast Korea.

During those 18 days, the UN Eighth Army in the northwest retreated 125 miles from the Chongchon River line to the approaches to Seoul and the Tenth Corps fought its way back 60 miles from the Chosin reservoir to Hungnam. Both were under attack by overwhelmingly superior Chinese forces.

A headquarters communique said the casualties were being revealed to refute reports that UN forces had suffered a military disaster in Korea.

By divisions, American casualties totaled: First Cavalry, 443; First Marine, 2,891; Second Infantry, 4,131; Third Infantry, 650; Seventh Infantry, 2,097; Twenty-fourth Infantry, 146; Twenty-fifth Infantry, 1,606.

The Second Infantry Division, hardest hit of the American units, caught the brunt of the Chinese counteroffensive against the allied Chongchon River line above Pyongyang late last month.

Also on the northwest front were the First Cavalry, Twenty-fourth, and Twenty-fifth Infantry Divisions.

YANKS ENCIrcLED

Elements of the First Marine and the Seventh Divisions were encircled by the Chinese on either side of the Chosin reservoir in northeast Korea and had to fight their way through attacking Chinese all the way back to the northeast port of Hungnam, 60 road miles to the south.

GI FAMILIES NOTIFIED OF 36,421 CASUALTIES

The Defense Department said yesterday that American battle casualties in Korea based on notifications to next of kin through December 15, now total 36,421.

This is an increase of 2,543 over the cumulative total announced a week ago.

The figure is considerably less than the total of 42,992 reported yesterday from Tokyo. However, the Defense Department said the Tokyo figures presumably include medical casualties.

THE HELPLESS "CEASE FIRE" COMMITTEE DISPATCH

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that another United Press news article entitled "Cease-Fire Unit Again Asks Mao To Talk Peace," dated Lake Success, may be printed in the RECORD at this point. It describes the thoroughly helpless "cease fire" com-

mittee upon which American lives must depend.

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

CEASE-FIRE UNIT AGAIN ASKS MAO TO TALK PEACE

LAKE SUCCESS, December 21.—The United Nations cease-fire team sent a third cable to the Chinese Communist Government today, pressing its previous unanswered bids for formal talks on halting the war in Korea.

Secretary General Lie said he hoped the cease-fire group would succeed in stopping the Korean conflict and said it would not be the mediators' fault if they failed.

The United Nations chief reiterated his belief peace could be preserved. He added that the United Nations would survive, no matter what the outcome of the Korean conflict, though he conceded some United Nations Charter principles might suffer.

The mediation team—General Assembly President Nasrollah Entezam of Iran, India's Sir Benegal Rau and Canadian Foreign Minister Lester B. Pearson—sent its first cable to Peiping last Saturday, offering to meet Chinese Communist representatives "here or elsewhere" to discuss terms of a Korean cease-fire. No answer has been received.

A second message went Tuesday night.

The third message was drafted at a 2-hour session today. Pearson, who is in Ottawa, conferred with his colleagues by phone. Canadian delegate R. G. Riddell sat in for his chief through the rest of the session.

Today's message was addressed to Chou En-lai, Chinese Communist Foreign Minister, It said:

"We hope to receive your reply to our earlier messages regarding cease-fire arrangements in Korea. Political Committee of United Nations Assembly has now taken brief recess but will meet again very shortly in order to consider amongst other things a full report from the cease-fire group. We propose to begin preparation of that report next week, and would, therefore, appreciate an early reply from you."

ELEVEN FOREIGN POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the 11 foreign policy recommendations made during my Senate address on Thursday, December 14.

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

PEOPLE AWAKENING TO THEIR PERIL

This is the time of decision. At this time of great crisis I feel more hopeful than I have dared to feel for some time—hopeful because the people are at last awakening to their peril, are becoming aware of its causes, and are showing definite signs of doing something about it. I suggest the following:

First. Forthwith stop assistance of every nature to Communist nations and to nations in any way assisting Russia or her satellites to consolidate Soviet gains and to prepare for world war III.

Second. Stop supporting colonial slavery in any form anywhere.

Third. Oppose with every means at our command the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations.

Fourth. Three suggested approaches to the war in Korea and Asia are as follows:

(a) We could do the obvious, namely, arm Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists and guerrillas to furnish the foot soldiers for the job. Then, under General MacArthur, we could make the most efficient use of our air power and our Navy, including submarines, to destroy the war-making power of Communist Korea and the aggressor Communist China troops.

(b) We could withdraw from Korea and could arm and equip Chiang Kai-shek's troops and let him do the job. It would require a longer time, but he would engage the Communist forces to the extent that it would be doubtful if they could harass us for a considerable time.

If the first two alternatives are not accepted, we could (c) completely abandon Korea and China—with all of its possible consequences and repercussions.

(d) We can then establish our first line of defense through Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, Guam, the Philippines, Indonesia, New Guinea, and Australia, using ground troops recruited from those countries.

(e) If all of these suggestions are discarded, then we can come home and defend the Western Hemisphere. We must be prepared to defend this continent in any case.

The one thing that we cannot do is to continue the present course of indecision and the nervous jittery attitude, and inactivity until our boys out there either are dead or have climbed aboard the ships.

Fifth. We should inform the governments of Europe which still maintain political and economic agreements with the Soviet Union that these should be terminated at the earliest possible date, as a prerequisite to the continued friendship and assistance of Europe by the United States. Both England and France have separate nonaggression pacts with Russia reading startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact which they have signed with us.

Sixth. Let us give no more money as loans or gifts to any government. Make such loans in the same manner, and under the same rules and regulations, that the RFC loans funds to private business in this country in times of stress. I would not give any money direct to foreign governments as such, and I would not lend taxpayers' funds to private business in a foreign country on less exacting terms than those on which the RFC would make loans to business concerns or private businessmen or GI's in the United States; and furthermore it is not necessary to do so.

Seventh. Build as rapidly as possible a military force, spearheaded by an adequate submarine fleet and an air corps of whatever number of groups may be called for, and install radar equipment to protect the Western Hemisphere.

It will be remembered that in December 1947, or early in 1948, the President received the report of his air-policy commission. The Congress also received the report of a committee, which they had previously appointed. The two reports coincided; both reports contained the statement that the United States needed a 35,000-plane striking force which would cost \$16,800,000,000, over a 5-year period to be effective in defense and offense.

What happened to that report? It was buried as is usual with reports not meeting the State Department's peculiar ideas of national defense.

When that report was made, I said on this floor, "Let us refer the report to the Armed Services Committee, and have them determine whether it makes sense. If it is found that the Air Force recommended in the report is what we need, let us build it." If we did that, then we would have sufficient money left over to lend private business in the areas which were important to our ultimate safety. However, those planes have never been built and no further mention of the report was ever made.

Eighth. If the European people will enlist in their own armies and will furnish the ground troops, then—and then only—serve notice on Russia that any move on Europe will be met with an aggressive aerial attack on their means of making war, using every means at our command to defeat their purpose of controlling Europe.

If the people in Europe will not enlist in their own armies, what can we do for them?

The suggestion has been made on the floor of the Senate that we send 20 or 30 divisions of American boys into Europe as bait, to persuade the people of Europe to enlist in their own armies. However, if we sent our boys over there, the European countries would find that they would need an additional 20 or 30 divisions of our American troops, as was the case in World War II, when our forces ultimately constituted approximately 70 percent of the Allied armed forces in Europe.

Ninth. In every possible way, protect and strengthen our national economy, while making all possible speed toward proper preparedness, guard well our national economy; stop wasting the hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers through Marshall-plan and other give-away schemes; and inaugurate a businesslike fiscal policy.

Tenth. Clean up our own Government—throw out the Communists, Communist associates, adherents to foreign ideologies, persons of abnormal moral weakness, and other dangerous security risks.

Eleventh. The Armed Services Committees of the Congress should immediately institute a thorough investigation to determine why we are not prepared to fight a war, considering the huge annual expenditures for that purpose. Where did it go—and why is it not effective?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a release I have issued dated December 23.

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

(For release to all Saturday papers, December 23, 1950)

United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, said today that—

"For the first time in our 175-year history we have completely abandoned an American army and that despite the new and horrible casualty list in the war in Korea, the President is doing nothing to relieve the situation. We have done this unpardonable thing on the eve of a Christmas Eve.

"In the news dispatches we read of the appalling number of dead and wounded boys, nearly 43,000 up to December 12, but we read nothing of positive action on the part of the President," the Nevada Senator said, continuing: "He seems to be spending his time writing letters about all kinds of unimportant personal matters, and the United Nations is spending its time in the impotent action of cabling Peiping, China, to stop the war.

"What action relating to the deplorable Korean situation can the administration point to? Has the President, as Commander in Chief, ordered the evacuation of our ground forces in Korea, to stop the meaningless killings? Has the Commander in Chief ordered the American boys to stand and die rather than retreat? Has the President taken steps to reinforce our troops there, or to completely stop the shipping of supplies to our enemy by United States firms and by nations receiving our Marshall plan aid? Has the President taken steps to get the foot soldiers of the Chinese Nationalists in action? What action is being taken now?"

"Apparently, all that has been done is the writing of three notes to the Chinese Reds, not by the United States Government, but by an ineffective UN organization, asking the enemy to please stop—three notes, only one of which has even been acknowledged up to this time—and they are written by a committee, the members of which represent na-

tions which have recognized Communist China. It is high time the President took some positive action, high time he gave more of his attention to matters affecting the lives of all Americans and to establishing an American foreign policy that makes some sense.

"Through this stupid so-called police action, and the still more stupid fiddling around by the United Nations, American blood is strewn from the Manchurian border to the ports of embarkation.

"How anyone who has had anything to do with this whole stupid business can eat a Christmas dinner and enjoy it is beyond my understanding."

PROPOSED CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning following the end of the last call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator make such a motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair rules that such a motion is not in order.

Does the Senator from Arizona request unanimous consent that the Consent Calendar be called at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, permit me to resubmit the statement I made a few minutes ago, namely, that the hour is late—it is now 5:30—and if there is to be a call of the calendar, we should have a quorum call. But we cannot now obtain a quorum.

I humbly beseech the acting majority leader not to have a call of the calendar until later, even though that may be on the second day of January.

A short time ago I asked the chairman of the Judiciary Committee whether there were on the calendar any bills reported by his committee which have to be passed tonight, and he said there were none. Of course, we realize that 50 percent of the bills on the calendar come from his committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, notice has been given that the calendar would be called. I concede that only a few bills may be passed during the call of the calendar; but it will take only a short time to have a call of the calendar, and there are on the calendar some bills in which various persons are interested.

Of course, if the Senator wishes to object, that will be all right; then we shall proceed with the next speech.

However, Mr. President, I have asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the call of the calendar. I was asked to make request, and I feel bound to make it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WATKINS obtained the floor. Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me, to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, for some days I have been awaiting an opportunity to address the Senate, in order

to make a report which I think would be pertinent in regard to a trip I recently took around the world, and also in order to have an opportunity to submit some views on foreign policy.

It is now 5:30 in the afternoon, and Senators are tired, and we have come to the immediate prospect of the taking of a recess.

I have consulted the Parliamentarian and I find nothing in the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered which would be contradictory to the unanimous-consent agreement I am now about to propound, namely, that when the Senate convenes on January 2, following a quorum call, the senior Senator from Florida be permitted to address the Senate for a reasonable period of time.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator please repeat the request?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Florida may be permitted to address the Senate on the 2d day of January, following the convening of the Senate and after a quorum call is had, and may then address the Senate for a reasonable period of time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there are the various conference reports to be acted on at that time. I am willing to dispense with the call of the calendar, but I hope the Senator from Florida will make his speech tonight, rather than on the 2d of January.

I do not know exactly what the situation on January 2 will be. Notice has been given that at that time we shall proceed to consider the conference reports which have been enumerated.

So I hope the Senator from Florida will proceed to make his speech this afternoon.

Let me inquire how long the Senator from Utah expects to take at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. Without any assistance from other Senators, I think I can conclude in 10 minutes. If I get assistance from other Senators, it may take me 20 minutes to conclude.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Florida will make his speech this afternoon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not know of anything in the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered quite recently which would be contradictory to the request I have submitted.

I understand that the only agreement is that certain matters are to be taken up on January 2, and that there will be a limitation on the time available for the disposition of certain of those matters.

If the existing unanimous-consent agreement contains anything contradictory to the agreement I have propounded, I am willing to agree to the fixing of an hour as the over-all limit of the time I would consume—which would seem to me to leave ample time for the disposition of the other matters.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. What was the unanimous-consent agreement which previously was entered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is not sufficiently advised with reference to the exact details to be able to answer the question. The Chair asks that the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered be read, or at least that the appropriate part of the agreement, so far as concerns the request made by the Senator from Florida, be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered further, That on said day of Tuesday, January 2, 1951, a motion shall be in order that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference reports on the following bills, namely:

H. R. 9920. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes;

S. 4266. An act to amend and extend title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 9798. An act to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes.

Provided, That not to exceed 1 hour's debate shall be permitted on each of said conference reports, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing said reports, and controlled as follows: In the case of H. R. 9920, by Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. BRIDGES, respectively; in the case of S. 4266, by Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. TAFT, respectively; and in the case of H. R. 9798, by Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. SALTONSTALL, respectively.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I renew my request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senators will defer for just a moment, the Chair will state that the present occupant of the Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that under the unanimous-consent agreement, as entered, the Senator from Florida could with propriety request his proposed unanimous-consent agreement; and if consent is given, he could fulfill the same under the terms of the present unanimous-consent agreement, in two ways: First, by asking that he be given the floor prior to the bringing up of the first of the conference reports; second, by asking that he be allowed to have the floor upon the conclusion of action upon the conference reports.

The Chair has stated the interpretation of the unanimous-consent agreement as given by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thought I was to be recognized upon the conclusion of the statement by the Chair, for the Chair asked me to defer until the Chair could make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Florida that if he makes his unanimous-consent request to apply after the conference reports have been acted on, on January 2, there will be

no objection then to giving the Senator from Florida an hour's time, at least. I should like to join in the request, because I think the Senator should be treated with all possible courtesy, in view of the fact that he has already waited 2 or 3 days to obtain the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to accommodate the Senator from Florida. I am willing to remain here tonight until midnight, if necessary, to hear the Senator from Florida.

The reason for the division of the time provided by the existing unanimous-consent agreement is that the Democratic caucus is called for 2 o'clock on Tuesday, January 2. Between 11 a. m. and 2 p. m., on January 2, there will not be sufficient time for the Senate to dispose of those conference reports and also to hear the speech of the distinguished Senator from Florida, for the caucus is to be held at 2 p. m. on that day.

So I hope the distinguished Senator will make his speech this afternoon. I know it is asking a great deal of him to do so; but the program for January 2 is entirely full, and I do not see how we could go through with the program unless we follow the arrangements already made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what would the Senator suppose would be the program for the remainder of the afternoon, on January 2? Is it contemplated that in view of the calling of the Democratic caucus for 2 p. m. on that afternoon, and the possibility that there will be a Republican caucus at the same time, there may be no session during the remainder of that afternoon?

Mr. McFARLAND. Very possibly. At any rate, I hope the Senator from Florida will make his speech today.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. Mr. President, I withdraw the request I have made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the acting majority leader can point out on the Consent Calendar any measure which has to do with civil defense and which needs to be acted upon between now and January 2, I shall not oppose bringing up those bills on the Consent Calendar, in order to expedite matters.

Mr. McFARLAND. Possibly we can take up such civil-defense measures following the addresses which Senators are to make. However, I do not think there are any such measures on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion.

REMOVAL OF MARKETING PENALTIES ON LONG-STAPLE COTTON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a moment or two?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, I wish to inform the Senate that there is on the calendar a bill (H. R. 9832) to remove marketing

penalties on certain long-staple cotton. It merely provides that in the case of cotton ginned in one type of gin, the marketing penalty shall not be applied.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no objection to considering the bill, if the Senator believes it urgent. We shall be glad to take it up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9832).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Texas for that purpose?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for that purpose, provided there is no argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill mentioned. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 9832) to remove marketing penalties on certain long-staple cotton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Utah very much.

EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER'S SPEECH— AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, within recent days a great American has spoken from his heart to the American people. No one can doubt his sincerity or his motives. Our only living ex-President, Herbert Hoover, has rendered a great service to this country.

Just how far-reaching that service will be, only history can tell. Men may differ with his conclusions. They may not agree to the facts which he assumes to be true, but no American, and more particularly the men in this country who have in charge our foreign policy, should fail to heed his grave warning message, and if they disagree, they should do so only after the most thorough examination and testing of what he has said.

The most profound advice which he has given us is his call for honest men now to state honest differences of opinion and to shape our future course on the anvil of public debate. This courageous stand should inspire all men who are deeply and sincerely interested in their country's future, to stop, look, and listen, so that we can give our foreign policy the complete and exhaustive examination and overhauling it so desperately needs.

It would be tragic indeed if for any reason Mr. Hoover's warning should be smothered with isolationist smears, either laughed off or ignored in order to evade the real issue he has raised. It will be a disservice to this country for men to pat Herbert Hoover on the back with one hand, while they deliberately dig the ground from under his feet with the other.

Mr. President, I speak today as one Senator who had grave questions about many phases of our foreign policy, yet who in spite of those doubts voted for the Greek-Turkey loan, also known as the Truman containment doctrine, and who also voted for the Marshall plan and for our appropriations to implement both these efforts to deter communism

and to protect America and the other free nations of the world.

I raised many questions about the advisability of entering into the Atlantic Pact and I proposed reservations which would have preserved America's freedom of action. I announced that if these reservations were accepted I would vote for the pact. The reservations were rejected and I voted against the pact.

In accordance with our constitutional processes, the pact was approved and became the law of the land. As a loyal American I have supported that pact as the law of my country. I sincerely wanted it to succeed, but as the months have gone by since the ratification of the Atlantic Pact, I have heard and read with grave misgivings reports from Europe which indicated that our allies were not actually making progress toward building their defenses, even though heavily supported by us with money and arms.

Approximately 16 months of valuable time have passed since the pact was ratified. As far as visible results are concerned, that time seems to have been largely wasted, if not completely lost.

We were told during the debate that time was of the essence, that it was necessary to get the pact approved and its implementation under way immediately to meet the threats of Communist aggression, not only in Europe but throughout the world.

Necessarily, to make such a pact work as our Atlantic defense, it was necessary to have it in full operation within a very short time to meet the growing Communist threat. Referring again to Mr. Hoover's speech, let me quote:

It is clear the UN cannot mobilize substantial military forces.

And remember that the Atlantic Pact was supposed to have been organized under and within the framework of the UN Charter.

He further declares:

It is clear continental Europe has not in the 3 years of our aid developed that unity of purpose and that will power necessary for its own defense. It is clear that our British friends are flirting with appeasement of Communist China.

Again Mr. Hoover emphatically asserts:

But the prime obligation of defense of western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money.

You can search all the history of mankind and there is no parallel to the effort and sacrifice we have made to elevate their spirit and to achieve their unity. To this date it has failed. Their minds are confused with fears and disunities. They exclude Spain, although she has the will and means to fight. They haggle with Germany, although she is their frontier. They vacillate in the belief that they are in little danger and hope to avoid again being a theater of war.

Mr. Truman and his Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, deny these statements of facts and characterizations of Western European psychology. A mere general denial is not enough.

Why should not the President, who is supposed to have all the facts in his possession, give to the American people a bill of particulars? What have our European allies done to this date to prepare their defenses? What specific actions have they taken in the way of creation of defenses, of budgets, of programs actively under way? What have they done besides talking, holding meetings of the Atlantic Defense Council, or of interchanging notes with their allies?

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the questions which the Senator has propounded, because I am in total agreement with him. They are questions the American people are asking today, and they have a right to ask them. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator saw in today's Baltimore Sun an editorial which is along the line of his remarks. Near the end of the editorial, speaking of the American people, the editorial concludes:

They want to know what the evidence is, pro and con, on the willingness of Europe to contribute to its own defense. They want to know how we want to handle the balky Germans.

The editorial goes on with a statement of various questions to which the Senator from Utah has alluded. If the Senator does not mind, and since this editorial fits in so completely with his remarks, I may say that, although I had intended asking for its insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to have it follow at the proper place in the Senator's own remarks, in the body of the RECORD, if possible.

Mr. WATKINS. I should be very glad to accept it and have it placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say I saw the editorial a moment before I rose to speak. I think it is along the same line that I am now discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Utah has had his attention drawn to a statement on this subject by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, who, I think, has never been classified as an isolationist or an appeaser, dealing with the very subject which the Senator is discussing.

Mr. WATKINS. I have not.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a statement made by him almost a month ago, on November 27, at Charleston, S. C. If the Senator wishes it to be inserted in the RECORD at the close of his remarks, I should like to read it and ask him to insert it at any point he suggests.

Mr. WATKINS. I should be glad to yield to the Senator from Maine in order

that he might read it, with the understanding that it be placed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request that that be done?

Mr. WATKINS. I so request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. BREWSTER read the statement referred to.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, is there any truth to the persistent stories which come out of France, Italy, and the Benelux countries that their people want to be passively neutral in any war that may arise between the United States and Russia and her satellites? Such rumors have been persisting for many months, in fact, for more than a year, and many persons who have investigated the situation have come back and told us, and their statements are not contradicted, that the common people of those countries have had enough war, do not want to be involved in another war, and would rather have their countries occupied than to fight again.

Only yesterday the President declared that our allies mean business. Is that based on mere promises for future action, or have they put into effect measures which will establish a claim that they do mean business? Let Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson specify.

No revelation of defense secrets need be involved in giving to the American people information on these questions. If anything has been done to build up defenses, that fact should be revealed to offset the damaging statements that have been made repeatedly, not only by the press, but semiofficially, that little if anything has been done to this date.

Giving the American people the facts—if substantial progress has been made—not theories or promises, will do more to restore the confidence of the people in our present policies with respect to our defense frontiers in the Atlantic area, than all the glittering promises our diplomats can make for future action.

In the words of the Scriptures, let them prove their faith by their works.

This was no doubt the basis for Mr. Hoover's proposal that—

To warrant our further aid, they should show they have spiritual strength and unity to avail themselves of their own resources.

But it must be far more than pacts, conferences, paper promises, and declarations. Today it must express itself in organized and equipped combat divisions of such huge numbers as would erect a sure dam against the Red front. And that before we land another man or another dollar on their shores.

Mr. President, there are still other questions which the President and the State Department should answer to the American people, and the answers to these questions should be given promptly so that they may be considered early in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

May I submit these interrogations among others that could be added?

First. What concessions has this administration made to our Western European allies in the Far East?

Second. What arrangements have been made concerning the division and allocation for civilian and military use of strategic materials?

Third. What concessions has this administration made concerning the financing of the rearmament of Western Europe, in proportion to the contributions of our allies? There is no point in shuffling hand-out programs by announcing the termination of ECA on one hand and the gift of \$12,000,000,000 in armaments on the other. We desperately need to know what the European nations are determined to do for themselves.

Fourth. What is the maximum manpower potential of the Western European nations themselves which is available for the defense of Europe, and what proportion of that available manpower are they willing to enlist in the program?

Fifth. What is the basic military defense strategy underlying the North Atlantic Pact? Does it call for the defense of anti-Soviet Europe, or just for part of Western Europe?

Mr. President, these are questions to which the American people want answers. Many other questions will be asked from time to time. But I feel that Mr. Hoover has rendered one of the greatest services ever rendered to this country by any patriot in its long history. He has pointed out what is in the minds of literally millions of Americans. They want to know the truth about the entire situation. If the story is a bad one, they can take it. On the other hand, if there are matters with respect to Europe and the defense of Europe and of the free world that are encouraging, they should have the facts. The President should take the American people into his confidence, and that immediately, so that the American people can know what to do about the future course of American foreign policy.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Baltimore Sun of December 22, 1950]

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

Mr. Hoover has now said what he thinks our foreign policy should be in these years of crisis. Mr. Dewey has said what he thinks it should be. Neither has outlined a complete program, but each has said enough to indicate the general course he wants the Nation to follow.

Between the policies outlined by these men—the one our only living ex-President and the other the titular head of the Republican Party—there is one glaring difference. To all intents and purposes, Mr. Hoover would have us withdraw all support from Europe, save possibly Great Britain. Mr. Dewey, by contrast, does not write Europe off as hopeless. He is certain Britain will fight and he has greater hopes of both France and Italy than Mr. Hoover. He is not wholly convinced that they will make valuable allies, but he thinks it would be a mistake to abandon them now when the general rearmament program under the Atlantic Pact is just getting under way.

These, then, are the two well-developed points of view which have been laid before the American people. Both have their passionate adherents. But the great body of Americans are tremendously puzzled by the whole business. Moreover, nothing that has so far come from either Mr. Truman or Mr. Acheson has served to lessen the general puzzlement.

The American record since the end of the Second World War proves that we lay great stress on the role Western Europe should play in the general struggle against Communist imperialism. Leaving out of account the loans made at the conclusion of hostilities, we have sent billions to Europe with the sole purpose of helping these countries to repair their economies and regain the spiritual tone of which 5 years of war had bereft them.

Specifically, we expected them to rehabilitate their industrial plant. Next we expected them to remove trade barriers so that Western Europe, if not Eastern Europe, would be a free trading area, comparable to the United States. We expected that the material prosperity resulting would of itself revive the flagging wills of these people so that they would be capable of self-defense, if self-defense were necessary.

Some industrial rehabilitation did, in fact, occur in Europe under the stimulus of the Marshall-plan funds. But small progress has been made toward removing trade barriers. Europe, including even Western Germany, seems superficially prosperous, but almost everyone feels that it is a false, almost hysterical prosperity. The revival of spirit, without which little else is important, is a matter of debate, with all too much evidence suggesting that it has not occurred.

It was to stimulate the will to self-defense that the Atlantic Pact was first proposed, then debated, and finally adopted. Under its terms, the United States becomes once more the arsenal of Europe. Also, as has now been decided, General Eisenhower, a man whom all Europe (save perhaps Germany) admires and trusts, has been named to create a unified defense force. Some American troops, perhaps a great many of them, will be a part of this defense force under the plan as discussed. If all goes well, the industry of the German Ruhr, as well as that of Britain, France, and Italy, will contribute a share of the implements of defense.

The knotty question of creating an actual German armed force is still being debated, though almost any military man will tell you that unless the Western Germans participate in the defense of their country there is almost no hope for the rest of continental Europe.

These, then, are some of the issues posed by the addresses of Mr. Dewey and Mr. Hoover. They would not, they could not, have brought them up if they did not feel, as so many of us feel, that the American people are floundering dangerously.

The reason the American people are floundering is not hard to find. They do not trust their present leadership. They know that Mr. Truman is a man of fits and starts. They find in him neither great wisdom nor steadfastness of purpose. They are being convinced, many of them unwillingly, that Mr. Truman is not capable of thinking in the large terms which the crisis demands.

When they turn to Mr. Acheson, they get little comfort. Even if they have not been worried and confused by the charge that he is "soft" with Communists, here and abroad, they are still uneasy. They know that he had a large part in the formulation of the Marshall plan and in its execution. They know that the Atlantic Pact was mainly his idea. But if they come to believe, and it is clear already that many have come to believe, that the Marshall plan has failed and that the continent of Europe will not resist if the Russians attack, then all Mr. Acheson's fine structure will collapse and we shall have to retreat to the lines suggested by Mr. Hoover.

And this, however it may be gilded by the apologists for complete isolationism, is a grisly prospect for 150,000,000 Americans and for the rest of the world too.

The American people cannot and should not follow a leadership which leaves so many life-and-death issues hanging in midair.

They have a right to demand that Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson make an honest and straightforward effort to tell them the whole story as they see it.

They want to know what the evidence is, pro and con, on the willingness of Europe to contribute to its own defense.

They want to know how we want to handle the balky Germans.

They want to know what will happen to Japan, to the Philippines, to southeast Asia, and our supplies of tin and rubber, to India, and to Australia when we are finally forced to evacuate Korea.

They want to know, in brief, whether Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson truly understand the fix we are in and what they propose we should do about it.

If these and related questions are not answered soon and with complete candor, our precious national unity will have been lost beyond recovery and the confusion which now grips the country will be replaced by a tragic and destructive isolationism.

EXHIBIT 2

GENERAL CLAY HITS WEST EUROPE APPEASEMENT

CHARLESTON, S. C., November 27.—Gen. Lucius D. Clay, former military governor of West Germany, assailed tonight increasing talk of possible appeasement abroad and said nations which we arm must be willing to fight for freedom.

In the United Kingdom and in Western Europe, Clay said, we are hearing appeasement talk instead of a renewed determination to get ready.

Clay, now New York State civil defense director, spoke to the southern governors' conference here. He questioned the wisdom of economists who, he said, have asserted the Marshall plan could not be used for war production without retarding the economic recovery of the beneficiary countries.

"The reasonable use of production facilities for armament purposes need not adversely affect the soundness of the over-all economy," Clay said. "In Europe and in this country, prosperity has been achieved even when substantial portions of the national productive powers were used."

Clay suggested that we put Marshall plan money into our own war machine unless we get assurance that Western Europe is preparing for a fight for freedom.

He urged the Government to find out what Western Europe is doing to rearm, because there is nothing more important to the success of our fight for freedom than the support of West Europe.

"Unless we can be sure that rearmament is taking place, should we not ask ourselves if any of the money being used to strengthen Europe could be employed more effectively in increasing our own strength.

"Western Germany will still be willing to join us in the defense of Europe," he added, "if the Germans are not made second-class associates."

He said he was not in favor of a preventive war but rather of bringing about "a proper balance in military strength that will make war unprofitable to any aggressor."

The need for that accomplishment is urgent, he said, because as "more and more satellite troops are being pushed into action we are coming dangerously close to a major war."

Mr. BREWSTER. That editorial which I read a few moments ago would seem to be very compelling evidence from a man who knows more about the European situation, certainly, than does any other American at this time, as a result of the 3 years he spent there in rehabilitation work. He speaks with pro-

found knowledge to the very point which the Senator from Utah is seeking to drive home.

Mr. WATKINS. I appreciate the statement. Former President Herbert Hoover, by reason of his residence for many years, not only in Europe, but in China and the Far East, is, in effect, practically a world citizen. I think he is one of the best informed men in the world today on world conditions. Although he is not holding any official position at this time, I understand he keeps in touch with events all around the world. That enables him to get information which will permit him to give expression of views which have all the force and effect of coming from one of the best informed men in the world today.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is unquestionably the case; and it should be added that General Clay—and I hope the country can take comfort from it—has just been selected by Mr. Charles Wilson as his chief assistant in the production effort at home, and he will seek to develop our own strength in America and be sure it is not wasted in any misadventure.

Mr. WATKINS. America is to be congratulated upon securing the services of General Clay as Mr. Wilson's assistant. I think he has a correct understanding of the European situation.

HIGHWAY CONVENTION WITH REPUBLIC OF PANAMA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive W, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a highway convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama on September 14, 1950. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention; the convention and message from the President will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the highway convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama on September 14, 1950.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention and a copy of each of two notes exchanged on September 14, 1950, constituting a *modus vivendi* between the two Governments, together with a translation of the Panamanian note.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

DECEMBER 22, 1950.

Enclosures: (1) Report by the Secretary of State; (2) highway convention with Panama, signed September 14, 1950; (3) copy of each of two notes dated September 14, 1950, with translation of Panamanian note.

REPORT ON WORLD CONDITIONS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, Senators will recall the famous words of the gladiators in the Roman Colosseum as they entered mortal combat:

O mighty Caesar! We who are about to die salute you.

As one of those whose term is about to expire in this great body, I salute my colleagues. I thank them for their uniform courtesies and their numerous kindnesses. I should like to make a few reports and observations for whatever value they may be to my distinguished colleagues in the service of their country during this period of great crisis.

On the sixth of September, in conjunction with two of my colleagues in the Senate and some Members of the House, I was one of the delegates to the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Dublin, Ireland. The meeting of this old and eminent organization was the occasion for the convening of representatives of 34 nations in the great capital of a great country. I shall not discuss the proceedings of the Interparliamentary Union, but shall refer only to some evidence of the shape of things to come which we heard at the conference. Our delegation made an effort to get through a resolution condemning the aggression which was taking place in Korea. The delegations of the other countries present were agreeable to the adoption of a general resolution. However, they were not willing to insert the word "Korea" in a resolution of condemnation. It reflected some timidity on the part of other countries, which has had some lamentable consequences in more recent times. As I say, it was interesting as evidencing the shape of things to come.

Another resolution, which I am sure my colleagues will recall, was a resolution offered by certain representatives from the Far East—Ceylon, India, and I believe other countries—in which they denounced food policies, particularly of this country. They surmised that those policies contemplated a scarcity of production of food and artificial raising of the price of food in the world market. They pointed out that hundreds of millions of people were starving in Asia, and intimated, even if they did not charge, that much of the starvation and suffering was due to the curtailed production of food in the United States, and that there would be much larger surpluses of food on hand were it not for scarcity production; that there would have been more food available for the starving millions of Asia had we not artificially raised the price in the world market so that they could not buy the food.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Florida recall that they pointed to the destruction of food, as well, which they deplored, and, to our great humiliation, denounced us as military colonialists?

Mr. PEPPER. That was embodied in their suggestion. I was going to refer to that a little later in my statement. They assumed falsely that we were de-

stroying food in large quantities in this country. Fortunately, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Representative COOLEY, from North Carolina, was chairman of our delegation, and to the surprise of our critics our delegation unanimously supported the resolution which was offered. It indicated that we were interested in succoring the starving people of Asia and other parts of the world and made it very clear that we were not squandering or wasting food in this country, or denying it designatedly to those who needed it in any part of the world. We were also advised by delegates from the Middle East that the United States was playing a policy of duplicity, and that while we perpetrated and condemned aggression in Asia we were guilty of it in the Middle East. Of course, they had reference to what had happened with respect to Palestine and Israel, in some respects, and with respect to the policies of certain Western Powers in the Middle East in the past.

However, that is rather a prologue to what I heard on Sunday from someone who had received a report from a representative of his company in Cairo. It is to the effect that when a picture of our President appeared on the screen in the newsreel there were manifestations of displeasure and animosity from the audience in the theater. When the manager of the theater remonstrated with the audience against their protest and their display of animosity, the audience reacted by tearing up the seats in the theater. As I say, those are only some of the ominous signs that we had as a prologue at the Interparliamentary Conference in Dublin. They indicate that there are many parts of the world which either misunderstands the attitude of the American Government and the American people, or were disseminating a propaganda which is desirous of discrediting the policies of our Government and our people and perverting them to mean something they do not mean.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator could well emphasize, as it is unfortunately and tragically true, that within the next 3 months, under present policies, millions of bushels of potatoes will be destroyed, to the very great distress of the Senator from Maine. I also think that everyone appreciates what those potatoes might do in the production of industrial alcohol, or for our rubber-research program. I will not labor the point now. The fact that the foreign countries were talking about it in Dublin is, I hope, something that will persuade our friends in the next Congress to see that something is done about it.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course that relates to a domestic matter, and we know that here at home, and, as I pointed out to the delegates at Dublin, we have a policy and law which would permit those organizations who would like to supply food to the needy to come and get it provided they pay transportation charges across

the ocean. We would make the food available to them for nothing. It is probably true that with potatoes and commodities like that they could not without great expense transport them across the ocean, and perhaps it would not be feasible to do so. At the same time, certainly, we are not a heartless and callous country, inconsiderate of the hungry and impoverished people of the world, as some of the critics of our policies would like to have others believe.

While we were in Dublin we heard debate between the spokesmen on both sides on the subject of Ireland's partition. Among those participating in the debate were the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, Mr. McBride, and Mr. De Valera, the leader of the opposition. One of the participants was a member of the British Parliament who came from the north of Ireland. Another representative who participated was a member of the House of Commons who lived in England. The issue of partition was fairly debated before this international convention of 34 nations.

I may say, Mr. President, that I believe very strongly in what I gave out as a press release before leaving Dublin, that it is in the interest of the security of the Atlantic group that a way be found to eradicate the partition of that great and courageous people of Ireland, and I believe that they should either be a member of the North Atlantic Pact group of nations or at least a member of and participant in the military-aid program, for certainly they are of the greatest value and strategic importance to the security of the Atlantic community. I believe the elimination of the partition that divides Ireland, and allowing those people in a national referendum to determine their own destiny and to choose their own government, is not only in the interest of their unity, but it would also contribute immeasurably to the strength of the Atlantic community.

Mr. President, we spent a very brief period in London. It was obvious from only a superficial observation of England that things were very much better, that there was a far more encouraging attitude on the part of the people to be observed, that the economic strength of the country had been vastly improved and increased by the many programs in which we had participated, and in which we had been the greatest benefactor, and that today Britain was far able to do her part in preserving freedom and resisting aggression in the world than she would have been had we not given her the great assistance which she has obtained since 1945. She will perhaps do more, although I understand that percentage-wise she is doing as much as we are doing at the present time in the way of industrial production, and in building up armed forces. She is making a very material contribution by troops which are actually fighting in Korea. And Britain today deserves commendation for the part she is playing in standing by our side in opposing the aggression which confronts the free world today.

In Germany we found greatly improved economic conditions and a growing demand for a peace treaty and the end of

occupation, and repeated assertions that the Germans were not going to furnish troops to defend Western Europe unless they had their own staff, command, and army on equal terms with other Western European nations.

We made a brief stop in Yugoslavia, and, having been to that country in 1945, I found a great change in conditions as I observed them at that time. When I arrived in Belgrade in the fall of 1945 and drove with the Ambassador of the United States from the airport into the city, we passed long lines of people in the streets carrying banners or placards, and chanting words and songs, and a little bit later we heard speakers speaking on a great decorated platform, and all was commendation of Russia or communism, and extolling the virtues of Lenin and Stalin. Of course, Tito was arrayed as one of the Communist immortals along with Stalin and Lenin.

On this visit this year, as is known by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is doing me the honor of listening now, and was present in Belgrade, as well as two Members of the House of Representatives, Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina, and Mr. POAGE, of Texas, there would be an occasional picture of Lenin. There was no picture of Stalin anywhere. There were certainly no banners extolling the virtues of Stalin and Russia. There were no Russian flags displayed anywhere.

On the contrary, Marshal Tito told us in the conference we had with him how definite and how final the break was between him and the Kremlin, of the aggression the Kremlin had committed against Yugoslavia, and how determined he was to defend his country, and preserve its integrity and its sovereignty.

He told us about the needs of the country for famine aid on account of the drought which the country had suffered. He told us that the 31 divisions which were attributed to Yugoslavia were not the total military potential of his country, and I believe, having inquired, as we did, of many sources outside of our own Embassy, that the consensus of the informed people is that Yugoslavia will fight if Russia attacks them, and that the resistance they will put up in case of an attack will divert large Russian forces from those we would have to face in other parts of the world. I am sure that the action Congress has recently taken in giving famine aid to the people of Yugoslavia is definitely and directly in the interest of the security of our own country and the free world.

We protested to Marshal Tito against religious persecution for which his government had been responsible. He assured us the whole subject was under consideration by his Government at the present time. I inferred that the Government's policy was going to undergo a favorable change.

We did also have advice that the general attitude of Tito, he being determined in his opposition to the Russian aggression, and his generally friendly attitude toward the Western Powers, was of great

value to our country in keeping the Russians from getting a seaport on the Adriatic, constituting less danger to Italy than had existed in the past, that is, less Communist pressure on Italy which would draw it away from the western countries, and also be of value to us in that it removed the pressure which had previously been upon Greece.

It was the opinion of those to whom we talked in Yugoslavia that the breach between Tito and Stalin is a real breach, that the prospect is that it will be of indefinite continuation, that the people are opposed to the domination of their country by Stalin and Russia, that they are opposed to the collectivization of their lands into communal farms, and the confiscation of their property by the Government. It was thought that Yugoslavia having been cut off from economic aid with the satellite countries and with Russia by the attitude of resistance they have taken to the aggression of communism in their country, they have to turn more and more to the Western Powers for economic aid, and gradually, as the Russian aggression becomes more pronounced, they will orient themselves more and more in the western orbit, and become more and more a country which may be depended upon to resist, certainly in Central Europe, the Russian aggression.

Tito also promised at my urging to expedite the return of all Greek children whose parents or the members of whose family would request their return. Later in conferring with the Prime Minister of Greece and my reporting Tito's promise to him, the Prime Minister said he would call upon Greek parents or families to request the return of their children at once. Since my return to the United States, a number of these children have been returned to Greece.

As the author of the resolution of the Senate calling upon the President to do all he can to help these children to be returned, the results are particularly gratifying to me. Now that diplomatic relations between Greece and Yugoslavia are being resumed, there is every likelihood all of these Greek children will be returned.

In Greece, where we were for a time, we observed a remarkable economic, political, and morale recovery on the part of the people. A phenomenal job has been done by the American military mission which has been there, and by the economic aid we have given to that country. We have reduced our ECA contribution from \$274,000,000 to \$208,000,000, because it was felt by our ECA representatives that the local government could do more than it had been doing.

We saw the great work that had been done, and it would give an American's heart joy to see the way the Greek people appreciate the fact that the intervention of the United States, to the extent of protecting them against Communist aggression, has saved their country from outside domination, and given them an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves from the terrible destruction they sustained, and the devastation they experienced in the war.

However, Mr. President, we began to see there a pattern, which we saw re-

peated many, many times in the Middle East and in other parts of the world, where we found that the Government policies and personnel were simply inadequate to meet the challenge of modern times. For example, their tax policies were so unfair to the masses of the people that one could not expect either adequate revenue or general popular support for those policies. We found that, relatively and generally speaking, the rich pay little taxes. They are often able to bribe or intimidate the tax collector against the collection of the taxes. There is a great deal of corruption in officialdom, and there is, generally speaking, a total lack of a political party that is devoted, genuinely and unselfishly and truly, to the service of the public interest, and that has real democratic progress as well as broad, general goods as the aim and the aspiration of the party. Too often there appeared, as we saw in other countries, the same little cliques running everything, and though governments may change from day to day, basically the people who control public authority are the same people.

Mr. President, I do not mention that in derogation of the great people of Greece, to whom I am devoted, but I mention it as a pattern we observed through almost all the Middle East, and as we go to the Far East, we find it even more pronounced, which indicates there will never be the strength these great people should possess until there arise in all these countries political parties that are truly devoted to the public interest, that will diligently, faithfully, and fearlessly serve the people, which will adopt governmental policies and programs, including tax programs and policies, which are fair to all the people, and which will cause the people to have confidence in the true democracy that actuates the Government, and will cause them to be willing to associate themselves with those policies, even to the point of giving their lives that their country and their high aims may prevail. However, I do want to say that the future of Greece, in my opinion, is bright, for the intrepid spirit and courage of these people has revealed a determination that, no matter how hard the struggle, they are going to see it through, and this ancient home of democracy is not going to become the citadel of any new tyranny which might be devised by those who would be their masters.

In Turkey we found an improving economic condition, largely by the assistance of the ECA, a splendid morale on the part of the government and the people, unflinching courage in the face of Soviet intimidations and threats, and a willingness on their part to fight if they were attacked, to fight until they had stopped the aggressor, or until they had spent themselves in an effort to resist his vicious aggressions.

We were there at a time when the Turkish troops were embarking for Korea. We talked to the head of our military mission there, General Arnold. We came to appreciate the magnificent job General Arnold had done in welding

the army into greater strength and unity and power, and we heard from General Arnold an expression of confidence in the showing the Turkish troops would make in Korea. I have followed with acute interest what those troops did there, and I heard stories from some of our people of the valor of these Turkish soldiers. They said that after the Turkish troops had been engaged in a terrible ordeal in resisting Chinese Communists who had come into the affray, after they had suffered severe casualties and they were ordered to retire, the first word these Turkish troops sent back was, "We are doing all right. Just let us alone. We are getting along fine."

It finally required a peremptory order from a superior authority to pull those courageous Turkish troops back out of the most terrific part of the front. That is the kind of courage, that is the kind of fighting qualities, those tough Turks have got. I feel that what we have done with our economy program and our military-aid program to Turkey has been wisely done, and corroboration and confirmation of it is being displayed by the fighting qualities they have exhibited in Korea.

I may add that today the democratic forces of Turkey are stronger than they have ever been in the recent past. They have free elections, and I believe it is only fair to say honest elections. They have a Government elected by the people and accountable to the people. I heard only recently of housing programs out in the little villages in Turkey which the Turkish Government is carrying on. They are poor relatively. Their private soldier receives only 21 cents a month for military service, and, therefore, it not being a very attractive service, they have a great shortage of noncommissioned officers. The soldier receives only two uniforms a year, one for winter and one for summer. Yet with those limitations which would be painful to us, as I say, they have shown remarkable and commendable fighting courage. There is a new Turkey oriented to the West which has risen upon the splendid edifice established by Kemal Pasha after World War I.

We were thrilled to observe the great strength, the morale, and the courageous facing of the future which one finds in Israel. Israel is truly a new hope for an old part of the world. Israel deserves our continued help, for it will be an effective bulwark of democracy and resistance to aggression in the whole Middle East.

Then we went on through all the other countries in the Middle East—Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia. There one finds many contradictions. One finds great potentialities. Some of the countries have great new agricultural possibilities which would be fulfilled if they had irrigation and reclamation. In some areas those projects are getting under way. Many have great natural resources, some being developed, some not fully developed, and some not opened up at all.

On the other hand, one finds in most of those countries much abject poverty, as most other visitors will recall. In

some places conditions are almost offensive. It almost nauseates one to see the deplorable condition under which the people are living in some areas, where children are drinking green, stagnant water out of ditches where cattle and dogs are washing themselves. There are for large masses of people conditions of squalor almost indescribable. Yet somewhere nearby one will find the greatest evidences of riches, luxury, and indulgence.

In nearly every one of these countries one can expect two things. One is they do not have a tax system that is fair to the masses of the people and another is that the efficiency of their governments needs greatly to be improved. One of the valuable contributions we are making is to give them assistance under the Smith-Mundt bill and under the four-point program in improving the efficiency of their governments. In many of their governments, however, in fact in nearly all of them, one will find signs of hope, one will find men of confidence and character and liberal views coming into political importance and sometimes being the heads of the governments.

Mr. President, it is obvious that our plain duty is to try to help those ancient and great people in every possible way to help themselves. We should exchange more personnel with them, let their personnel be trained here in the United States, and send to them trained personnel when they would like to have it, to aid them in the administration of their governments. We should aid them in the development of their natural resources. We should assist them in extending their trade and in every possible way to encourage them to add new strength to the democratic world.

We were in India and Pakistan for a few days. In India one finds a strange and striking paradox. There are the very rich and the very poor. India, one of the great romantic countries of the world, is at the same time a country where probably in volume poverty is exceeded only by that which is to be found in China. The average per capita income in India is about \$50 a year. They have, however, improved their condition a great deal. They have a truly democratic government now. Their people are proud of the liberty and independence they have gained. They feel that they have a great part to play in the future world. They are undertaking courageously their world responsibilities and, I believe, that taking into account their past, one can commend the part that India is playing in world affairs.

Having a tradition of nonviolence, it is not surprising that the great Hindu leader, Mr. Nehru, would desire in every possible way to settle disputes without violence. However, they have been realistic enough in their internal affairs to provide armed forces of considerable proportions which are quite burdensome to their economy, and as the threat to their own security has become more menacing by the recent invasions of the neighboring states, I think they are going to appreciate that we live in a world today, that we are dealing with enemies today who are not amenable to

the persuasions of morality or the entreaty of reason, that they respect only force and superior force, and that if India is to save the independence she has won after so long and so glorious a struggle, she has got to have the courage and the conviction to associate herself with those who are trying to build the protection that will only make possible a free world.

Probably nowhere else is there better illustration of the significance of this collective security program than in India and Pakistan. India is spending 55 percent of her budget upon her military establishment. Pakistan is spending 65 percent of her budget upon the military establishment. Neither of these countries, relatively poor, can afford such expenditures. Tragically, each is arming principally against the other. It is to be regretted that they cannot reconcile peacefully their own fraternal differences and unite as sister states in building up the welfare of their people and contributing to the security of a free world. But, as I said many times, in that part of the world, to press conferences and to others, the collective security program that the United Nations offers today is the cheapest insurance which any nation can possibly obtain. If a nation takes an honorable course in the United Nations organization, if a nation does its part in that great association of peace-loving peoples, then it will not have to rely only upon its own strength for its own security; then it will have the assurance that men and women of good will in other parts of the world, men and women of peace-loving purpose, will come to its rescue if it is attacked. The cheapest insurance that any of the nations can possibly take out today is in an honorable and creditable way to do their own part in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations organization.

Mr. President, if I may in all humility offer a word of counsel to that great leader, Prime Minister Nehru, let it be that I hope he appreciates the danger to his own country and to the freedom of his own people and to the freedom of the peace-loving, independence-desiring world, and that he will do his full part—as I know his heart leads him to do—in the United Nations and in getting word to the Communist aggressors in Russia and in China that India will not give them aid or comfort, will not countenance their wrongs or appear indifferent to their crimes, but that India will stand with the peace-loving nations and, if need be, will fight and resist the aggressions that Russia and China are engaged in and the aggressions that they propose.

I wish to say, to the great credit of the people of India, that they did support us in the resolutions in the Security Council when the fateful decisions were made, in June, that the United Nations would resist the aggressions occurring in Korea.

In my conference with Prime Minister Nehru, he said that he felt that India was the window to the west, that India could play a great part in bringing the east and the west together, by trying to be the intermediary.

Mr. President, that view presupposes that Russia is disposed to have honor-

able differences, and to have them honorably reconciled; and it completely ignores the reality that Russia does not want any intermediary. In today's newspapers the headlines tell us that the Russians and Chinese Communists scorn efforts to get a cease-fire order into effect. They do not want reconciliation; they do not want mediation; they do not want conciliation; they do not want anyone to try to bring together themselves and their would-be victims, because they do not want to be arrested in the pursuit of their criminally aggressive aims.

So I hope that this great man, Prime Minister Nehru, who for nearly a lifetime has been devoted to obtaining the freedom of his people, will—now that he has such great power and confidence of his country and the admiration of a free world—be a great, eloquent voice in calling upon all the peace-loving peoples of Asia to arise against this danger, which now is apparent upon the borders of his own country, so that they will no longer try to appease it, so that they will no longer embrace it. I do not know of any man today who has an opportunity to make a greater contribution to the preservation of the freedom for which he fought so long, and which so recently has been obtained, for his country and for the peace-loving world, than the great leader of the Indian people, their honorable Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is an interesting contrast that when the Senator from Maine visited there a few years ago, it was impossible to see Mr. Nehru, because he was then confined in prison. There has certainly been a marvelous transformation.

The analogy he suggests—namely, that of India's being the window—suggests also that at this time the Russians would seem to be throwing a brick through the window.

Had the invasion of Tibet by the Chinese Communists occurred at the time when the Senator from Florida was in India?

Mr. PEPPER. No; it had not.

Mr. BREWSTER. So Mr. Nehru has been very much educated since then.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that event must have influenced Mr. Nehru greatly.

Mr. President, I still hope Mr. Nehru will rise to meet the challenge of today and will assume even a more bold leadership of the peace-loving peoples of Asia than he has asserted up to the present time.

Mr. President, I must commend Pakistan. Senators will recall the visit to this country of the Prime Minister of Pakistan. I think he made a favorable impression here. In the United Nations Pakistan has—with no deviation—supported the program of resisting aggression in Korea.

I found, on the part of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, every disposition to associate his country unqualifiedly with the peace-loving peoples of the world.

They were determined to continue to do their full duty in the United Nations. I commend very highly the attitude and the activity of the people of Pakistan in determinedly resisting aggression and associating themselves unqualifiedly with the rest of the peace-loving world.

In Siam we found an interesting example of another courageous government which had definitely alined itself with the rest of the peace-loving world, and was doing its part, not only in the United Nations, not only in its domestic program of strengthening democracy and extending the democratic base of its government, but in actually sending troops into Korea, where they have made a military contribution of meaningful significance.

Siam, famous for its friendliness, certainly engages one's warm feelings. While in Siam, I think I saw one of the most thrilling sights I ever beheld—when, one morning, we went in a small motorboat along one of the canals, which the Siamese call clongs, visiting what is called the floating market, where there are many boats and also shops and homes along the sides of the canal. What most caught the attention of Mrs. Pepper and myself was the unusual friendliness of the children. Hundreds of children in their enthusiastic and warm way waved very friendly greetings to our little group as we passed along in the motorboat. That brought to my mind one of the songs in the wonderful musical comedy, *South Pacific: You Have To Be Taught To Hate*. Those children did not know whether we belonged to one country or another or to one political party or another or to one religion or another. They simply saw some strangers passing along the canal in a boat, and they waved their friendly greetings.

Mr. President, Siam is a fascinating country. I know of nowhere that one would find a better confirmation of the wisdom of our course in extending aid and effective help under the Smith-Mundt program and under the military-aid program. We are giving Siam our help. Even though Siam is in an exposed position, that Nation is alining itself with the Western World, which is trying to serve the best interests of the peace of both the East and the West. Those people are courageously cooperating with us and deserve our continued help.

We spent a period of 3 or 4 days in Hong Kong, which, of course, is a very unique as well as a very attractive area. However, I must say that there are a great many persons there who did not seem to have any hesitation or any compunction against carrying on trade—even with materials which would be of war value—with Communist China.

Our own naval authorities told us that they consistently saw commercial craft going into Communist China, but they had no instructions or authority to stop it, because their duties related only to the performance of the function given to the Seventh Fleet by the President, to protect Formosa against attack from the mainland, and the mainland, of course, from attack by Formosa. But I regret very much that the disposition to carry on trade as usual has led some of

the old firms in Hong Kong to continue to carry on trade with Communist China, as if Communist China were not dedicated as it is to its present course, a threat to the very security of Hong Kong. I am sorry that they have not felt that they, exposed as they are, cannot hope to survive, except, of course, by the possible temporary indulgence of the Chinese Communists, unless they associate themselves with the free world and we effectively stop the aggression of Russia and communism in the Far East.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator familiar with the reports, just received, of over \$1,000,000,000 worth of trade done through Hong Kong with Communist China during the past year? It is a tragic revelation of the extent to which their profits have gone.

Mr. PEPPER. I understood the report. I saw the press account that their 1950 business was the best year that they have had.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. I should be interested in hearing the Senator's impression or opinion as to the possibility of Hong Kong, in the long run, really surviving as a British possession in the midst of Communist China.

Mr. PEPPER. Unless we can stop aggression by collective action, Hong Kong would have no hope of existing except through the temporary tolerance of Communist China.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Florida agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that the probabilities are that Great Britain is going to lose Hong Kong in the long run, and that she ought to face the realities of the situation and realize that Hong Kong is probably already a war casualty, at least a war prisoner, and certainly should not follow an economic course of action whereby Hong Kong can be used as a device by the Communist Chinese to do great damage to American forces in Korea?

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator, in my opinion, is justified in his assertion. I think probably the best way to surmise what may happen to Hong Kong, if this determination and program of Russia, with and through Chinese communism, to occupy the whole of the Far East is carried out, as they are today carrying it on, is to surmise that the same thing will happen to Hong Kong under that aggression as happened to Hong Kong under the Japanese aggression, which was bent upon the same objective, namely, pushing all other influences out of the Far East, under what they called the doctrine of Asia for the Asiatics; and, just as certainly as did the Japanese occupy Hong Kong in that program of aggression, so would the Russians and the Communist Chinese take it, if their own program of aggression is permitted to be extended.

Mrs. Pepper and I went on to Japan, to Tokyo, and were there from November 1 to November 28. I must say I did not

appreciate the magnificence of the job done in Japan by General MacArthur, until I got a chance to see something of it by personal inquiry and observation. I made a statement in Tokyo, which I am glad to repeat here in the Senate, that I had known before that General MacArthur was regarded as one of the great generals of history—and I have not changed my mind about it, by reason of recent reverses—but I had to discover in Japan that he was also entitled to be called one of the great statesmen of history; for, today, his work in Japan speaks for itself. In the first place, when the Korean attack occurred and our forces had to be thrown immediately into Korea, General MacArthur had practically to strip Japan of all our military forces there in order to send those forces at once to Korea. Yet there was never any threat of aggression or uprising, or in any sense of the word violence from the people or from the Government of Japan. On the contrary, we have not had the slightest feeling of insecurity of our administration there, however much we have found it necessary under the emergency to strip Japan of our occupying forces.

In addition to that, the people of Japan have been helping in the program that directly benefited our resistance to aggression in Korea, for they have, of course, helped load our ships, they have helped carry on the work of our agencies over there, where Japan has been an essential base in the conduct of our operations in Korea.

More than that, Japan has adopted a constitution which is democratic in character; and Japan, today, in my opinion, is entitled to be called a democratic country. Not only that, Mr. President; their people have learned to appreciate the blessings of democracy, and in my opinion they are not going to permit those blessings to be taken away from them in future years. The suffrage has been extended to the masses of the people, including the women. My wife and I visited a polling place late one afternoon in the course of an election, and the election officials were constituted, six women and four men. When we inquired of the election officials how many women had voted that day—women were not entitled previous to our occupation there to vote—they said more women had voted up to that time of the day than men.

In addition to that, Mr. President, in my opinion, the Japanese Government and people can be depended upon in the future to associate themselves with the western powers in resistance to Soviet aggression. They know that since we have been there we have not treated them with brutality or atrocity, but have treated them with fairness and consideration, and they have sense enough to know what sort of experience they would have under a Russian occupation.

So, Mr. President, my opinion is that the Japanese people have learned the error of their previous evil way, and in the future they are going to preserve basically a democracy for their country, and with appropriate help from us in arming and aiding them so that they can resist aggression, they will be found

on the side of the western powers in resisting Soviet aggression.

I cannot too highly commend, as I said, the statesmanship exhibited by General MacArthur in the way he has handled the whole Japanese situation. At the time he advised the retention of the Emperor. I doubted the wisdom of it, but after I got a chance to make inquiry in Japan itself, I learned that the Emperor was of the greatest benefit to General MacArthur and to our country in bringing about the transition of the Japanese people to the occupation; and he has been a great force in aid of the democratic character of the Japanese Constitution and the country.

On the 20th of November I joined our great Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews, with Admiral Joy, naval commander of our far-eastern forces, at Fukuoka, and, on the following day, the 20th, I flew with these gentlemen and their party to Wonsan. We went immediately aboard the *Mount McKinley*, which was the flagship of Admiral Doyle, who had the immediate responsibility for one of the greatest military operations in history—the Inchon landing. During that afternoon we saw the *Consolation*, a naval hospital ship. Senators can be proud of and the country can be grateful for what is being done by all of our Armed Forces, in giving medical care to those who sustained injury in Korea.

The hospital ships, Mr. President, are simply floating hospitals containing the best of hospital equipment, and the personnel is competent and devoted to their humane tasks. By having these hospital ships afloat in an area such as that of Korea, a base hospital is available, in a very short time, to those who have sustained injury.

My wife and I visited many hospitals in Japan, and I visited others, on the ground as well as upon the sea, while in Korea. Mrs. Pepper and I spent some time with Maj. Gen. E. E. Hume, the very able Surgeon General of our Far East forces, in visiting hospitals in Yokohama, at our great naval base at Yosuka, and at Tachichawa, our air base. At those hospitals in Japan and Korea it is unbelievable the way medical science and devoted men and women have saved the lives of the sorely wounded who have been brought to those hospitals. The percentage of recovery of casualties exceeds any that has ever been experienced in the past, including World War II. One of the reasons for that is the rapidity with which the injured personnel are brought under medical care. Too high praise cannot be paid the corpsmen. Those corpsmen, without weapons, are attached to companies in the front line of combat, and their first job and their dedicated task is to get out of danger a man who is hurt and give him treatment at the earliest possible moment. The result is that we find these devoted corpsmen when necessary giving blood plasma right where they find a wounded man, right where he fell, sometimes with bullets flying around them. I have seen some of the phenomenal cases of recovery of men who came in with gangrene in the brain, with part of the head shot

away, with fungus in the brain, and other severe injuries which had been sustained.

I said, "It certainly must be a hazardous task for these corpsmen to get men out of the places where they are hit."

I was told that there were corpsmen all over the hospital, that there was one next door who had been shot all to pieces in trying to rescue men who had been wounded.

I was very proud of the fact, Mr. President, that I discovered, at one of the places, a Negro corpsman who had been in the Navy. I was at a marine base with my wife. One of the marines in the little group was a Negro corpsman who had won the Distinguished Service Cross for the valor which he had shown in going back three times, although injured, to get men who had been wounded, and bringing them back. So let me pay the warmest tribute to the medical service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, for the magnificent job they have done in rescuing and in attending those who have fallen as casualties in battle.

Mr. President, on the evening of the 20th of November we of the Secretary's party went aboard the great battleship *Missouri* and spent the night aboard. Early next morning we saw the fueling of the *Missouri*, a system which has been developed by no other navy as effectively as by the American Navy. It is one of the remarkable improvements which make it possible for our fleet to stay at sea longer than can any other fleet in the world.

All praise to the ingenuity of the American naval service for having devised such a system.

We then went aboard the *Philippine Sea*, which is one of our great carriers, off the east coast of Korea. There we saw airmen going off the deck of that carrier in their dive bombers and in their jet planes, going right to the battle line to drop their bombs or to engage in combat protecting our planes which were dropping their bombs along the Yalu River. On that afternoon I saw one of the airplanes land on the deck, and a great many persons rushed around it to look at it. A little later it was brought to the hangar, and there was a great hole, at least 18 inches in diameter, which had been shot in the right wing of the plane which had been bombing the bridges over the Yalu River. But the shell which had torn that great hole through that wing and endangered the life of the flying American, did not come from the Korean side; it came from anti-aircraft batteries on the Manchurian side, the China side, of the Yalu River. I heard some of our pilots tell the Secretary of the Navy, their superior officers, and me about having to fly along the river's edge, on the Korean side, and take the intensive flak from the other side, and take the fire from the other side, without any authority to cross the river either to pursue a plane that had tried to shoot them down or to silence a battery that had jeopardized their lives and their planes.

I cannot, for the life of me, Mr. President, believe it is wise policy or that it is fairness to our fighting personnel to

deny them the right to resist those who are trying to destroy them, because of technicalities. If a bridge is the means over which the enemy is sending troops over on the Korean side to kill our men, I think our men have the same right to bomb that bridge on the China side as on the Korean side, and to stop those troops before they get within range of our men. If planes come over to shoot down our planes, our planes should have the right to pursue them across the border and probably impress upon them the hazard of their repeating any such attacks upon the Korean side.

Mr. President, on November 23 we saw some of the marines of the First Marine Division and had lunch with General Smith, the great commander of the First Marine Division which fought so valorously and with General Harris, his able air commander at Yonpo. All honor to those valiant marines. They paid a terrible price, but, Mr. President, I hope they impressed upon these evil forces that Americans and other peace-loving peoples in the United Nations are determined to resist aggression, even if some have to make the supreme sacrifice in order to do it.

I went over to Seoul and had dinner with our excellent and able Ambassador, Mr. Muccio, there, who has done such a splendid job and who is staying on so courageously, even in the face of the present danger.

I had Thanksgiving dinner with General Walker and his staff at Pyongyang. That afternoon we went in a plane to Anju, and then by jeep up to the regimental headquarters of the Nineteenth Regiment, and to some of the company headquarters.

I was very happy to see that the American soldiers had turkey which was roasted brown and which tasted and smelled very good. So far as I could observe, right up at the front, with the artillery shooting over our heads, the efficiency of the Quartermaster Corps was such that every American soldier was eating turkey and had on his mess-kit the same kind of food and the same little delicacies that I had enjoyed at the table of General Walker.

We also met the commander of the British brigade there, and General Walker complimented the British brigade for what it had done in the fighting. He said they were good fighters and had given a good account of themselves since.

The next day, the 24th, at 10 o'clock, the advance took place, and our troops began to move up. At 11:10 a. m. I took off in a small plane from Pyongyang and flew over the line for approximately 2 hours.

I saw our troops moving up, lines of tanks going forward, artillery at work, our B-26's shooting their rockets and dropping napalm. Also I watched our jet planes in action and fierce action it was against ground targets.

Let me pay highest praise to our Air Forces, to General Stratemyer and the commander of the Fifth Air Force, General Partridge.

General Walker and other ground commanders told me of how intimate

and effective was the cooperation between the Air and Ground Forces. Both in strategic bombing and in giving support to our Ground Forces, the Air Force is doing a magnificent job.

From the air, Mr. President, one could see the terrible nature of that Korean terrain. One could see how easy it was for the Chinese and North Koreans to conceal themselves, for we flew, I suppose, as far as 30 miles behind their lines, and in all that flight of 2 hours we did not observe one vehicle moving on the roads. The Communists have devised a devilishly dangerous and devastating technique of combining the characteristics of guerrilla warfare with the most proficient use of modern weapons, and they were able to carry those modern weapons largely upon the backs of men. Since then they have been using camels and pack animals, but at that time they largely used the backs of men. They principally had three types of weapons—rifle, machine gun, and light and heavy mortars. It can be seen from looking at the terrain what a terrible task our forces have had to face in meeting the aggression.

Mr. President, in fairness to those who have had charge of these operations, let me say that I think our command was justified in launching the offensive they did at the time they did after they had built up enough supplies to make the offensive possible. That is all that held up the offense—building up enough supplies to initiate the forward movement. Better to have found out what they were going to face, instead of sitting in a given place and suddenly finding themselves surrounded by overwhelming superior forces, without any previous knowledge of the nature of the enemy they had to face. So I think the offensive was justified when it was taken. I want to say one other thing in defense of our command over there. They knew that those four hundred or five hundred thousand Chinese Communists were on the other side of the Yalu River. General MacArthur told us that on the 4th of November, when Mrs. Pepper and I had lunch with him and Mrs. MacArthur. He said, "We know they are over there. We know how serious it is and how threatening it is."

Who knew that they were going to advance across the Yalu River in the volume that they later displayed?

I think that nothing we have done, except our entry into Korea, has provoked the Chinese aggression with which we are faced today.

They would have aggressed as they have done today if we had stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel unless they had determined as a matter of policy to let us stop, and by some kind of deceitful negotiation get us out, when they could resume their aggression with the probability that we would not return to resist them again, because the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists are bent upon one single objective, and that is the complete conquest of the total Far East, and they will not stop, unless they are resisted by superior forces, until they achieve that objective. We may as well accept the fact that that is the kind of contest in which we are engaged and

that that is their objective and determination. Nothing save effective resistance will prevent their carrying that purpose into effect.

Mr. President, I have before me Admiral Mahan's book, *The Problem of Asia*. This is what one reads on page 24 of that book, which was written a good many years ago. It was written in 1900, a half century ago. This is what Admiral Mahan said:

Upon a glance at the map, one enormous fact immediately obtrudes itself upon the attention—the vast, uninterrupted mass of the Russian Empire, stretching without a break in territorial consecutiveness from the meridian of western Asia Minor until to the eastward it overpasses that of Japan. In this huge distance no political obstacles intervene to impede the concentrated action of the disposable strength. Within the dominion of Russia, only the distances themselves, and the hindrances—unquestionably great and manifold—imposed by natural conditions, place checks upon her freedom and fullness of movement. To this element of power—central position—is to be added the wedge-shaped outline of her territorial projection into central Asia, strongly supported as this is, on the one flank by the mountains of the Caucasus and the inland Caspian Sea—wholly under her control—and on the other by the ranges which extend from Afghanistan, northeasterly, along the western frontier of China. From the latter, moreover, she as yet has no serious danger to fear. The fact of her general advance up to the present time—

This was half a century ago—

most of which has been made within a generation, so that the point of the wedge is now inserted between Afghanistan and Persia, must be viewed in connection with the tempting relative facility of further progress through Persia to the Persian Gulf, and with the strictly analogous movement, on the other side of the continent, where long strides have been made through Manchuria to Port Arthur and the Gulf of Pe-chi-li. Thus, alike in the Far East and in the Far West, we find the same characteristic of remorseless energy, rather remittent than intermittent in its symptoms. Russia, in obedience to natural law and race instinct, is working, geographically, to the southward in Asia by both flanks, her center covered by the mountains of Afghanistan and the deserts of Eastern Turkestan and Mongolia.

It is therefore obvious, Mr. President, that they are carrying on today in the Far East southward, and in the Middle East northward, the same determined pressure forward, the same aggression, upon which Admiral Mahan commented half a century ago.

Mr. President, that is what we are facing. Let no one say that it was a tactical mistake to start an offensive on the 25th day of November, that had we not started that offensive, the Chinese Communists would have stopped at the 38th parallel, or never would have come in.

On the 26th of November I interviewed 43 Chinese prisoners, with our officers and with interpreters, as a part of the 6,000 prisoners of North Korea and the Communists we had in our compound in Pyongyang. Through the interpreters I asked some of these 43 Chinese Communist prisoners various questions.

First I said, "When did you come into North Korea?" The most recent arrival out of about 10 I questioned in that group, asking "When did you come

over?", was 25 days prior to the 25th of November, in other words, the 1st of November. All the rest of them said "About 30 days ago." They had come over there 30 days before we started the offensive on the 25th day of November.

Then I said, "When you came over, did you know you were coming to Korea?"

They said, "No."

Of course, this was all through the interpreter. I said, "How did you get over here?"

They said, "They put us on trains and sent us over at night, and we did not know we were in Korea until we got there."

What does that show, Mr. President, about the claims of the Chinese Government that they are volunteers? A man does not volunteer and get in a train and be sent to a country to which he did not know he was going, and did not know where he was until he got there. That is just a part of the deliberate falsehood the Chinese Communists have tried to perpetrate upon the gullible world.

Not only that, but I said, "Did you want to fight the Americans?"

With enthusiasm they all shook their heads and said, "No; we did not want to fight the Americans."

Then I asked, "How many of you, if any, ever belonged to the Nationalist Army?" After the interpreter questioned them I asked all who had formerly belonged to the Nationalist Army to hold up their hands. Nearly every one of them held up his hand, to indicate that he had formerly been a member of Chiang Kai-shek's army.

I asked, "How did you happen to get into the Communist Army?" They said that they had surrendered, and that the Communists had coerced them into joining their own army. Most of them had been members of the Communist Army for 2 or 3 years.

Then I asked, "How many of the Chinese Communists who are fighting in North Korea, in your opinion, formerly belonged to the Nationalist Army?" Finally, after a good many consultations among them and among the interpreters, they said about 80 percent. That was interesting to me, because I had heard a story in Hong Kong to the effect that the Communists of China had a commitment to North Korea that they would come in if North Korea were attacked, that is, if the advance continued, and that in order technically to keep that commitment, they were sending over the troops in whom they did not have much confidence, because they had come over from Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Army.

There was one interesting corroboration of that. Up until that time, the 25th or 26th of November, there had been no instances of atrocities on the part of Chinese troops. On the contrary, there were many stories which indicated friendliness on their part toward American troops.

For example, I heard a story to the effect that some American prisoners were being carried back. One GI was injured so that he could not keep up. A North Korean soldier shot him through the foot, and when one of the Chinese

Communist soldiers saw it he walked over, snatched the gun out of the North Korean's hand, knocked him down with it, and then picked up the GI and leaned him against a tree and gave him some water, and left him there so that he would be found by our forces coming through there later. I believe they were going backward at that time. It has only been since that time—in fact, only in the past few days—that we have read stories about the Chinese Communist troops attacking our wounded in trucks and setting fire to the trucks, shooting and dancing around like wild Indians. Only recently have we heard of instances of atrocities. So it may be that the first troops which the Chinese Government sent in were the former Nationalists. It is absolutely a falsehood to claim that they were volunteers. They were ordered in in military units. They were not volunteers at all. It may be that the fanatical Communists were sent over in the later stages of the operation.

I made another discovery. I have here a .22 rifle which has on the outside of it, in plain figures, "1950," and the place where it was made. That rifle was found in grease in a North Korean arsenal, by our American troops, and was given to me by one of General Walker's aides at Pyongyang, to refute another falsehood of the Russians, that they had not given the North Koreans or the Chinese any military aid or matériel since 1945. This rifle is not loaded. I should like to exhibit it to Senators. It is stamped on the outside "1950" as plain as figures can be written. There is another marking upon it. I did not know what it was, so I consulted a colonel from the Ordnance Department of the Army. He came to my office to look at it. He said, "That means that that rifle was made at a place called Talu, about 100 miles south of Moscow, and that the figures 1950 mean it was made in the year 1950." That rifle, as I say, was found in a North Korean armory in grease. Evidently it was used as a sharpshooter's rifle. It has a long barrel. It is heavy and well balanced. It was said that evidently it had been used as a sharpshooter's rifle.

Also members of our naval forces tell me that they found Russian newspapers dated in 1950 on mines which they took out of the harbor at Wonsan. In the packing of the mines were Russian newspapers dated in 1950. So it is obvious that it is nothing but a pack of lies for the Communists to claim that the Communist troops in Korea are volunteers, and for the Russians to claim that they have not given aid or matériel to the aggressive forces since 1945.

On the 26th of November I interviewed North Korean prisoners. One of them was a full colonel, and the other a lieutenant colonel. They told me, through our interpreters, that up until October 1 the Russians had had advisers down to the battalion level in the North Korean Army. Then they pulled them out and limited their advisers only to the headquarters of the North Korean Army, the chief of staff, and the defense minister of North Korea. So again it is obvious that they are lying when they say that

they are not giving aid and comfort to the forces of aggression.

So, Mr. President, we see the difficulty of our soldiers in the terrain in which they must fight, and we see the nature of the enemy opposing them. We see also the hypocrisy and deceitfulness of the claim of Soviet Russia that she is not the principal factor behind this aggression and the principal criminal in the aggression which is in progress today in Korea.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to our great forces in Korea, and to the valor of our men. I pay tribute to them for the sacrifices which they have had to experience. I wish to let the commanders who are fighting this great battle for decency and democracy know, that so far as I am concerned, I am backing them up and will continue to back them up in every way I possibly can. This is the time when they need to know that the American people are with them, and are not barking at them with captious criticism when they are literally fighting not only for their lives and the honor of their country, but for the preservation of the free world.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the fact that the Senator has exhibited this Russian rifle on the floor of the Senate in support of certain observations and conclusions, I should like to have the Senator tell the Senate what information he gathered in regard to the quality of the Russian armaments as he witnessed them in his world travels. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not it is generally agreed among the military officials with whom he conferred that this particular so-called sharpshooter's rifle is an excellently made weapon, comparable in workmanship and quality to rifles made by the United States and by our allies.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is not as good for long-range shooting, although I was told that it was very effective at shorter ranges. One of General Walker's aides gave me the rifle as I was leaving. We had talked about the hypocrisy on the part of the Russians. He had previously told me about this rifle. He said, "Perhaps you would like to have it to take back and show to your colleagues. There is one in the office." So he went and got it, and I brought it along with me.

This rifle is said to be very effective at the shorter ranges. When our ordnance man, a colonel from our ordnance department, came over and critically examined it, he said that it was not good beyond about 250 yards, but that for guerrilla fighting it was most effective. It is light. Evidently they used a cartridge with a high powder charge in it.

I was impressed, as I went through the hospitals, by seeing so many men who did not know exactly how they had been injured. I would ask, "How did you get hurt?" They would say, "It must have been a sniper." Evidently sniping was very effective. For guerrilla warfare a rifle like that would be very effective. It would be used at pretty short range, in any event.

The general quality of Russian rifles is excellent. Their planes are very speedy, even in relation to ours. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is any secret, but that it is a very well-known fact that their planes are faster than ours. But our pilots were superior. Their ability made it possible for them to win in every encounter they had with planes which came from beyond the Yalu River.

The mortars used by the Chinese Communists and the North Koreans are extremely effective, but the light and the heavy mortars. They have remarkable proficiency in using them. I asked the North Korean colonel, and other officers: "Where did you get the equipment with which you were fighting? Did you get your equipment from China?" They laughed. They said, "The Chinese did not let us have anything but some little medicine and some blankets." That is all they got from China, they said. In the early stages every bit of the rest of it was sent directly over the Russian border, and in the latter stages some of it was sent around Manchuria to give the pretense that it came from China. But they said the Chinese did not have such equipment as that. My opinion is that every mortar, probably every machine gun, probably every good rifle, certainly every airplane they used to kill our men has come from the arsenal of Russia.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Florida has made these comments about the quality of the munitions being used by the North Koreans. He has made a statement which I also believe to be the fact, that these munitions and weapons have come directly from Russia. I am glad the Senator has made that statement, in view of the fact that the Senator from Oregon has expressed himself so many times that we Americans might as well face the ugly fact that we are at war right now with Russia.

I am particularly glad that the Senator commented upon the Russian munitions and weapons, because I am astounded at the frequency with which I run into the point of view on the part of fellow Americans indicating that they just cannot believe that Russia is capable, from an engineering standpoint, a scientific standpoint, and an industrial standpoint, to manufacture effective munitions and weapons of war. And here we have a Senator who has been there and seen, and who testifies—and I think he has rendered a great public service in doing so here today—testifies as a witness before the American people that these Russian weapons and Russian munitions are effective, and that when we meet them in war we are up against, so far as weapons are concerned, very effective opposition.

I want to thank the Senator from Florida for making that clear on the record today, because I think the American people have to wake up to the fact that in this struggle for freedom we are being opposed by an enemy who is demonstrating time and time again that she does have the industrial know-how and

the industrial ability to manufacture very effective instruments of war.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Oregon performs another in the many great public services he has rendered, by emphasizing that fact. There can be no more tragic folly on the part of the American people than even to assume that the Russians are just a bunch of ignoramuses wandering and stumbling around and that they are incapable of splendid production.

Not only have I heard stories from the fighting men themselves. Ask the men in the hospitals. I have seen them literally by the thousands. Ask those men what kind of weapons the enemy has. Ask their commanders what weapons they are having to face. They are having to face as good weapons as we ourselves have. The enemy is trained in the use of those weapons, too.

Senators will recall that I was in Moscow in 1945, at the same time the Colmer committee was there. We all together went to some Russian factories, one of which was an automobile factory. The assembly line moved as easily and efficiently in the making of good automobiles and good trucks in that Russian factory as I have seen it move in an American factory. They do not have as many such factories as we do, of course. But there are fine modern factory buildings in Moscow. They have all the attributes of factories producing the same products in this country. Their scientists are extremely capable scientists. I think the consensus is that they have not only a knowledge of the techniques of the atom bomb, but that they are making the atom bomb.

Everyone knows the excellence of the submarines they have today. We must remember that not only have they got their own technicians who made good artillery and good tanks and other war implements in World War II, even as against the Germans, but they have availed themselves since World War II of probably the cream of the German technicians in the making of weapons, because they took them by force. We must remember also that they took over the Skoda Works in Czechoslovakia, one of the greatest munitions works in the world, and that when they took over Manchuria they got, of course, the best the Japanese had built in Manchuria.

So I am glad the able Senator from Oregon emphasizes that we are not only up against a dastardly, devilish enemy, but a devilishly effective enemy in combat, and one that has an utter disregard for human life in combat as well.

Mr. President, one hears it said often here at home that it was a mistake ever to go into Korea. That we must have known that we might provoke the Chinese Communists. Mr. President, I do not believe those critics said that when the President made that courageous decision. I do not remember hearing Senators on the floor of the Senate condemning our carrying out the courageous action of the United Nations. There was remarkable unanimity on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress. Encomiums were heaped upon the President for having taken that courageous action to throw our

forces with other United Nations forces in Korea to stop the aggression. Why? Because we recognized that it was the Hitler technique all over again, and that if we let the aggressor have one country it would whet his appetite to take another, and that any kind of negotiations intended to lead him back to the paths of peace were as utterly hopeless with Stalin as they were with Hitler, that if we did not stop the aggression by force, and let the enemy know that aggression would be met with effective resistance, the sweep of his conquest would rush through all the Far East, and then into other areas of the world.

Some people retreat back again, as I said, and say, "We should not have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel. That maneuver provoked the Chinese Communists to come in. They are an easily frightened people. It was intimated that they are sort of dumb and cannot understand foreign soldiers being proximate to their border, and that in spite of all our declarations they became alarmed, and out of their deep concern they had to send in their volunteers.

Well, in the first place it is a little inconsistent to claim that they were provoked by our proximity to their shores of their border and then in the next breath to say that the Chinese Government did not send them over there at all; that it was just a sort of a mass volunteer movement; that people just rushed over there when they found there was some danger to their country.

Mr. President, if we had stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel it would not have made any difference, in my opinion. The Chinese troops were already in north China. They were waiting for their time to start. If we had stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel, it would not have accomplished anything except to have given them a chance to have regrouped and started their forces for another aggression south of the thirty-eighth parallel. Of course they, as a matter of deceitful strategy, have attempted to induce us to go away, so, with our departure, they would have no obstacle.

Mr. President, let our people not be deceived or confused. It was not our coming in that brought on the Chinese aggression. It was not our going beyond the thirty-eighth parallel; it was not the beginning of our offensive that brought on their aggression. The conflict in North Korea today is a part of an aggressive campaign and program conceived in Moscow, directed from Moscow, guided from Moscow, the objective of which is nothing less than the conquest of the whole of the Far East, involving substantially half of the human race. When I say the Far East I include Japan, for the aggressor is not going to stop, in my opinion, until he has occupied or conquered Japan, because he recognizes, as I have said, that today Japan has come to appreciate democracy and will resist aggression and will side with the peace-loving people of the world. So, Mr. President, that is what is responsible for the situation in Korea.

The next thing we hear is, "Let us pull out of Korea." Mr. President, I did not realize that it was a part of the American military tradition to pull out

under fire unless we were thrown out. American soldiers have had to retreat at times, in the course of our history; but, thank God, American military tradition is free of the contamination of quitting in the face of an enemy.

If we voluntarily pull out of Korea, unless we can obtain some decent and honorable terms upon which to do so, that would mean that not only would we leave the aggressors free to take over all of Korea, but we would betray the men who died in order that we might give some kind of aid and assistance to the peace-loving forces of Korea. The South Koreans would be butchered by the millions if we were to pull out of Korea.

I do not know whether it is possible for us to stay in Korea; I am not a military expert. I know we are still there, and I know we are making the enemy pay dearly for his advances. I know we may have to leave, under compulsion. But we will cause every Asian who is on our side to give up hope of receiving our succor if we pull out of Korea now, and adopt the fallacious recommendations of some persons who evidently have not thought the thing through, and pull back to some line outside Korea, and let the aggressors go ahead with their devilish design and occupy all of Korea and butcher the democratic forces in Korea. Then the aggressors will go into Indochina; and when the forces of Indochina attempt to resist, the aggressors will say to them, "You cannot expect any help from the peace-loving nations. They have left Korea, and they will not come to your aid." Then the democratic forces of Indochina will retreat before they fire a shot, for they will know that there will be no use for them to hope that the freedom-loving, democratic nations will come to their aid.

So I say that we should fight, and fight to the best of our ability.

Of course, Mr. President, I defer to the superior judgment of our military commanders. Whenever General MacArthur and our other commanders say, "We can do no more good there without incurring losses far exceeding, in cost and value and importance, any good we may do by remaining," then I am willing to have that decision made. However, I do not want that decision to be made on a political level here in Washington or by persons who are not expert in military matters.

The British sent their troops into Greece during World War II, knowing they would be thrown out by the superior German forces; but the sending of the British troops into Greece heartened the resistance of the Yugoslavs and the Greeks and encouraged them to pour out their blood in resistance movements, in fighting against the aggressive Germans whom the British were not able to restrain.

So, Mr. President, if we want to tell every Asian who today is on the side of decency and democracy, "You cannot count on the United States to assist you," and if we simply pull out and take the foolish advice given by no less than a former President of the United States and a former Commander in Chief of the Army, Navy, and Air Force of our country; if we pull out and leave the

Pacific Ocean between ourselves and the unrestrained and unresisted forces of aggression—if we do that—we shall hand over all that area of the world to the aggressors, without putting up any further struggle.

Mr. President, I never heard of a law-enforcement officer who refused to restrain a gang of murderers and robbers simply because when he counted them, he might discover that they were more numerous than the members of his police squad.

So, Mr. President, we are committed to resist and to fight to the best of our ability.

As a matter of fact, I wish to say that I was over there at the time, and I read in the newspapers the suggestions which came from London—so the newspapers said—that we should establish a corridor along the Yalu and should let it be a neutral corridor across which we would not go. I wish to say that suggestion gave encouragement to the forces of aggression, and led them to believe that if they pressed us hard enough and perhaps frightened us we would make concessions; and that if we would yield a neutral zone, perhaps we would yield a larger area, and then perhaps we would yield all of North Korea, and then perhaps we would leave Korea—if they made the situation so frightening if we attempted to stay there. Mr. President, the only effect of those suggestions, so far as the enemy was concerned, was to encourage them to fight harder in the hope of eventually achieving success in what they are doing.

One may ask, What can we do? Of course, Mr. President, as I have said, we must take into account what the aims of the enemy are. We are not deceived as to who the principal enemy is. It is Russia which is carrying out, with the aid of the devilish doctrine of communism, aggressive policies which have been the policies of that country for generations, if not for centuries.

Mr. President, probably I was one of the last to give up hope that we could find some honorable basis of reconciliation. I was terribly penalized by certain critics when I was talking about peace and when I had in mind the terrible conflict that would become more and more probable if we did not stop it in its earlier inception. As I have said, I was denounced by many persons. Yet even now there is talk of having a four-power conference in the next few days, in the early part of January. I proposed that in 1945 and in 1946 and in 1947—still hoping that it might not be too late to stop the rush toward war, in which all of us were being thrust along by evil forces.

Well, Mr. President, that policy, as I urged it, was not adopted; and the situation has become worse and worse. Today it is regrettable to have to say that I do not see any hope for any kind of immediate reconciliation of our differences, because the enemy would not negotiate with a view to keeping its promises, in the first place; and in the second place, it has made up its mind that it is going as far as it can go, and it is not going to stop voluntarily; it will stop only when it meets a superior force. So, Mr.

President, when one has to deal with a criminal mind with such a criminal purpose, negotiations will not do any good, for such a mind recognizes nothing but superior force.

Mr. President, what are the objectives of Russia and the Chinese Communists? First, as I have said, their objective is to push all western influences out of the Far East. That is what they are engaged upon now, and that is what they are going to continue to do until they are stopped.

That area offers more, at less cost, in terms of territory and materials and people, than any other part of the world they can attack. Not only that, but they attack it at a place where we would resist at our greatest disadvantage—in short, half way around the world.

We hear a great deal of talk about the shrinking world, but it is still a rather large world, if we go around it. For instance, it is 2,000 miles from Tokyo to Wake Island, and 2,000 miles from Wake Island to Honolulu, and 2,400 miles from Honolulu to San Francisco—a total of 6,400 miles that far—and it is 3,000 miles across the American Continent. So it is more than 9,000 miles from where we are now to Tokyo, and Korea is on the other side of Tokyo. So, Mr. President, we see that Korea and the adjacent parts of Asia are an area where we would resist to the greatest disadvantage, so far as we are concerned.

Mr. President, if the advice of the short-sighted is taken, and if we abandon all of that area to the aggressors, what will they do and where will they go? First, they will move down into, and occupy, Korea, and immediately will convert, by force, the people of South Korea to communism, or will kill them and get rid of them.

Then the aggressors will move right down into Indochina, and will take over the people of Indochina. Meanwhile, they will be moving ahead into Burma, Siam, which courageously is standing on our side, would be powerless to resist; so it is to be expected that Siam would easily acquiesce in the aggressor's encroachment, as happened in the case of the Japanese aggression; and then the aggressors would occupy Siam and Singapore, and then move into the East Indies. And what after that? They would take over not only about half the human race, in people, but one of the reservoirs of most strategic importance of all the earth in critical and strategic materials; so that would be one of the greatest gains of history. That is what the Japanese went to war to get, that they had by surrender, if the counsel of short-sighted opinion should be believed and relied on at the present time. That is their first objective.

My next point is that the next area that offers the greatest hope for the least cost is the Middle East. If the Russians could get the critical and strategic materials of southeast Asia and the populations of Asia, and if they could get the oil reserves of the Middle East, largely in Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, all they would need then would be the Ruhr; and the able Senator from Oregon was speaking well about that yesterday. If they could get the industrial capacity

and the materials which are found in the Ruhr, with all the others in southeast Asia, with the oil of the Middle East, with the Ruhr, and over half of the human race under their dominion and control, why, Mr. President, history has never imagined any such force as they would possess.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If they got the territory just described by the able Senator from Florida, does the Senator from Florida agree with the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, that the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans, plus the arming to the teeth of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force, would be adequate protection to our security?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that doctrine, promulgated by ex-President Hoover, is nothing in the world but a rehash of the old America-first doctrine, under which America was almost destroyed before we prepared to resist the aggression of Hitler. It completely ignores the power which a country that dominates the so-called heartland of the earth, and that left only to the Western Hemisphere the islands of the Atlantic and Pacific and part of Africa would possess, Mr. President, neither in manpower nor in strategic and critical materials, nor in bases, would we stand a chance against a power that possessed all that vast area with all of its contents, in materials and people.

So, Mr. President, that would be the most dangerous course that I could imagine. For, referring to the ex-President's address, he not only counseled us to give up Asia, but he practically counseled us to give up Europe, unless the Europeans, within the time that he allows and in the manner that he devises, build up their own forces. Of course, we expect Europe to defend itself, but when we are aiding in the defense of Europe, what are we doing? We are trying to move an enemy that many more miles away from America's shore.

Mr. President, neither in World War I nor in World War II could we afford to let an enemy power occupy Europe and have its bases around the North Atlantic; for England could not stand in the face of European occupation by such a power, in all probability, and the result would be that an enemy would be on the shores of Western Europe; and we have never been willing to countenance a strong enemy power taking possession of the shores of Western Europe without our fighting to prevent it; yet this gentleman speaks as if we are doing Europe a favor to advance the outpost of our friends to a point further removed from the shores of our own beloved country. No, Mr. President; that is the kind of selfish doctrine which would lead almost of necessity to the destruction of our country by the evil enemies who have their designs of aggression upon us.

Now, Mr. President, at a large dinner the other night, a certain very rich man walked up to me, and we chatted a little bit. He said, "If you want to gain politically in this country, go out and advocate America for the Americans." "Well," I

said, "I confess that there is much sentiment here in this country which would subscribe to such a doctrine. But I do not want political preferment at the price of sacrificing my country's security." Any man who counsels that doctrine, whether he knows it or not, threatens the security of his country. And if any there should be of those now in public office, who subscribe to any such fallacy, it is the same kind of isolationism which led us to the brink of disaster, upon the verge of World War II. I just cannot believe that either tragedy, unforeseen and regrettable reverses, or the magnitude of the sacrifice we shall have to make, will lead responsible American opinion ever to embrace so dangerous a doctrine; and I hope, Mr. President, that those who counsel it will diminish in number. Yet I read a statement in the paper, by so celebrated an author as Mr. Walter Lippmann, that we are going back toward armed isolation in America. Mr. President, we cannot defend America upon the shores of America, or upon even the oceans which touch the shores of America. Today, with modern weapons and with the means of aggression from foreign continents, we have got to stop an enemy before he springs, or else we risk destruction in his grasp.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask the Senator whether he observed the result to those countries which have defended their own shores, instead of striking where they should, and when they should?

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly. We saw how far the security of France was preserved by the Maginot line. It is the same psychology which they want us to adopt—a strong fleet and a strong army. I do not know where they think we are going to put them, unless we put them in the islands of the Atlantic and the Pacific, or else we are going to let the war come to America.

Mr. President, it is tragic enough for American men to have to fall in battle anywhere, but if the ravages of war have to sweep anywhere, and if it be possible to spare our own homes and cities, I should think Americans at least would be anxious to do so. I have seen in Germany and in the European Continent, as my colleagues have, and I saw in Korea, what has happened to those cities and those countrysides over which the terrors of war have rolled, and they talk about defending America here upon our own shores, which completely ignores the nature of modern weapons and of modern war.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Even if the United States should be victorious in such a war, I ask whether the same terrors of war would not exist at least everywhere throughout the United States after the battle was over?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. Why, certainly. Mr. President, in the face of this ordeal, what should be our policy? In the first place, we should be stalwart in our determination to support the United Nations, to work with those nations of good

will and democratic character, to build up their own strength and the capacity of the free world to resist aggression. The United Nations is not a broken reed. It has done one of the most heroic acts in history by flinging its forces into the teeth of aggression and saying, "Stop." I hope we shall not now undo all that great deed by saying it was all a mistake to have undertaken it, that we are too weak to resist aggression, therefore, let us supinely accede to it and let it sweep over the free world.

No, Mr. President; the United Nations is still a great and powerful organization. It has established one of the greatest precedents in human history—that the free nations will fight aggression. That is the only thing that will stop it, showing them that we are determined to continue to fight until it stops. I admit that all the other nations have not done as much as we. I am not sure that all have done as much as they could have or should have done.

Maybe they have not appreciated as much as we have the importance of collective security. Surely the weaker nations of the world should recognize that if there is a nation on earth which might perhaps exist behind the policy of isolation it is the United States. We, of all the nations, are the nation whose soil is perhaps in the least danger. Yet we have sent American men to fight on the other side of the globe. Why? Because we think it is important to the security of America. We are willing to pay that premium to be insured that the free world will collectively resist aggression.

I would earnestly admonish other nations more liable to danger and less secure, less remote than we, not to dally with their own security, but to pay a premium that would give them the insurance of collective security in case they were attacked, by doing their own heroic part.

Next, Mr. President, we have got to let the peoples of the world know the truth, that we are not fighting, as these lying propagandists say, for aggression, imperialism, exploitation, or trade. We are fighting for principle, for the right of an Asian to be free as well as for the right of an American to be free, to show that America does not associate itself with any form of exploitation of the people of Asia or of any other part of the world. Whatever may have been the sins of the past, we are trying to chart a course for the future that will respect the dignity and the well-being of every other man in the world, as we ask that our own citizens be respected. We are trying to be a good neighbor. We run into many embarrassing situations, and sometimes we have to make a choice between what appears to be the immediate course of expediency and the long-range course of policy or principle.

Mr. President, whenever I held a press conference in Asia, question after question was thrown at me. I was asked, "Why is the United States supporting the French in Indochina? Why have you got there, as the western champion, a man who has never been in sympathy with democracy? Why are you identifying yourselves with the most hated

form of exploitation so far as the Asiatic peoples are concerned, namely, western colonialism?"

One can go through a tedious explanation of why we are doing it—to keep the vacuum from being occupied by sinister Communist forces while democratic forces can be built up. But I am convinced, Mr. President, that since this is a long-range war which we shall have to fight, a long-range struggle upon which we are engaged, we have got to do certain definite things to let the peoples of Asia and all the rest of the world know that they cannot fairly charge us with being allied with the old colonialism or any other form of imperialism. That leads me to believe that, much as we appreciate the friendship of the French, the time has come when in the larger interest the United Nations should do with respect to Indochina what it did with respect to Indonesia. It should ask the French and the other forces to come together to the bar of the United Nations and take appropriate steps to see to it that those peoples have their own country to run in their own way. Then the United States as well as the United Nations would properly support the democratic forces that might be recognized, and then we would be free of the charge that we were allying ourselves with the hated imperialism of the past.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say to the Senator that the statement he just made with regard to his position on the Indochina question is most gratifying to the junior Senator from Oregon. To have one of the ability of the Senator from Florida and with the knowledge of foreign affairs possessed by him take that position is exceedingly satisfying to the junior Senator from Oregon, because during my recent campaign in the State of Oregon the question of Indochina came up in open-forum meeting after open-forum meeting, and I would be asked, "What is your position on Indochina?"

I want to say that I took the identical position which has just been expressed on the floor of the Senate, namely, that I think the United States should make clear to the United Nations that we feel that Indochina should receive the same procedural treatment that we insisted upon in connection with Indonesia. I think it is important that we make it perfectly clear to the French. They are not going to like it any better than the Dutch liked the position we took on Indonesia. But, after all, if we are going to chart a system of international justice through law, they too must submit these great questions to the processes of adjudication. I think the Indochina question ought to be answered by way of adjudication. They are going to have to face the fact that there should be an honorable negotiation worked out through the same kind of an international arbitration tribunal as we insisted upon in connection with Indochina.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I appreciate more than I can express the

concurrence of the able and respected Senator from Oregon. I feel that we must say to our friends as well as to others that we have got to go before the people of the world with clean hands if we are going to expect the people of the world to follow our leadership.

Mr. President, the next thing is that I think we have got to support the democratic forces of the world wherever there are areas of controversy and question. I think that sometimes we have been too dilatory in helping the liberal forces. In a certain country there was a Prime Minister in office, and our Ambassador said he was the best man that had ever headed the government there, that he was trying to carry out reforms for the benefit of the people and trying to align that country with the democratic forces of the world. He has his own problems of internal politics, and always the sinister, scheming, slimy opposition of the Communists to sow discord and build up dissensions. When there are cases such as that, we need to help the liberal forces to help the people to broaden and strengthen the democratic base of government.

I think the time has come, Mr. President, for us not to be too timid about it and not to be too niggardly or too shortsighted. I know of one country in which the government may fall in a short time because of waiting for an Export-Import Bank loan, in spite of the entreaty of our Ambassador that in the interest of supporting a peace-loving government, the loan should be expedited.

We must act with more effectiveness and acceleration than that.

Mr. President, we, of course, must not allow any doctrine of either isolation or appeasement to weaken this great fight we have been carrying on to build a better world. After all, Mr. President, there has never in human history been anything so dramatic as the program which we started shortly after 1945, and which the United Nations has recently carried out. I am proud to have been part of a Government which had a part in the establishment of the United Nations Organization. I think history will record that the American part has not been an ignoble one in the setting up of that great institution. I am proud to have been a part of a Government which brought the Western Hemisphere nations into a closer fraternity, as we did by the Rio pact in 1945, when we agreed upon the principle of collective defense and collective resistance to aggression. I am proud, Mr. President, that our Government had a part, through the United Nations in resisting Soviet threats to Iran, without which, probably, that rich area of the world might long ago have been occupied.

Mr. President, I opposed the Truman doctrine in 1947 when it was first proposed, on the ground that we should not go unilaterally into Greece. I thought we should have gone as we have gone into this war in Korea, collectively, with members of the United Nations, or at least with those who would go with us. In going into Korea several nations did

not go along, but the majority of nations did. I believe the majority of nations would have gone with us into Greece. Maybe I was right. Maybe I was wrong. As it turned out, we faced no real violent resistance as undoubtedly we can see now in retrospect, although we can see and observe the dangers which it entailed. However, when that decision was made, I supported the appropriations for it, and ever since that time I have supported every program that has been proposed by this Government which would stop aggression and strengthen the democratic and peace-loving forces of the world.

Mr. President, I am glad, therefore, to see that the nations in Europe with whom we were associated in the war have established a western union and a nucleus for cooperation more effective than it ever previously existed among the democratic nations of Europe.

Mr. President, I am proud to have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations which recommended, and a Member of the Senate that approved, the North Atlantic Pact, under which the nations assumed a reciprocal obligation to resist aggression and to stand up for peace and decency in the world.

Mr. President, I am proud to have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations which recommended, and of the Senate that adopted, a military aid program for Europe, parts of the Middle East, and areas in Asia.

I am glad, Mr. President, to have seen in my service in the Senate and to have had some part in the adoption of all that flowed from the North Atlantic Pact and the military aid program, namely, the council which was set up by the North Atlantic Pact nations and the military organization which was set up by those states, and to have seen the recent appointment by the President as the supreme commander of the forces of the Atlantic Pact nations of that great general, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower. He gives new hope to the democratic forces of the world that he will lead them in resistance to modern totalitarianism as effectively as he did against that initiated by the devilish Hitler.

Mr. President, I am glad that today's and yesterday's papers tell about the new spirit of cooperation and determination in Europe which our Secretary of State brings back, and the heartening message of the President to the effect that there is a new courage displayed in Europe today and grounds upon which we may base a more confident belief that they will do their full and great part than we have entertained heretofore.

Mr. President, what shall we do? We shall simply go ahead with that program, not retreating, not stopping, not shrinking. Mr. President, let us expand it and carry it ahead so long as the necessity exists.

Mr. President, I am also proud to have been part of a Congress which has met every request of the Executive to mobilize this country and which in its last hours has poured out twenty billion more dollars and is prepared to provide whatever funds are necessary to strengthen

America. In fact, Congress, instead of being laggard, has been far ahead of the Executive in demanding more effective mobilization than we have thus far achieved, appreciating the deadly necessity that faces us, and the urgency of effective action, before again we shall have heard uttered the lament: "Too little and too late." What we have done since 1945 and the aims to which we have dedicated ourselves are the right course, Mr. President. All we need to do is to be strong in our faith, unflinching in our courage, and to go ahead in the way Americans are expected to go.

Mr. President, I mention last the most important thing. None of these things are possible, no hope of survival, let alone of victory over these evil forces of national aggression and communistic conquest, unless we have in America a united people bent upon a single purpose, standing for a decent and free world. Mr. President, this is no time for back biting. This is no time to profiteer politically with the peril of America. This is no time for a back-seat driver, Mr. President, to seek to direct where he is not in a position for the best of observation and responsibility.

What do these criticisms do? I will read from the New York Times of December 21, yesterday, at page 14:

ATLANTIC PARLEY ACCORDS VIEWED SKEPTICALLY
BY SOME

Despite President Truman's reassertion of his intention to retain both Secretary Acheson and Defense Secretary George C. Marshall in his Cabinet, the continual rumors of their eventual departure worry those governments that have hitched their fate to the destiny of the United States. Although Mr. Truman's reiteration of faith in Mr. Acheson was received with pleasure, some delegates still talked of the Secretary's own desire to resign "at a date convenient to American and allied interests."

Mr. President, would any American think that General Eisenhower could do his job with constant demand in the United States Congress that he be fired?

Mr. President, I have not always been a great admirer of General MacArthur. I confess that I changed my mind after I got to know the man briefly, particularly when I saw the character of his work in Japan. While in the opinion of some soapbox orators, stove strategists, and armchair generals General MacArthur ought to be kicked out, on the 12th of December I sent this telegram to Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

DECEMBER 12, 1950.

Gen. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
Supreme Commander, Allied Powers,
Tokyo, Japan:

All of us deeply gratified your statement. We have undiminished confidence and faith in you and our magnificent Armed Forces in Korea, and will support you to the limit. All regards.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senator.

To which General MacArthur replied as follows, "Thanks and deepest appreciation paid."

When he is being sorely pressed by the enemy is no time to stab him in the back at home.

I said the same thing to the other great generals who are commanding over

there. I sent a telegram to Gen. Walton H. Walker, in which I said:

DECEMBER 12, 1950.

Lt. Gen. WALTON H. WALKER,
Commanding General, Eighth Army,
Korea:

The gratitude and acclaim of the country go out to you and your heroic command for the wisdom, the valor, and the sacrifices with which you have emerged, still a glorious fighting force, from your unprecedented ordeal. You know my thoughts have been with you all and you have our continuing confidence.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senator.

General Walker replied:

Your message is deeply appreciated. My command is heartened, encouraged, and sustained by the knowledge that their efforts have the confidence and support of our people at home, whose stake in this war is as great as that of the soldiers who fight.

WALTON H. WALKER.

I knew I spoke not only for myself but for the American people.

I also sent a telegram to Gen. Edward M. Almond, in which I said:

Your country is grateful your splendid leadership and magnificent performance of your heroic forces in the ordeal from which they have emerged.

General Almond replied:

The officers and the men of the X corps deeply appreciate your inspiring message on their performance in combat during recent operations here in Korea. I am personally most grateful for your expression in my behalf. Maj. Gen. E. M. Almond.

I also sent a telegram to Gen. Oliver P. Smith, heroic commander of the valorous First Marine Division:

The heart of the Nation goes out to you in understanding praise for the magnificent courage and intrepid valor with which the First Division has emerged triumphant from its ordeal.

I have not heard from General Smith.

Mr. President, I would rather go on record as telling our leaders in time of adversity, "We are supporting you," than to be sniping at them or saying, "We never liked that fellow. Let us get rid of him." Critics write to me and say, "I read in the newspaper that you stated that you thought General MacArthur was a great general. We think he is a flop. Why do they not get rid of him?"

Mr. President, I have not followed the practice of running under fire. I still believe that General MacArthur is a great general. He has done everything that human direction could have done in the face of a very desperate situation. At least I am going to support him to the best of my ability in his herculean efforts.

It is not too much to say that our Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and our Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, are entitled to the same kind of support. General Marshall needs no defense. The record of the Secretary of State is a great record. Who equals that record as Secretary of State? It is said that he did not defend Formosa. I heard his speech at the Press Club in January 1950. If one reads that speech he finds that he did not say that we would not defend Korea as a member of the United Nations if it were attacked by the forces of aggression. He was speaking of a perim-

eter which was essential to the United States, and which the United States would defend whether anyone helped us or not—such as the Philippines, Okinawa, the Aleutian Islands, the Kuriles, and other places which we regarded as of necessity outposts of our own national defense. We do not have to ask the United Nations whether or not to defend the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Acheson has not been an appeaser. He made the first speech for the Marshall plan at the Mississippi Delta Cotton Council, ahead of Marshall's Harvard address in 1947. Why? To stop economically the forces of aggression. I know of no man who has held more stalwartly to his course, that we could not rely upon the Russian word. When he first began to say that I did not believe him. I still thought it might be possible to come to some honorable accord with the Russians, until I abandoned hope entirely. They did not want an accord. They wanted conquest, or supine yielding to their aggressive force.

I respectfully say that the greatest shield of American strength is the unity of our people in their determination to continue to fight aggression, to continue to resist the devilish doctrine of communism in every way within our power, by trying to build a stronger and more noble edifice of democracy in every part of the world.

Some ask, "How long is it going to last? Where is it going to stop?" I do not know, and no one else does. In my opinion, this is the darkest period of American history, if not human history. It is the first time that, through the dark, impenetrable veil of the future, there is no glimmer of the light of hope, save the confidence that is in our faith, that God is still in his heaven, and that, just as right has prevailed in the long and tortuous past, it will again emerge triumphant under the banners of the just, the valorous, and the courageous. It will, of course, require sacrifice. The mobilization upon which we are now embarked is but the foothills of the mountains which we must ascend, the mountains of struggle and sacrifice, before we finally come to the eventual glorious dawn of victory.

Mr. President, there have been other periods in history when men who were on the side of God and good have struggled against darkness and superior forces, and have won. If that were not true, we would not have this grand world which is our inheritance today. We shall win, too. Have no doubt about that.

I saw Hitler in 1938, swaggering in his arrogance of Nuremberg, with Goering, Hess, and others about him. I saw most of them at Nuremberg again in 1945 at the prisoners' dock; and a little while later, most of them, in the very cold dawn in a forlorn jailyard, were hanged by the neck until they were dead.

I saw the swaggering braggart Mussolini in the streets of Rome taking the acclaim of the populace as he reviewed his troops. Seven years later he was dead, hanged ignobly by the heels by his own irate people, to the beams of a filling station.

Let Stalin read the lessons of history. They certainly should be sufficient to

deter him from the evil course upon which he has embarked. But without unity here at home we shall be divided, and in division will come defeat for ourselves and all that we hold dear.

Mr. President, I have heard it said that in the Scandinavian countries it was the practice at one time for the priest, when the fishermen were about to go off to the sea in ships, to meet with them at the seaside, and, as their families were gathered around, to give what is called the fishermen's benediction. At this time, for the benefit of my beloved country and my colleagues, who have such fearful responsibility, may I, with no irreverence, repeat that benediction:

May the Lord bless thee and keep thee, grant thee favoring wind, a prosperous voyage, safe harbors, and stout hearts for the storms.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope all Senators who are not present will read the able, courageous, and instructive speech of the distinguished Senator from Florida. I hope that many others throughout the United States will also read it. I have heard him deliver many, many able speeches on the floor of the Senate. I am not so sure but that his last speech has been his best. I have certainly been rewarded for remaining here and listening to his speech. I know that if other Senators could have known what was in store for them, they would have remained to listen.

I regret very much that the Senator from Florida had to speak at such a late hour. His willingness to wait showed the magnanimous attitude which he has evidenced throughout his career in the United States Senate. I wish him well, and I hope that this will be the happiest and best Christmas ever for him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a moment?

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Arizona in his commendation of the great speech just delivered by the Senator from Florida. I have heard the Senator from Florida make a number of historic speeches in the Senate. I would that every American could have heard the speech which he delivered here today. I feel that I am greatly indebted to him for the inspiration which he has given to me in his great speech, a speech of penetrating foresight and keen analysis, a courageous speech with regard to the great obligations and duties which confront the American people in the crisis which is ours.

I join with the Senator from Arizona in wishing the Senator from Florida God-speed. I believe that he has made a great contribution to American history through his service in the Senate. I am sure I speak for my colleagues in the Senate when I say he will always find a warm welcome when he returns among us, which I hope will be often.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friends who have spoken so generously, and say that from no mouths could I have heard words that would have made me happier.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I am sure we speak the sentiments of the entire United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPEL in the chair). Let the present occupant of the chair, without he hopes violating any of the dignities of this position, join and say, "God-speed" to the Senator from Florida who has just concluded a great speech. I wish him good luck.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Kansas very much.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22 (d) (6) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], from the Committee on Finance, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, with amendments, House bill 9794 to amend section 22 (d) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, and I request its immediate consideration.

Mr. President, I understand there is no objection to the bill. However, if there should be later, I am informed by the Parliamentarian that on the days on which the Senate meets next week a motion to reconsider could not be made. Such a motion could be made, however, on the following Tuesday, January 2. The meetings to be held next week will not be in the sense of the word actual sessions of the Senate as provided for in the rules limiting the time for reconsideration. That is, there will be no actual sessions held next week under Rule 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9794) to amend section 22 (d) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

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

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have discussed this bill with the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I am advised that the bill meets with the approval of the Republican members of the committee which reported the bill to the Senate. Therefore, the Republican side of the aisle offers no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9794) to amend section 22 (d) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 2, line 6, after the word "Years", to strike out "Beginning after December 31, 1949", and insert "Ending after June 30, 1950"; on page 2, line 12, after the word "Years", to strike out "Beginning after December 1, 1949", and insert "Ending after June 30, 1950"; on page 2, line 15, after the word "year", to strike out "beginning after December 31, 1949", and insert "ending after June 30, 1950", and on page 5, line 16, after the word "years", to strike out "beginning after December 31, 1949", and insert "ending after June 30, 1950."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill (H. R. 9794) was read the third time and passed.

NOMINATION OF ANNA M. ROSENBERG—STATEMENT BY BRIG. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate held intensive hearings on the nomination of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg for the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense. We received much help from a great many people in this country who recognized that the attack on Mrs. Rosenberg was unwarranted, was unfair, and, unfortunately, represented a spirit of intolerance, which if it becomes widespread in America, will endanger the great principles of democracy. Among those who were of great help to the junior Senator from Oregon in connection with his work on the Armed Services Committee in respect to the nomination was the consultant on national defense to the Republican National Committee, Gen. Julius Klein. I think it is only fitting and proper that I pay him this tribute of thanks and commendation on the floor of the Senate so that acknowledgement of his fine work may be a matter of record.

I want to say that he was a great help to me in supplying me information in answer to certain questions raised by the unfair and false charges against Anna Rosenberg, questions which I thought needed to be answered as we proceeded with those hearings.

Following the nomination a press release was issued in regard to Mr. Klein's position on the Rosenberg nomination, and I ask unanimous consent that the press release may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

"A group of open and notorious anti-Semites who sought to make Anna M. Rosenberg the victim of an American Dreyfus case has succeeded only in crippling this country's defense effort in an hour of immediate national peril," Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, of Chicago, asserted here today.

General Klein is the consultant on national defense to the Republican National Committee and a past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

Along with a group of national leaders, including Bernard M. Baruch, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith and others, he urged full Republican support for Mrs. Rosenberg's confirmation when her appointment was first recommended by Secretary of Defense Marshall. He charged that "precious weeks have been lost at a time when minutes are essential to preparations for the Nation's defense."

He added: "The Senate should proceed at once to a unanimous confirmation of Mrs. Rosenberg. By so doing it will indicate that those who are charged with the responsibility of making the Nation's laws will not tolerate the use of anti-Semitism and bigotry as political weapons."

General Klein noted that he had urged Republican Members of the Senate to en-

dorse Mrs. Rosenberg's appointment because "As a woman she would have a special appreciation of the problems confronting American wives and mothers who twice in this decade are suffering the impact of a war emergency."

Exposure of "the clumsy plot to smear an able public servant," he said, "will prove of little value if the Senate does not speed action to determine whether Mrs. Rosenberg was the victim of calculated perjury, so that if guilt is properly assessed, prompt prosecution can be instituted."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now wish to take 4 or 5 minutes to make very brief comment on a great issue which I think confronts America, the issue of what kind of a foreign policy America will follow in the critical months ahead. It is an issue which raises the question as to whether or not the people of this country are going to continue to give support to a very much needed bipartisan foreign policy based upon a recognition that America cannot stand alone in the world without friends, that America cannot isolate herself from the rest of the world and survive in the great struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. That conflict is bound, I think, to be the struggle of our generation.

This afternoon my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] presented his point of view, and he did it ably and sincerely. He commented on the speech of the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Hoover. The point of view which the able Senator from Utah presented this afternoon was almost diametrically opposed to the point of view the junior Senator from Oregon presented to the Senate at length yesterday. In the course of his remarks this afternoon the Senator from Utah pointed out that it was much to be desired that there be full and frank discussion of this great question of foreign policy. I completely agree with him, and undoubtedly in the weeks ahead, as we come into a new session of Congress, that issue is going to be the issue that will perhaps receive greater attention of the Congress than any other issue.

The Senator from Utah this afternoon raised a series of questions, and said he thought it was very important that the American people be informed of the administration's stand on the questions he raised. I agree with him. I feel that to the extent the administration can make available to the American people the information called for by those questions, it should do so, keeping in mind the fact, of course, that for security reasons certain information sometimes cannot be given to the American people when we would like to have it given.

On the other hand, I think it is very important that the administration does not use the matter of security and military secrecy as an alibi for denying to the American people information that it is in fact safe to give to them.

In the course of his remarks this afternoon the distinguished Senator from Utah pointed out that the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, was really a citizen of the world—and he is quite right about that. But I want to say here tonight, Mr. President, in taking a position somewhat different from that

of the Senator from Utah with regard to the speech of the ex-President, that the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, is not a military expert. I think that in his speech to the American people he demonstrated very clearly that he is not a military expert. I think one of the most unfortunate results of that speech, as is evidenced today by the newspaper stories and by the types of telegrams which Members of the Senate are receiving from people all over the United States, is that the speech of the ex-President has tended to give millions of American people a sense of security that is not supported by the facts. It seems to me that it is most unfortunate that one of the impressions formed by millions of Americans from the speech of the ex-President is that it is militarily safe for us to withdraw unto ourselves and to assume that the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, together with the building up of our Navy and our Air Force, will be adequate to protect our security. The Hoover speech gave the impression to many Americans that we can walk out of Europe with safety.

Mr. President, there is no question but that at least until this hour the reaction of many Americans to the speech of the ex-President has been one which has satisfied a psychological yearning of every American for an escape from the realities of the world situation. Each and every one of us must constantly be on guard, in connection with our own thinking on these problems, to make certain that we are not victimizing ourselves by exposing ourselves to the constant danger of a psychological escape mechanism, more commonly called wishful thinking—the psychological delight of imagining facts, when facts do not exist.

Mr. President, I was so disturbed about the implications of that part of the speech of the ex-President, which I think stirred up those feelings of false security on the part of many people, that today I took advantage of the opportunity to cross-examine one of the highest military officials in our Government. He is a general upon whose shoulders rest great responsibilities for the safety of our Nation. The replies I received from that high military official leave no room for doubt that the ex-President of the United States should have consulted with military officials of our Government before he, with his great prestige and great influence in this country, made a speech which had the effect of giving to the American people by the millions a false sense of security that is unwarranted by the military facts. For the RECORD, Mr. President, I wish to mention some of the questions I asked that high military official this afternoon, and I wish to give for the RECORD my best recollection of his answers.

I asked this high military official what his opinion was in regard to the following question:

General, if Western Europe, with all its industrial, war-making power, should fall into the hands of Communist Russia, and if we found ourselves in all-out war with Russia, would the fact that Russia controlled Western Europe make it more difficult for us to defeat Russia?

Mr. President, I think the Senate should ponder the answer that general gave to the question. He said, in effect:

It not only would make it more difficult for us to defeat Russia, but I think it is doubtful whether we would defeat her, whether we would survive that struggle.

Mr. President, I do not quote him verbatim, because I do not have the record before me; but I assure the Senate that is the import of his answer to my question.

Let us ponder the significance of that answer, Mr. President. Here we have a high military authority in our country, fully familiar with the great military problems that confront our country and the world; and in his answer to that question, he bore out the major premise of the speech I made yesterday on the floor of the Senate, namely, that if we walk out of Europe and permit Russia to obtain control of the Ruhr, there is a great danger and a great question whether in the years ahead America will survive an all-out war with Russia.

I think that military point of view needs to be made clear to those Americans who tonight are tending to victimize themselves by means of a psychological escape mechanism of wishful thinking about our security, and who wish to accept the false assumption made by the ex-President in his speech, namely, that it is safe for us to withdraw unto ourselves on this continent, and to assume that the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans, along with a Navy and an Air Force, will protect us adequately in an all-out war with Russia.

Mr. President, there is no basis in fact for that assumption; but, to the contrary, the best military advice available to us is that our survival itself would be seriously threatened if we followed the philosophy set forth in that part of the speech of the ex-President.

I wanted to be sure that I thoroughly understood the position of this high-ranking American military authority, so I put the question in a somewhat different way, and asked him in effect this:

General, do you think it would be correct to say that if Western Europe should fall to Soviet Russia the resulting industrial war-making power of Western Europe in the hands of Russia would prolong for several years a war with Russia?

His reply, in effect, was:

It would not prolong it for several years; it would prolong it for many years.

Mr. President, that is one of the points I tried to drive home yesterday in my major speech on this question—namely, that we Americans must face the ugly reality, which in my opinion was not properly emphasized in the speech of the ex-President the other night, that if we lose Western Europe to Russia, we are going to be in a death struggle with Russia for a great many years, and it is doubtful whether we will survive that struggle.

I then asked the general if he thought that Russia would be able to use the industrial war-making power of Europe if she overran Europe by putting into effect with any degree of success her policy of slave labor or enforced labor of conquered people?

He replied in effect that he had little doubt about it judging from the success Russia has had in other conquered countries in respect to enforcing her slave-labor program.

Mr. President, I think the general is absolutely right. The people of Western Europe would have no choice. They would either have to produce war goods for Russia or be shot. That is the police-state method.

That is why I say, Mr. President, we must make clear to the American people in these days that, after all, Western Europe constitutes the front line of American defense, and if we walk out on our allies in Western Europe and adopt the isolationist philosophy which characterizes much of the speech of the ex-President of the United States, we shall threaten the security of America and the destiny of our country.

As far as I am concerned, I am going to continue to stand up against this flood of isolationism that is sweeping America in these days, because I think that flood of isolationism threatens to engulf and drown the security of the American people. The American people must be told, I think, that this hour is so critical that they must recognize that the psychologically comforting feeling of wishful thinking is one of their greatest enemies. They must face coldly and objectively the ugly facts of the world in which we live; and the ugliest fact of all is the fact that Soviet Russia gives every indication that she is proceeding to prepare herself as rapidly as possible to make war on the United States.

That is why I protest, Mr. President, the particular emphasis which the ex-President of the United States gave to his speech the other night, when I think unfortunately he gave the American people the impression that we could walk out on Europe and be secure in the United States. Mr. President, today I attended a conference of two Senate committees at which appeared the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Army, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am not privileged to discuss the information which was given us at that committee meeting in respect to the Brussels Conference. Incidentally, I think that much of the information which was given to us in regard to that conference should be given to all the American people. There were some things said of such a top-secret nature that I think it would be a great mistake to make them public; because to make them public would be of great assistance to our enemies. But much of the discussion could be given to the American people, and I think should be. I hope that at an early date the President of the United States will, either himself or through the Secretary of State, give the American people as much of a detailed report about the Brussels Conference as possible. I interpreted some of the remarks of my good friend from Utah this afternoon to be a plea for the same sort of information and on that, I think he is right. But what I do want to say about the joint committee meeting this afternoon, Mr. President, is that I wish the American people could have heard the Secretary of State

give his report on the Brussels Conference. If they could have heard it, they would have found in his factual analysis much greater reassurance for the security of America than they can possibly find in the speech of the ex-President of the United States given the other night. As I listened to the Secretary of State this afternoon and to the Secretary of the Army, and to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I had a better understanding, a much clearer understanding of the great significance of the North Atlantic Pact and of the military implementation of it to the security of 160,000,000 American people. If the American people could have heard the report we received this afternoon, they would have a much clearer conception of the fact that the North Atlantic Pact and the military implementation of it constitute our front line of defense in this great struggle of freedom against totalitarianism. They would also have heard a report, in my judgment, which constituted a complete answer to the false assumptions contained in the ex-President's speech the other night.

I am satisfied from the information I received at the joint committee meeting this afternoon, and from the answers that I received from a high American military authority today, as I questioned him, that the major objections and reservations that I made to the ex-President's speech, on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon, in connection with the military implications of that speech were absolutely and completely correct. I repeat, I think it most unfortunate that the ex-President of the United States did not consult with the high military authorities of this country in regard to the military problems which confront our country, before he made a speech that gave the American people the impression that we could withdraw unto ourselves on the American Continent and take refuge on this side of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, stick our heads in the sand, and wishfully think ourselves into a security which does not exist, and will not exist for us, if we walk out on our allies in Europe.

I want to say, here and now, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate, that I do not believe there is any basis in fact for the assumption that our allies in Europe are not going to fulfill their full share of obligation in carrying out the objectives of the North Atlantic Pact. But let us keep in mind the fact that this fight for freedom is ours as well as theirs. Let us keep in mind the fact that Russia is as great a threat to us as she is to Western Europe. In fact, I happen to be one who believes that we in the United States, that our capitalistic system is the No. 1 target of Soviet Russia. If we are going to be able to stop Russia from gaining the great industrial war-making power that she would have if she got possession of the Ruhr and Western Europe, we must help make the North Atlantic Pact a success.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that in the historic debate which is going to be conducted in this country for the weeks ahead, the American people are going to face and answer the issue as to

whether we are going to hold fast to that great philosophy of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], based upon the sound concept that we must in our generation seek to establish a system of international justice under law, or whether we are going to withdraw unto ourselves and prepare to face the Russian threat alone after Russia takes Europe which she will do if we walk out of Europe. Are we going to get our heads out of the sand too late to save ourselves? Are we going to wipe the myopia of isolationism away from our eyes too late, only to discover that we stand alone in the world? Mr. President, as I said yesterday if we follow the false assumptions of the Hoover speech we will stand as an isolated island of freedom surrounded by the raging seas of communism that will engulf and drown both our security and our freedom.

That is the issue between an isolationist philosophy that is rearing its head in this country and a philosophy of sound internationalism that recognizes that mankind has entered into an era in which freemen of the world must stand together. We must follow the principle of "United we stand for freedom, or divided we fall into the slave state of Russian communism."

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION—RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before moving a recess, I wish to take this opportunity of again expressing my appreciation to those who have waited on the Senate during the past year, and who have worked with us tirelessly and have remained in attendance when many other Senators have gone home on evenings such as this. I wish each and every one of them the best and the happiest Christmas ever.

Now, Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Tuesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), the recess being under the unanimous consent agreement, the Senate took a recess to Tuesday, December 26, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 22 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Herbert L. Pugh, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Ben Ivy King, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 22 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Lt. Col. William R. Shuler, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Frank J. Parker to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Ben Ivy King to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Cornelius F. Reardon, of Billings, Mont., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou great God of all love and mercy, we thank Thee for this hallowed and joyous Christmas season, commemorating the birth of our blessed Lord.

We are again calling to mind and pondering the oft-repeated beautiful story of the shepherds bowing in adoration and humility at the manger of the Christ Child and the story of the wise men following in the wake of natural piety and worshiping at the same shrine.

We rejoice that when there was no eye to pity and no arm to save them in the fullness of time Thou didst send Thy Son to be the Saviour of the world.

Grant that the Christ of prophecy and of history may become the Christ of experience. May there be in us and in the hearts of all mankind a new nativity of His spirit of peace and good will.

May this Christmas not only be a time of commemoration but of consecration when we shall pledge ourselves anew to every righteous endeavor to hasten that glorious day of prediction when every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess that the Christ is the Lord to the glory of God.

Bless our beloved country, our homes, and all who are near and dear unto us. Wilt Thou give some special blessing and revelation of Thy sustaining presence and peace to our fellow citizens who are out on the fields of battle. May we daily send them our thoughts of love through the Christ of Christmas.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4653. An act for the relief of the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc., Merck & Co., Inc., and Mallinckrodt Chemical Works; and

H. R. 9893. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following

title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4266. An act to amend and extend title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9920. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title V, Public Law 754, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 555) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units in each branch of the Government, such amounts as may be necessary for the carrying out of projects or activities for which appropriations, funds, or other authority (subject to limitations, restrictions, and permissive provisions) would be made available by the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (H. R. 9920, 81st Cong., 2d sess.), to the extent and in the manner provided for by said act as passed by the House of Representatives on December 15, 1950, or as passed by the Senate on December 21, 1950, whichever is lower: *Provided*, That no funds are appropriated by this joint resolution for any project or activity not provided for by both Houses in said bill.

SEC. 2. Appropriations and funds made available, and authority granted, pursuant to this joint resolution, shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for herein, or (b) enactment of the applicable appropriation act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) January 3, 1951, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 3. Expenditures from appropriations or funds made available pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to any applicable appropriation or fund whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation or fund is contained is enacted into law.

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

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the

chairman of the committee to explain this resolution?

Mr. CANNON. This is a continuing resolution. It is couched largely in routine language. It makes available the money provided in the pending bill upon which both Houses have agreed. If there is a difference as to the amount, the lower of the two is appropriated by this resolution. Any item which is not in either version of the bill is suspended pending action in conference. The resolution expires on January 3, 1951.

Mr. TABER. The idea would be that we would go to conference and clean it up before that time?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. On top of that, the provision that is made here would take care of all needed defense activities until that date?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; that is correct, Mr. Speaker. We expect to go to conference on the pending bill as soon as a quorum is available, which is expected to be January 1. In the meantime, there are funds included in the bill for necessary defense expenditures which should be made available immediately. This takes care of all items on which there is complete agreement.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

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.

RETIRING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, with the conclusion of this session of the Eighty-first Congress, which will certainly come not later than Tuesday, January 2, there will be a number of distinguished Members of the House who will conclude their public services to the people of the United States. The Nation is fortunate in having had the services of these men. They will leave these legislative halls, Mr. Speaker, and return to private life bearing with them the gratitude and the appreciation of their colleagues and of the Nation for work well done. With them will also go the best wishes of all of us for their health, happiness, and prosperity in the years ahead.

I have asked for this time, Mr. Speaker, to especially pay tribute in my humble way to two Members of this House who have served on our side of the aisle, with the Republican minority. They have not only served their party, but in a broader sense, their country, with exceptional ability and with patriotic fervor.

These two men to whom I refer are legislative veterans—although young in

spirit and in vision—who have served for 30 years in the Congress of the United States. I refer to the Honorable JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York, who has served 8 years in this body and 12 years as a Member of the United States Senate with great credit to himself and added honor to his family name; and to EARL C. MICHENER, of Michigan, who has been a leading Member of this body for 30 years. Both of these distinguished gentlemen are retiring voluntarily to private life. Both of them have been repeatedly urged by their constituents, of both political parties, to continue their public service. Yet they have been so diligent, contributed so much, and worked so zealously in behalf of the people they represent, that none of us can gainsay the fact that they have earned the right to the rest from their labors they seek. Both of these men served their country in its time of need. Both are veterans of our Armed Forces. Both fought beneath Old Glory in the war with Spain. Certainly they have set before all of us an example of public service and patriotic devotion that we can well follow.

They go forth from these halls into private life with the full knowledge in their own hearts and souls that they have lived good lives; that they have never done that of which they need be ashamed; that they have acted only as they believed was in the best interests of their beloved country. They take with them the love and affection of all who have known them.

It has been my privilege to have worked closely with both of these gentlemen as a member of the Committee on Rules. I know something of the stuff of which they are made, and of their strength of character which typifies the best in American manhood. Of each of them it can be truthfully said, "Well done, my good and faithful servant," for they have kept the faith.

Personally, and on behalf of each Member of this House, I wish them Godspeed.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the gentleman for his consideration and appreciate the opportunity to join in the richly merited tribute he pays our colleagues who are leaving us.

One of the many compensations for service in the House of Representatives is association with the exceptional class of men who serve with us. As the years pass we are prone to forget on which side of the aisle they sit. While we must at times disagree with them on political and economic questions, that does not mean personal disagreement. After the debatable issue has been settled as it properly should be settled, the friendship and comradeship and mutual regard between those who battle on the proposition is all the stronger.

May I especially concur in the tribute which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has paid the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. I regret,

both personally and because of my interest in the House, the retirement of Mr. MICHENER. He has rendered not only distinguished service throughout these critical 30 years, but he is one of the ablest and most accomplished parliamentarians who has served in the House. On that account, as well as for many other invaluable services, he will be missed in the coming Congress.

And AL ENGEL is leaving. He probably has a wider and more comprehensive first-hand knowledge of the United States Military Establishment than any man who has ever sat in either House. To him in no small part is due much of the credit of modernizing and motorizing land branches of the military service.

We have on this side, too, Mr. Speaker, men whose retirement will leave vacancies which it will be difficult to fill.

It is going to be especially difficult to fill STEVE PACE's place. He has served in a broad field including every interest of the Nation, but his comprehensive knowledge of all questions affecting agriculture and his wise and patriotic contribution to the solution of agricultural problems is perhaps unsurpassed by that of any man who has served in the American Congress in the last half century.

It is going to be hard to find a man to carry on adequately WILL WHITTINGTON's work. In his service he has written one of the important chapters in the development of the Mississippi Valley.

HARDIN PETERSON also is leaving us, to the general regret of the House. No one leaves more or warmer friends. We tried in vain to dissuade him. When I was in his State recently I found a strong sentiment in favor of drafting him for the governorship of the State. No better selection could be made for that high position. But he will never serve in any official capacity more effectively than he has served here in this body.

SAM HOBBS is retiring in spite of every effort on the part of his colleagues to persuade him to remain. He has long been one of the outstanding members of his committee and the House. We can ill afford to lose him at this critical time.

And our beloved MARY NORTON is retiring after one of the longest and most distinguished services in the history of the House. She has broken many records while here. The first woman to serve as chairman of a standing committee of either House and one of the most useful Members of the House and the Congress.

There are many others who could be named if time permitted who like these are retiring voluntarily although they could have remained here indefinitely. Our hearts go with them. In their retirement we are losing not only useful and experienced legislators and statesmen but warm and valued personal friends.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am happy to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the going of EARL MICHENER and JIM WADSWORTH,

the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New York, I feel a deep personal loss, because since they have been Members of this House they and I have been warm personal friends. I regret it not only on my own account but also because they are leaving the service of their country and I regret it deeply for our common country. I do not know of two men who have served more faithfully and with greater ability than these two.

The gentleman from Missouri remarked about the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] being a parliamentarian. I have seen him many times preside over the House and over the Committee of the Whole. He did it with great dignity, with great fairness, and with a regard for the rules of the House of Representatives. I think that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], is one of the most perfect legislators I have ever had the privilege of serving with. He is gentle, he is fine, he is kind; and into his retirement he takes with him my every good wish.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is the same type—maybe a little different, but I always knew that when the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] took the floor the Speaker would have no trouble keeping order because the gentleman from New York always brings a message from the heart and mind that appeals to every Member of this House and would appeal to every patriot throughout the length and breadth of this country if they knew him as we do.

I must say, of course, in the matter of the fine qualities he attained early in life that build the strong physical man and the strong character, that he got some of that out on the bounding prairies of west Texas where he was the manager of a great empire for, I think, 5 years. He carries back with him to his valley in northern New York my deep affection and kindest regards, and my hope that his useful life may be spared for many years to come.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks relative to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my agreement with everything that has been said today relative to the public service of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I cannot add anything to the eloquent tributes which have just been paid them. I cannot forego however this opportunity to pay both of them a personal tribute and to express my appreciation of the splendid public service which they have rendered as Members of Congress.

EARL MICHENER was one of the first Members with whom I became acquainted when I came to Congress 24 years ago. I was impressed from the beginning with his knowledge of parliamentary procedure and his ability as a legislator. I made it a point as a new Member to

question him on matters of legislation and procedure and found his suggestions, advice, and example most helpful. As the years went by my admiration for his ability and knowledge has increased. I can say without qualification that I have known of no better legislator during my time in Congress than EARL MICHENER. He not only has a thorough understanding of the mechanics of legislation but even more important he has the understanding of human nature and the ability to make wise compromises which are so important in the enactment of legislation.

His influence as a member of such important committees as Rules and Judiciary has been reflected in the provisions of many important laws now on the statute books.

EARL MICHENER has been a hard working Member of Congress but he was never too busy to make himself available for counsel and advice to Members of less experience. I shall always be appreciative of the sound advice and wise counsel which he has given me on many occasions and of the kindly spirit in which it was given. I have frequently referred new Members of Congress to EARL MICHENER as a man who had the correct answers to their questions.

The major part of EARL MICHENER's life has been devoted to public service. This Congress and the Nation can ill afford to lose him but all of us who know him and have served with him know that he has earned the right to retire from the strenuous life of a Member of Congress. I hope that he may enjoy many happy years as a private citizen secure and serene in the knowledge that his public service constituted a great contribution to his country and that he left the Halls of Congress with the respect and best wishes of every Member with whom he had been associated.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH had a distinguished public career before he entered the House of Representatives. Had he never been a Member of this body his name would have gone down in history as a great legislator and political leader in his own State and as a most able and distinguished Member of the United States Senate.

After such a record there are some perhaps who would have hesitated about starting a new career in the House of Representatives. I am sure that in doing so JIM WADSWORTH had but a single idea in mind—that of serving his country.

During my time in Congress I have known no man who commanded closer attention when he took the floor or whose counsel was more highly regarded by his colleagues. Whenever he spoke he clarified the issues and contributed to the knowledge of the House on the subject under discussion. His course has been characterized by the highest ideals of public service and patriotism. His colleagues know him as a man of wisdom and one to whom the appellation of statesman in its true sense can be given with propriety.

JIM WADSWORTH will be greatly missed in this body. There are none who can take his place. His departure from Congress is a serious loss to the Nation. But I doubt if his leaving means the end of

JIM WADSWORTH'S public service. His wisdom and experience are so preeminent and well known that whether he is in public or private life his advice and counsel on public matters will be sought from near and far.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, everyone in this House joins with the Speaker in the sentiments expressed by him with respect to our esteemed colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. It is a great tribute to them that all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, so wholeheartedly join in our expressions of admiration and tribute to both of them.

Working together for years in the public service we learn to love and appreciate men of that character. This is true also in my case with respect to my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MILES], who likewise is leaving the Congress voluntarily and will not be with us after January 1. I, therefore, take this opportunity to say a few words about him as well.

I have known the gentleman from New Mexico, JOHN E. MILES, for many years. He has faithfully served my State in nearly every capacity of public trust. As a pioneer from the State of Tennessee, he settled in New Mexico close to 50 years ago and has been in the public life of the State since 1918, with a short digression into the newspaper field as an associate editor of two newspapers back in the twenties. As one of our most trusted party leaders, he helped to solidify and place the Democratic Party in a dominant position that lasted unbroken for two decades. As its chairman he gained the trust and confidence of the people throughout the State, and as the result he was elected as governor for two consecutive terms. It is characteristic of his down-to-earth humility that when he was first taking that office he declared he did not expect to be a great governor, but that he would try to be a good governor. That he was. The people appreciated his honesty, his sincerity, and his patience—qualities which have endeared him to his colleagues here in the House.

The people of the State rewarded him by sending him to Congress to which he could have been renominated without opposition and reelected without question had he chosen to stay. That he chose otherwise is a tribute to his devotion and loyalty to lifelong friends for whom he stepped aside from a virtually unopposed reelection to Congress, to accept a third nomination for Governor in an uncertain and bitterly contested election.

The members of the Public Lands Committee, where he chose to serve during his term of office, will remember him for his quiet, common-sense, and steady influence. His pioneering experiences and instinct led him to take a special interest in the West and in our new frontiers. With a subcommittee of the House he made an arduous journey last year to visit the Pacific Islands, including Guam and Samoa, and took a

special interest in their problems and aspirations.

During his term as Governor, and during his service in Congress, I have been closely associated with him and have learned to love and admire him as a man among men, free from all affectation or pretense, candid, sincere, and dependable as a rock. We will miss him in the House, where he leaves many friends. As for me, I hope I may have the opportunity of serving closely with him again either here or back in our beloved State.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1951, when the curtain is drawn on the Eighty-first Congress, this Nation will lose a truly great public servant in our colleague, Representative EARL MICHENER. EARL MICHENER'S long record with his countless achievements as a legislator for his district, State, and Nation, will forever be the envy of those who serve in the House in the future.

EARL MICHENER has been a personal friend for only 2 years, but in that relatively short period of time I have learned to admire and respect him. His friendly and helpful advice were of great aid and assistance and I will miss his wise words of counsel in the crucial months ahead.

EARL MICHENER, a great American, has left an indelible mark on the pages of history. His colleagues on both sides of the aisle have spoken glowingly of his record which will shine even brighter in the future.

We all wish EARL our very best in health and happiness as he leaves the House, but we want him to know that his good influence will be long felt in the Chambers of this body.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of the House of Representatives who, as real patriotic citizens, contribute much to the welfare of our country especially during these difficult times, but I seriously doubt that there are any in our membership who are held in higher esteem by their colleagues than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH.]

They have served their country faithfully and well, and have always executed their responsibilities with zeal and fidelity. Honor is a word which is too frequently abused, but when one speaks of honor in connection with Mr. MICHENER and Mr. WADSWORTH, he speaks of that rare quality in the highest sense of the word. When I refer to these men as men of honor I mean that they both have that delicate sense of what is right and are uncompromising in their stand for truth.

The House of Representatives, and through it, the Nation can ill afford to lose the services of these outstanding members who are retiring voluntarily, but they have earned their rest and they leave us with the gratitude and affectionate regard of their colleagues who will ever remember them as friends never lacking in warm affection. I venture to suggest that they will not be able to dismiss public service lightly from their minds but will always be ready to come

to the aid of their country. I wish them all the good things of life bound up in the happiness and contentment of many years of devoted service.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the close of this Eighty-first Congress, I should like to say a few words about the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] who are concluding their long and distinguished careers in Congress. I do not believe two finer and abler men have served in the Congress of the United States. They rank among the great legislators of all time.

I selfishly wish they had not decided to retire to private life. We will miss them in many, many ways. I do not know where we could possibly find a substitute for the parliamentary skill of the gentleman from Michigan and the persuasive oratory of the gentleman from New York. I can recall the many occasions when I first came to Congress that I solicited the advice of the gentleman from Michigan on some parliamentary rule. He was always patient and understanding with me, and always helpful. I can also recall the many times the gentleman from New York has taken the floor on some major issue to command the complete attention of the House. He always knew his subject. He spoke only when he really had something to say, and he always spoke with clarity and conviction.

Both EARL MICHENER and JIM WADSWORTH are personal friends of mine. Their retirement is a personal loss. I have made several trips with JIM to our international livestock exhibitions, of which he is a director. He probably knows more about cattle raising than any man in this country. I certainly learned a great deal from JIM.

The more I associated with JIM the greater my affection and respect for him. He always impressed me as the quality of man I should like to see in the White House. He never stooped to conquer. He has always been a man of principle who would never sacrifice principle for expediency. He has always been a man of convictions with the courage of his convictions. There are few like him. There are few with his intellectual, physical, and spiritual stature.

To my good friends, EARL MICHENER and JIM WADSWORTH, I extend my sincerest best wishes. You take with you my highest regards and deepest affection. It is a privilege to call you my friends. You have served your country well. In wishing for you every joy and contentment in the years ahead I know I am expressing the wishes of every Member of this House.

HON. HERBERT HOOVER AND GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think that Americans everywhere are very much heartened by two recent addresses given by prominent Republicans. I refer to the speech made before the New York County Lawyers Association by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, and the more recent speech given by the only living ex-President of the United States, Honorable Herbert Hoover.

The one outstanding feature of both of these remarkable addresses was that they were definite, and set forth concrete proposals for the planning of the future. It is immaterial whether we agree with the details suggested by either of these great citizens but their definite proposals indicate far-sighted thinking and the kind of leadership which the country is sorely in need of.

I feel sure that the views of these men will be present in our thoughts in the days ahead because the truth of what they said is inescapable; it is logical; and, it appeals to the liberty-loving people of this great Nation.

I am moved to quote from another great American who was also a Republican, and whose loyalty and fearless courage will always be an inspiration to citizens of the United States. Theodore Roosevelt, in a speech which he made in Chicago in 1899 on the subject, *The Strenuous Life*, said:

Our country calls not for the life of ease, but for the life of strenuous endeavor. The twentieth century looms before us big with the fate of many nations. If we stand idly by, if we seek merely swollen, slothful ease, and ignoble peace, if we shrink from the hard contests where men must win at hazard of their lives and at the risk of all they hold dear, then the bolder and stronger peoples will pass us by and will win for themselves the domination of the world. Let us therefore boldly face the life of strife, resolute to do our duty well and manfully; resolute to uphold righteousness by deed and by word; resolute to be both honest and brave, to serve high ideals, yet to use practical methods. Above all, let us shrink from no strife, moral or physical, within or without the Nation, provided we are certain that the strife is justified; for it is only through strife, through hard and dangerous endeavor, that we shall ultimately win the goal of true national greatness.

Theodore Roosevelt might well have said the same things today as we face, at this turn of the half-century, the tremendous responsibilities and problems involving the destiny of mankind. The high moral tone, the straight-forward inspiration, and the will to risk all for the right, can be found in the words of

all three of these men. They are the words and the thoughts of true Americans everywhere and it is inspiring for us to know that this spirit of righteousness and strength and clear thinking is still to be found among our great men.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a House Resolution No. 839 which has been referred to the Committee on Rules.

It would authorize and direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any directly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full, complete, and continuing study and investigation of the administration, execution, and enforcement by Government departments and agencies of the export policies and control regulations of the United States.

It provides for a continuing oversight into the effectiveness of measures and efforts instituted for the Federal agencies to prevent the shipment or transshipment of exported materials to countries unfriendly to the United States or to the lack of such measures or efforts.

The resolution also directs the committee to ascertain to what extent, if any, American carriers have been and are authorized in such transportation.

Finally, the committee would be directed to ascertain the names of all those engaged in making such shipments or transshipments.

I have now received a report, which I understand contains all of the criminal cases arising out of violations of these laws and regulations. I have had a partial analysis made in order to outline the facts as to the effectiveness, or lack of effectiveness, in the prosecution and disposition of these cases. I am not prepared to draw any firm conclusions as yet from this analysis, but I think it is necessary to state now that the resolution as drafted should undoubtedly contain a specific direction that the committee should inquire into the effectiveness of any criminal prosecution and into the question of whether existing penalties should be increased. It seems clear to me that procedures in effect prior to

June 27, 1950, will be completely inadequate now.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the detailed report with reference to these criminal cases. It is obvious that in some instances, there are very substantial delays between the date when the case was referred and the dates of indictment and sentence. There also seem to be quite a variation in the disposition of the cases. Of course, after a fuller investigation of the entire facts, it would be impossible to make any sound determinations in this field but I am sure the outline indicates the wisdom of action by a congressional committee.

First, I include the general letter from Nathan Ostroff, general counsel, Office of International Trade:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1950.
Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: Pursuant to our telephone conversation today I am enclosing a list of the export control violations that have been disposed of by administrative action, together with a list of the more serious cases which have been disposed of by way of criminal prosecution.

Since mid-1948, we have instituted 76 administrative proceedings against over 200 United States and foreign individuals and firms for various violations of export controls, including about 20 instances of transshipment or diversion of strategic goods. License revocation and denial orders have now been issued in most of these cases; some are still pending awaiting hearing or decision. These orders have barred United States exporters from shipping, foreign buyers from receiving, and United States and foreign freight forwarders from handling United States goods for various periods of time extending up to the entire future in which United States export controls may remain in effect.

Thirty-seven highly serious cases of violations of export controls have been sent to the Department of Justice. Of these, 23 cases have reached the stages of indictment or conviction; while 14 cases are being reviewed by the United States attorneys for criminal action. Sentences have been handed down including prison terms ranging from 3 months to 10 years, and including fines ranging from \$300 to \$10,000. The Customs Bureau, which aids in the enforcement of export controls, has also brought over 400 seizure cases since the summer of 1948, involving approximately \$1,000,000 of United States goods attempted to be exported in violation of export controls.

You may feel free to use any of this information as you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN OSTROFF,
General Counsel.

Criminal cases (under indictment, awaiting trial, or already convicted)

Title	Nature of case	Criminal action	Court	Date referred	Date indicted	Sentenced
Joseph L. Cardona... Nicholas R. Benedetti, d. b. a. Pan Pacific Trading Co. A. W. Schwimmer et al.	Unauthorized shipment... Falsification of shipper's export declarations to ship unlicensed commodity. Attempted exportation of 42 combat aircraft engines and aircraft radio parts either not declared or falsely described on declarations, and intended for shipment to Israel (Export Control Act and Neutrality Act).	Awaiting trial in New Orleans... Fined \$1,500 and year and day imprisonment, suspended for 5 years on probation. A. W. Schwimmer, Reynold Selk, Leon Gardner, and Service Airways, Inc., each sentence to pay fine of \$10,000.	Louisiana... San Francisco... Los Angeles...	July 1947... November 1947... September 1948...	October 1948... June 1948... April 1949...	November 1948... February 1950...
Irving Grossman, alias Charles E. Fox, d. b. a. Pacific Color Co.	Falsification of shipper's export declarations and exportation of commodities not disclosed in declarations.	United States court in Los Angeles sentenced Grossman to 10 years' imprisonment.	...do.....	December 1949...	March 1950.....	May 1950.

Criminal cases (under indictment, awaiting trial, or already convicted)—Continued

Title	Nature of case	Criminal action	Court	Date referred	Date indicted	Sentenced
Thomas P. Lynch...	Misrepresentation of commodity for purpose of effecting exportation under general license.	Set for trial in New York.....	New York, southern district.	October 1948....	December 1950..	December 1950.
Martin Markowitz et al.	Bribery, conspiracy, and illegal use of licenses.	Martin Markowitz sentenced to year and day imprisonment; Arthur Blumenfeld sentenced to year and day imprisonment plus \$5,500 fine and probation for 1 year after expiration of sentence; Rubin Leviton sentenced to 3 years imprisonment plus \$11,000 fine and probation for 2 years after expiration of sentence. Trials still pending on several indictments.	do.....	March 1948.....	September 1949..	February 1950.
Cervo Export Corp. et al.	Unauthorized shipments of streptomycin; falsification of shipper's export declarations.	Corporation fined \$1,000; Bernard D. Hirsch and Franko G. Hirsch each sentenced to 18 months imprisonment and fined \$2,500 and \$1,000, respectively. Trial on another indictment resulted in additional fines of \$2,500 each and additional sentences of 1 year and 1 day each.	do.....	April 1948.....	December 1948..	June 1950.
Robert M. Mistrong.	Falsification of shipper's export declarations; exportation of commodities without license; false representations concerning existence of licenses.	Set for trial in New York (perjury case pending in Washington, D. C.).	do.....	July 1948.....	March 1949.....	Not yet.
Daubion Corp. et al.	Trafficking in licenses and unauthorized exportations.	Awaiting trial.....	do.....	July 19, 1948....	November 1950..	Do.
John A. Quinn and Thomas Quinn.	Forgery of export licenses and falsification of shipper's export declarations.	John A. Quinn sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment to be served at conclusion of New York State sentence of 15 months to 2½ years on attempted grand larceny charge. Thomas Quinn sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment on each count of 2 indictments, sentences to run concurrently.	do.....	November 1948..	February 1949..	May 1949.
Arthur Harris..... Wisconsin Farms, Inc., et al.	False statements to obtain licenses..... Misrepresentation of merchandise exported; exportation of merchandise in excess of that licensed and lawfully exportable.	Awaiting trial.....	do.....	June 1949.....	November 1950..	Not yet.
Penn Export Petroleum Division.	Misrepresentation of commodity.....	Individual given suspended sentence 1 year and 1 day; corporation fined \$2,000.	New York.....	October 1949....	May 1950.....	October 1950.
International Manufacturing & Equipment Co., Inc.	Transshipment of mine carloader.....	Awaiting trial.....	New York, southern district.	December 1949..	May 1950.....	Not yet.
Aceto Chemical Co. C. L. Janik, Rockefeller Plaza.	Transshipment.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Cervo Export Corp. et al.	Unauthorized shipments of streptomycin; falsification of shipper's export declarations.	Corporation fined \$1,000; Bernard D. Hirsch and Franko G. Hirsch each sentenced to 18 months imprisonment and fined \$2,500 and \$1,000, respectively. Trial on another indictment resulted in additional fines of \$2,500 each and additional sentences of 1 year and 1 day each.	New York, eastern district.	April 1948.....	April 1949.....	April 1950.
Peter K. Semadis and Semadis & Co.	Submission of false donor-donee lists in effecting gift shipments; violation of suspension order.	Fined \$300 (Semadis).....	do.....	March 1949.....	December 1949..	Do.
Minos K. Zongos.....	do.....	Zongos sentenced to pay fine of \$100 on each of 3 counts of making exportations during period of suspension order and contrary to terms thereof.	do.....	May 1949.....	do.....	Do.
Orlando Lokpez.....	Attempted bribery and presentation of fraudulent licenses.	Sentenced to 3 to 9 months imprisonment by United States district court in Washington, D. C., on attempted bribery charge. United States attorney for southern district of New York has declined prosecution for violations of export control laws.	District of Columbia.	August 1948.....	September 1948..	December 1948.
Greek Railway Express, Inc.	Submission of false donor-donee lists in effecting gift shipments.	Corporation sentenced to pay fine of \$250. Case against individuals dismissed.	do.....	November 1948..	September 1949..	February 1950.
Robert J. Badal.....	Attempted bribery.....	Badal fined \$1,000 and imprisoned for 2 years, suspended for 5 years.	Houston, Tex....	August 1948.....	September 1948..	April 1950.
Pacific Trading Corp.	Transshipment.....	Arrested, awaiting indictment.....	Boston, Mass....	April 1950.....	November 1950..	

Next, I include a description of 12 cases which are either pending hearing or awaiting decision before the Compliance Commissioner. The names are omitted because of the circumstances.

Names are omitted from the following cases which are either pending hearing or awaiting decision before Compliance Commissioner:

Case No. 1 (four companies): Switzerland, Italy, and Holland; false representations for license to ship boring and turning mill to Italy and transshipment to Hungary, without authorization; pending decision.

Case No. 2 (one corporation and two individuals): New York, N. Y.; false representa-

tions and transshipment of lubricating oil from Switzerland to Austria; pending decision.

Case No. 3 (one company): Zurich, Switzerland; false representation as to order for caterpillar tractors to Switzerland; awaiting decision.

Case No. 4 (four companies and two individuals): Split shipments of steel sheets to Ireland contrary to general license GLV; pending decision.

Case No. 5 (one individual): Union of South Africa; false representations and diversion of jute bags from Venezuela to South Africa; awaiting hearing.

Case No. 6 (one company and two individuals): Brooklyn, N. Y.; false representa-

tion to induce license for shipment of chemical to Hong Kong, actually intended for transshipment to China; also violation of suspension order; awaiting decision.

Case No. 7 (one company and two individuals): New York and Denmark; false representations to obtain license for shipment of chemical to Denmark, with intent to transship; awaiting hearing.

Case No. 8 (one company and one individual): New York, N. Y.; false representation to obtain license for shipment of chemical to Belgium, actually transhipped to Hungary; awaiting hearing.

Case No. 9 (one individual): New York, N. Y.; transshipment of electronic equipment from Italy to Czechoslovakia and un-

licensed shipments to Czechoslovakia; awaiting decision.

Case No. 10 (one company and four individuals): London, England; false representation by consignee abroad to obtain license for shipment of molybdenum to England, actually transhipped to U. S. S. R.; awaiting decision.

Case No. 11 (one company and two individuals): Switzerland; false representations by consignee abroad to obtain license for shipment of pavers to Switzerland, intended to be transhipped to Hungary; awaiting hearing.

Case No. 12 (two corporations and four individuals): New York and Belgium; false representations to obtain license for shipment of ball bearings to Belgium, actually transhipped to Switzerland; awaiting decision.

Next, I include a descriptive list of a substantial number of cases handled through administrative procedures:

Swiftway Enterprises, Inc., and three individuals, New Orleans, La.: False representations for licenses to ship steel bars to Dominican Republic and unlicensed shipment of same commodity to Cuba. August 10, 1948—Order suspending license privileges for 3 months.

Dalton-Cooper, Inc., and three individuals New York, N. Y.: Unlicensed shipment of lead to South America. May 1, 1948—Order suspending privilege to export lead for 3 months.

American Hellenic Corp. and two individuals, New York, N. Y.: Fraudulent gift-parcel shipments to Greece. October 14, 1948—Order suspending all license privileges for duration of export controls.

Oceanic Express Co. and one individual, New York, N. Y.: Fraudulent gift-parcel shipments to Greece. December 23, 1948—Order suspending license privileges for 6 months.

Superior Packing Co. and one individual, New York, N. Y.: Fraudulent gift-parcel shipments to Italy. December 2, 1948—Order suspending license privileges for 1 year.

Henry Robinson, New York, N. Y.: Trafficking in licenses for shipments of tinplate to Yugoslavia. March 7, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for 6 months.

The Traders Syndicate and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: Unlicensed shipments of caustic soda to India. February 28, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for 60 days.

Bellmex Corp. and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: False representations and attempted transshipment of ball bearings from Belgium to Czechoslovakia, August 3, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for duration of export controls.

Sheldon Merchandising Corp., two individuals, and one corporation, New York, N. Y.: Split shipments of streptomycin in violation of provisions of general license GLV. January 31, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for 6 months.

Vilco, Inc., and two individuals, New York, N. Y.: Split shipments of streptomycin to Hong Kong in violation of provisions of general license GLV. December 24, 1948—Order suspending all license privileges except general license GO and GRO for 3 months.

I. D. Talve Trading Co., five individuals, and two companies, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Submission of false and altered firm orders in applications for export of soda ash and caustic soda to India. February 7, 1949—All license privileges suspended for 6 months. March 25, 1949—Appeals board decision reducing general license suspension to 2 months and validated license suspension to 3 months.

Murray M. Nelson, three individuals, and four companies, New York, N. Y.: Submission of false documents in support of applications for licenses, and misrepresentation of appli-

cant on applications. March 23, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for duration of export controls.

E. A. Bromund Co. and one individual, New York, N. Y.: Alteration of license as to destination, commodity, quantity, and price. March 30, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for 3 months.

Arthur Harris and two corporations, New York, N. Y.: Submission of forged documents in support of applications for licenses, and exportation at price in excess of licensed price. April 1, 1949—Order suspending validated licenses for 9 months and general licenses for 2 months.

Nicholas R. Benedetti and one company, San Francisco, Calif.: Misdescription of commodity for purpose of effecting exportation of streptomycin under general license. March 31, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for duration of export controls.

Thomas P. Lynch and one company, New York, N. Y.: Misrepresentation of commodity for purpose of effecting exportations of sanitary ware under general license, to Colombia. August 15, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for duration of export controls.

Milton Berk, Newark, N. J.: Split shipments of streptomycin to Cuba contrary to general license GLV. May 25, 1949—Order suspending license privileges for duration of export controls.

Iro Trading Co., three individuals and one corporation, New York, N. Y.: Trafficking in license for shipment of caustic soda to India. August 25, 1949—Order suspending validated license privileges for 30 days.

American General Supply Corp., five individuals, and four corporations: Split shipments of streptomycin to Brazil contrary to general license GLV. June 1, 1949—Warning letter issued to all respondents.

Semadis & Co. and one individual, New York, N. Y.: Fraudulent gift parcel shipments to Greece. March 24, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for duration of export controls.

David Schkolnik Sons and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: False representations to induce license for caustic soda to Pakistan. August 26, 1949—Order suspending validated license privileges for 3 months.

Elameric Co., Inc., and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: Fraudulent gift parcel shipments to Greece. August 26, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for 3 months, plus additional 6 months for gift parcels.

Joseph R. Awad and one company, New York, N. Y.: False representations to obtain licenses for lard to Venezuela. July 28, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for 2 months.

Wisconsin Farms, Inc., and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: False representation to export lard without license, disguised as gift parcels. August 26, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges to one individual for duration of export controls. Other respondents similarly barred for 30 days.

Pacific & Atlantic Overseas Trade Corp. and four individuals, New York, N. Y.: False representations to obtain licenses for flour and lard to Nicaragua. August 18, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for 30 days.

Daubion Corp. and four individuals and two companies, New York, N. Y., Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, D. C.: Trafficking in license and unauthorized export of barbed wire to Cuba. August 15, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges of one individual and one company for 6 months; all other respondents for 3 months.

Edwards International Corp. and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: Attempted transshipment of tires and tubes from Italy to Turkey or Rumania. August 16, 1949—Order suspending validated license privileges to R countries for 2 years and general licenses to all countries for 2 months. May 18, 1950—Order modified reducing suspension to 1 year.

Wisconsin Farms, Inc., and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: Fraudulent gift-parcel shipments to Germany. Case consolidated with first Wisconsin Farms case above, and consolidated order entered. See above.

Theodoros Miller, one individual and two companies, New York, N. Y.: Fraudulent gift-parcel shipments to Greece. September 16, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for 4 months.

American Firstoline Corp., three individuals and two corporations, New York, Mexico, and Texas: Unlicensed shipment of carbon black to Mexico with intent to transship to Holland or Belgium. October 4, 1949—Order suspending all positive list exports for 1 year, as to one corporation and one individual. January 26, 1950—Order suspending all positive list exports to Mexican corporation and individual for 6 months, and suspended sentence 1 year's suspension on other respondents.

United States Intertrade Corp., five individuals and four corporations, New York, N. Y.: Trafficking and unlawful use of licenses for caustic soda to India. February 3, 1950—Order suspending validated license privileges of one corporation and individual, 4 months; two corporations and two individuals, 3 months; two corporations and two individuals, 2 months.

International Manufacturing & Equipment Co., Inc., and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: False representations with intent to transship mine carloader from Switzerland to Czechoslovakia. November 9, 1949—Order suspending validated license shipments of positive list commodities to group R countries for 6 months.

Allied Universal, Inc., and one individual, New York, N. Y.: Attempted transshipment of silicon steel sheets from Holland. October 25, 1949—All license privileges suspended for 6 months.

Maxwell Meyers Affiliation, Ltd., Inc., six individuals and two corporations, New York, N. Y.: Unauthorized transfer and use of license and shipment of wire nails in excess of quantity licensed. November 9, 1949—Order suspending positive list shipments for 9 months for one corporation and one individual, and for 1 year for one corporation and one individual.

Ralph F. Marotte, Miami, Fla.: Unauthorized use of license to effect an exportation of lard. August 18, 1949—Order suspending validated license privileges for 3 months.

Penn Export Petroleum Division of Harvey Watkins Associates, Inc., and one individual, New York, N. Y.: Misrepresentation of commodity in obtaining license and effecting exportation of fully refined paraffin wax to Norway. September 12, 1949—Order suspending validated and general license privileges for 3 months with exception of limited quantities of shipments of white oil or petrolatum to Latin-American countries.

Shawnee Milling Co., Inc., two individuals and one company, Kansas City, Mo., and San Francisco, Calif.: Diversion of shipment of flour from Philippines to same consignee in Hong Kong. April 17, 1950—Order suspending all license privileges of two individuals for 6 months, to be held in abeyance.

Frawley Chemical Corp. and one individual, New York, N. Y.: Split shipments of streptomycin to Hong Kong in violation of general license GLV. November 10, 1949—Order suspending validated license privileges for period of 60 days.

Aceto Chemical Co., Inc., and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: Misrepresentations in preparing applications for licenses and shipper's export declarations for purpose of effecting transshipment of 25,000 pounds of dibutyl phthalate from Belgium to Czechoslovakia. November 21, 1949—Order suspending all license privileges for 6 months.

Maurice Carten and one company, New York, N. Y.: Misrepresentation of toilet bowls for purpose of exporting under general

license. May 5, 1950—Order suspending all license privileges for 60 days.

Coal Export Corp., New York, N. Y.: Misrepresentation for purpose of effecting transshipment of chemicals from Holland to Germany. January 26, 1950—Order suspending for 90 days validated license privileges for shipment of positive list coal-tar products.

Index Trade Service, Inc., six individuals and two companies, New York, N. Y.: Trafficking in license and overshipment of caustic soda to authorized consignee and destination. July 3, 1950—Order suspending all license privileges for positive list commodities for 6 months with respect to one corporation and one respondent, and for 3 months with respect to one individual.

Charles G. Beth Export Corp. and two individuals, New York, N. Y.: Transshipment of 250 tons of lard from Holland to Austria, whereas Germany was authorized destination. Awaiting decision.

Prometheus Trading Co. and one individual, New York, N. Y.: Fraudulent gift parcel shipments to Greece. January 24, 1950—Order suspending all license privileges for 30 days.

Arthur Harris, two corporations and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: Violation of suspension order; misrepresentations on shippers export declarations. August 7, 1950—Order suspending all license privileges for positive list commodities for 6 months.

LaRapida Co. and two individuals, New York, N. Y.: Fraudulent gift parcel shipments to Italy and Yugoslavia. March 10, 1950—Order suspending all license privileges for duration of export controls.

Siegel Chemical Co., Inc., and two individuals, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Attempted transshipment of chemical from Switzerland to Czechoslovakia. February 23, 1950—Order suspending all license privileges for shipment of positive list commodities for 6 months. May 10, 1950—Appeals board decision reduced suspension of company and one individual from 6 to 3 months.

Berwin Trading Co., Inc., two corporations and two individuals, New York, N. Y.: False representations for licenses to ship wire to South Africa. February 23, 1950—Order suspending validated license privileges for 3 months and general license privileges for 30 days.

Minos K. Zongos, two companies and one individual, Long Island and Bronx, N. Y.: False representations and violation of suspension order. July 27, 1950—Order suspending positive list shipments for 1 year.

Rolf G. Grote, New York, N. Y.: Transshipment of chemicals from Switzerland to U. S. S. R. July 3, 1950—Order barring all positive list shipments for duration of export controls.

Alex Pruzan, New York, N. Y.: False representations for shipments of commodities to Spain. March 24, 1950—Order suspending all license privileges for duration of export controls.

Harris Chemical Corp. and three individuals, New York, N. Y.: False representations for license to ship chemicals to Belgium with knowledge of intended transshipment to Czechoslovakia. April 28, 1950—Order suspending all positive list shipments for 4 months.

John Rentzeperis and one corporation, New York, N. Y.: Violation of suspension order against Oceanic Express Co., owned by him. March 24, 1950—Order barring all exportations for duration of export controls.

David Einhorn, nine companies and nine individuals, New York and Colombia: Split shipments of steel sheets to Colombia contrary to GLV general license. August 31, 1950—Order barring positive list shipments for 1 year as to one respondent and one corporation; for 4 months for two individuals and two companies; for 2 months for one individual and one company; 20 days for one company; warning letters sent to four in-

dividuals and four companies; charges dismissed as to one company and two individuals. September 22, 1950—Order set aside as to company suspended for 20 days, and remanded for rehearing, now pending.

Pacific Trading Corp. and one individual, Boston, Mass.: False representation and transshipments of steel sheets to China and Europe. February 1, 1950—Order suspending positive list shipments for 4 months.

Paul Wormser, Zurich, Switzerland: False representations and transshipment of chemical from Switzerland to Czechoslovakia. May 19, 1950—Order barring all positive list shipments for duration of export controls.

Leon N. Rodell Co. and Contrax, A. G., and two individuals, New York and Switzerland: False representations for license to ship chemical to Switzerland with knowledge of consignee's intention to transship to Eastern Europe. June 29, 1950—Order suspending all positive list shipments for 6 months and other commodities for 60 days. August 30, 1950—Case dismissed as to Swiss company and individual.

Theodore E. Kedros, and two other individuals, New York, N. Y., and Trieste: False representations and transshipment of tires from Trieste to Yugoslavia. July 28, 1950—Order barring all positive list shipments by United States participant for duration of export controls. December 5, 1950—Order suspending for duration of export controls the privilege of Trieste respondents of participating in any capacity in positive list exports from the United States to any destination.

Finally, I wish to include three recent press dispatches from Hong Kong with reference to the action taken to prevent strategic materials reaching Communist China and Russia and its satellites.

I do not know whether any billion-dollar lobby has made any effort to make itself heard at Washington quickly, but I suggest that if there is any such effort made, it points up the wisdom of having this suggested investigation by our House committee.

I want to call particular attention to the third of these dispatches with reference to the value of the shipments of strategic materials and to the accounts of materials which have been shipped.

I requested today as full a report as possible in connection with the advice that the Danish ship *Henrich Jessen* was scheduled to sail today for Communist China with aluminum ingots and scrap rubber, among other items.

UNITED STATES EXPORT BAN DEALS BIG BLOW TO HONG KONG—SOME BUSINESSMEN THERE FEAR GHOST CITY WILL ARISE; DOLLAR DECLINES

HONG KONG, December 10.—This British crown colony has virtually stopped functioning economically as the result of the American ban on critical exports which might find their way into the hands of Communists. Some observers held the view today that Great Britain's last foothold in China may become a "ghost city" of the Far East.

Two factors, they said, should determine whether Hong Kong will change, perhaps overnight, from one of the British Empire's biggest dollar earners to one of its biggest white elephants:

1. How far the American Government will go in enforcing its embargo, announced Friday, on "strategic" exports to Hong Kong; 2. How closely the line will be drawn between strategic and nonstrategic goods.

When news of the ban hit Hong Kong Saturday, the American dollar dropped in the exchange market from 6.45 Hong Kong dollars to 6.17, the lowest rate in nearly 9 months. Businessmen predict that in the

next few days it may drop to the official rate, 5.79.

BANKS HARD HIT

American banks and Chinese banks with branches in the United States are refusing to issue letters of credit for would-be exporters.

It is perhaps ironic that American bankers should be so seriously hit by their own Government's action to stop movement of strategic goods into Communist China. This, in broad terms, is how the ban works:

A Chinese merchant in Hong Kong wants to buy \$3,000 worth of goods in the United States for resale to Red China. He purchases a letter of credit from an American bank in Hong Kong, paying, say, \$1,000 (U. S.) in cash and promising to pay the other \$2,000 when the goods are delivered and resold.

MERCHANTS LOSE

Then the United States imposes a ban on exports to Hong Kong, and the already purchased and paid-for merchandise cannot be delivered. The bank in Hong Kong has lost its \$2,000. The Hong Kong merchant has lost his \$1,000 in cash.

Fifteen percent of Hong Kong's imports are purchased in the United States. With this in mind, it should be easy to see how Hong Kong's future could be affected by rigid enforcement of the American export restrictions.

However, some American banking sources here predict that the United States will be forced to relax the order. They say the "billion-dollar lobby" of American banking, shipping, and insurance interests is bound to make itself heard at Washington quickly.

HONG KONG URGES PROTEST OF UNITED STATES BLOCKADE OF COLONY

HONG KONG.—The Hong Kong Government has called on British Colonial Secretary James Griffiths to make the strongest representations to Washington on the "American blockade" of this colony.

A government spokesman said that the blockade was likely to have serious repercussions in the colony and would halt its trade and industry.

The American ban announced this month bars United States ships and planes from carrying "strategic materials" destined for Communist China and Russia and its European satellites. The ban included Hong Kong and the neighboring Portuguese colony of Macao, to make sure that goods would not be forwarded from these ports to China.

The Hong Kong spokesman pointed out that this colony "has already banned the export to China of a whole variety of strategic materials, of which the most important are oil and petroleum products."

Official and private sources here estimate that the colony will lose millions of pounds sterling if the United States does not relax its ban on imports to the colony.

They also are concerned over the possibility of widespread unemployment and labor trouble.

The ban, in its present form, will affect most of the 87,000 Chinese workers in Hong Kong's registered industries, as well as tens of thousands in small firms, according to industrial sources.

They say it already has jeopardized the future of 13 cotton mills and many enamelware, flashlight, match, and other industries using American raw materials.

The ban is also reported to be affecting Hong Kong's huge warehouse trade, by which it breaks down and distributes shipments of many goods to other countries.

STRATEGIC GOODS ARE HIGH ON HONG KONG EXPORT LIST

HONG KONG, December 21.—Shipments of strategic materials from Hong Kong to Communist China made up nearly one-half of

Hong Kong exports during November, official figures showed today.

The Chinese Reds bought rubber, pharmaceutical products, dyestuffs, tanning materials, iron, and steel in large quantities.

Total exports for November were 442,000,000 Hong Kong dollars (\$77,350,000), of which 214,000,000 (\$37,350,000) went to China and Portuguese Macao, off the coast.

Raw rubber was the largest single export item to China and Macao.

The trade figures also indicated that Nationalist China—now Formosa Island—and Communist China still were exchanging products, with Formosan sugar being traded for north Chinese soybeans.

The Danish ship *Henrich Jessen* is lying here with more than 27,000 aluminum ingots destined for Communist China, scheduled to sail Friday.

Aluminum is on the United States export blacklist, but not on that of Hong Kong. The cargo also includes dyestuffs, scrap rubber, and gunny sacks.

MRS. ROBERT P. HORRELL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1139) for the relief of Mrs. Robert P. Horrell.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would explain this bill to the membership of the House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this is a private bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert P. Horrell, widow of Robert P. Horrell, in the amount of \$4,344.13. It involves an insurance claim. The deceased served in the Armed Forces, and through a certain amount of confusion was not permitted to take out the insurance to which he would otherwise have been entitled in the amount of \$10,000. The Committee on Claims and the Committee on the Judiciary felt that it was improper to allow him the \$10,000, but this lesser figure is based upon the present amortized value of \$25 a month for 240 months. This bill has passed the Senate and comes to us from that body.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] is interested in the bill, and I am only acting by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and would therefore be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida for any further explanation regarding the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am acting on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], whose constituent is involved in this legislation. As I understand the situation the serviceman involved requested permission to get the insurance in a formal manner, and the only reason he did not fill out the insurance papers was because they did not have the form to let him do it in the way they thought it ought to be done. In the meantime the young man lost his life. It was felt by the committee, as I understand, that the man should have some compensation for it. They reduced the claim, but they have allowed the approximate amount which was requested. In my opinion it is a fair bill, and I do not

think it is a type of legislation that could be expanded very greatly where a great many other people could come in; in other words, I do not think it opens the door very wide, because in this particular instance the evidence is clear and conclusive that he requested permission to take out the insurance, and the only reason he did not actually fill in the form was because they did not have the proper type of form for him to fill out.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, and I am in hearty sympathy with the principle of the bill, would it apply to a Navy man who intended to fill out his insurance papers and then was killed in an accident at sea? What I mean by that is, this particular case looks to me as though it was somewhat analogous to the case of a widow who was attempting to recover insurance in maintaining that she was named as the beneficiary of her husband, and yet he never signed the papers. I wonder whether this would be analogous to the gentleman's case.

Mr. KEATING. If I may be permitted, I suggest to the gentleman from New York that he introduce a private bill if he feels it is meritorious, and it will be considered in due course.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am for the gentleman's bill in principle, because I have had the same situation arise. But if that would set a precedent for the type of bill I have in mind, I would certainly be in favor of it. I think it is very fair.

Mr. KEATING. Has the gentleman introduced a bill on this matter?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I introduced one a year ago. They have just been fussing along with it, to be honest with the gentleman about it.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman's particular bill has not come to the attention of the gentleman now speaking to the House. If the gentleman will reintroduce his bill in the next Congress, I feel he will be granted a hearing before the Committee on Claims if he requests it. There may be and may not be any difference between that and the bill we have before us.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot object to the bill. I am glad to see the gentleman bring it up, but I think if this sets a precedent there are others that should be allowed to come under that category. I know I have one such case, and I imagine other Members have.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The only difference is that in this particular case the young man actually evidenced his intention by going originally to the officer and attempting to get insurance. He was turned down. There is a record of that having happened.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I say to the gentleman that mine is exactly the same sort of case. Mine is the case of a widow whose husband

had declared his intention, but he was killed the very next day and did not have the opportunity to sign his insurance. Therefore, if we are going to start passing bills like this, I can bring in at least one, and I hope others will, too. I hope this bill passes.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Robert P. Horrell, of Orlando, Fla., the sum of \$4,344.13 as a gratuity for the death of her husband, Lt. Robert P. Howell, United States Naval Reserve, who died on December 25, 1942, as the result of an illness contracted in active naval service; *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 891) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say to the House that he will not be here next Tuesday or next Thursday. Therefore, it becomes necessary to elect a Speaker pro tempore.

The Chair takes this opportunity to wish each and every one of you a happy holiday, and hopes that you will get a good rest, that you come back invigorated and able and willing to do real hard work in passing upon questions that are world-shaking, indeed.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will yield to me, may I give him assurance that he takes with him on his visit to his old home the love of his fellows here in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, a Representative from the State of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President of the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS took the oath of office as Speaker pro tempore.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Tuesday next, the Clerk may receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker pro tempore be authorized

to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the excess-profits-tax bill, H. R. 9827.

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

There was no objection.

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX ACT OF 1950— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOUGHTON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9827) to provide revenue by imposing a corporate excess-profits tax, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Dinosaur National Monument" which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$225.50.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a telegram.

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

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include therewith two articles.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Philadelphia Bulletin.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an address by Secretary of Defense Marshall, and in the other an editorial.

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

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WADSWORTH (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include extraneous material.

MERRY CHRISTMAS TO ALL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I just wish to send a message to the Speaker—a very merry and happy Christmas, and thank him for his patience during these trying days, to thank the leaders and thank all my colleagues in the House, to thank all of the pages and clerks and everybody here, all of the members of the press, and wish them a most merry Christmas and a happy new year and peace on earth, good will toward men.

COL. CHARLES J. TREES, AUS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5244) for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles J. Trees, Army of the United States.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill about?

Mr. GOSSETT. It is a private claims bill from the Committee on the Judiciary. As the gentleman knows, I do not serve on that committee.

Mr. TABER. For whose benefit is it?

Mr. GOSSETT. It involves a man by the name of Trees.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DUAL FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2351) to simplify and consolidate the laws relating to the receipt of compensation from dual employments under the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the measure which was brought up yesterday and to which I raised objection as to its consideration at that time. The objectionable portions of the bill will be deleted by amendment as a result of discussion on this particular measure with the leaders of the committee of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if there will be an opportunity to offer an amendment which would make the application of the exception to the Recreation Board of the District of Columbia similar to that of the Board of Education.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I certainly have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That unless otherwise specifically authorized by law, any person receiving compensation from any office or position, appointive or elective, under the United States or any department or agency thereof, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, or under the government of the District of Columbia, shall not be eligible to receive compensation from any other such office or position except to such extent as will not cause the combined amounts actually received for any period of time to exceed the rate of \$5,000 per annum: *Provided,* That when the compensation of either office or position amounts to or exceeds the rate of \$5,000 per annum such person shall be eligible to receive the compensation of either office or position, as he may elect.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this act, an hourly rate, other than an hourly rate which is paid as a proportionate part of an annual rate, shall be multiplied by 2,080 to obtain an equivalent annual rate for the position; and a daily rate, other than a daily rate which is paid as a proportionate part of an annual rate, shall be multiplied by 260 to obtain an equivalent annual rate for the position.

Sec. 3. As used in this act, the phrase "compensation from any office or position" shall be construed to include any basic salary, wages, or other emolument, including permanent additions such as statutory pay increases, but excluding any temporary additions such as overtime pay or night differential, for or on account of service as a civilian officer or employee of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, or of the government of District of Columbia, and retired pay on account of services as a commissioned officer in any of the services specified in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (U. S. C., title 37, sec. 101 and the following), but nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to retired pay of enlisted men or warrant officers of such service retired for any cause, nor to retired pay of Regular, Reserve, or temporary commissioned officers retired for disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or for disabilities resulting from an explosion of an instrumentality of war in line of duty during an enlistment or employment as provided in Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part I, paragraph I, nor to retired pay of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted person retired under provision of title III of Public Law 810 of the Eightieth Congress, as amended, when such retirement is effected during the time such person is so employed as to otherwise come under the provisions of this act as set forth in section 1 hereof.

Sec. 4. The provisions of this act may be suspended by order of the President during any period of national emergency when in his opinion the public interest would be served by making the services of Federal officers and employees available for additional duty.

Sec. 5. (a) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and such repeal shall include but shall not be limited to the following acts and parts of acts:

(1) Section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205, as amended by the act of May 31, 1924, 43 Stat. 245); section 6 of the act of July 30, 1937 (50 Stat. 549); and the act

of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1194), relative to the holding of two offices (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 62).

(c) Section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916 (39 Stat. 120), as amended by the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 582), relative to double salaries (U. S. C., title 5, secs. 58 and 59).

(3) Section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 406), as amended by section 3 of the act of July 15, 1940 (54 Stat. 761), relative to limitation of retired pay received for commissioned service when combined with civilian salary (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 59a).

(4) Revised Statutes, section 1763, relative to the receiving of compensation from more than one office.

(5) Revised Statutes, section 1764, relative to additional compensation for extra services (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 69).

(6) Revised Statutes, section 1765, relative to additional compensation to any person whose salary is fixed by law or regulation (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 70).

(7) Section 7 of the act of June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 235), relative to retired officers of the Army and Navy employed on river and harbor improvements (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 63).

(8) Section 9 of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 384), relative to teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia who are also employed as teachers of night schools and vacation schools (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 61).

(9) Act of July 8, 1918, section 1 (40 Stat. 823), last paragraph under the heading "Public schools", relative to employees of the community center department of the public schools of the District of Columbia (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 61).

(10) Act of June 25, 1920, section 1 (41 Stat. 1017), ninth paragraph under the heading "Public schools," relative to employees of the school garden department of the public schools of the District of Columbia (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 61).

(11) Act of February 17, 1922 (42 Stat. 373), the proviso to paragraph heading "Bureau of the Budget," relative to retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, appointed to offices in the Bureau of the Budget (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 64).

(12) Section 6 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1108), relative to employees of the Library of Congress receiving additional compensation from trust funds (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 60).

(13) Section 1 of the act of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1441), as amended by the act of June 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 358, Public Law 605, 77th Cong.), and the act of December 23, 1944 (58 Stat. 922, Public Law 555, 78th Cong.), relative to dual employment of postal employees (U. S. C. Supp. V, title 39, sec. 136).

(14) Act of January 22, 1932, section 3, fifth sentence (47 Stat. 5), relative to employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 603).

(15) Act of July 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 467, Public Law 642, 77th Cong.), relative to custodial employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

(16) Act of June 28, 1944, section 1 (58 Stat. 575), first paragraph, third proviso, under the heading "Finance Department, Finance Service, Army," and similar provisions in the act of July 3, 1945, section 1 (59 Stat. 386), first paragraph, third proviso, under the heading "Finance Department, Finance Service, Army," and the act of July 16, 1946, section 1 (60 Stat. 543), first paragraph, third proviso, under the heading "Finance Department, Finance Service, Army," relative to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 5, sec. 59b).

(17) Act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 978, Public Law 718, 79th Cong.), relative to appointment of retired officers in the Veterans' Administration.

(b) The act of June 16, 1938 (52 Stat. 752, Public Law 645, 75th Cong.; U. S. C., title 28, sec. 569), is amended by striking out "\$3,000 per annum" in the last line and substituting "\$5,000 per annum."

(c) Nothing in this act, however, shall be construed to modify or repeal any of the following:

(1) Act of August 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 616, Public Law 202, 77th Cong.), as amended by act of April 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 200, Public Law 517, 77th Cong.), and the act of November 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 584, Public Law 226, 79th Cong.), relative to receipt of payment for annual leave by civilian employees who enter the Armed Forces, and receipt of compensation in civilian positions by military personnel on terminal leave from the Armed Forces (U. S. C., title 5, Supp. V, secs. 61a, 61a-1, a-f).

(2) Naval Reserve Act of June 25, 1938, section 4, third proviso (52 Stat. 1176), relative to members of the Naval Reserve receiving pay and allowances from civilian positions concurrently with pay and allowances under that act (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 853b).

(3) Public Law 153, Eightieth Congress, approved July 1, 1947, section 1 (b), relative to concurrent receipt of civilian pay and pay and allowances under laws relating to the Officers Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps.

(4) Public Law 153, Eightieth Congress, approved July 1, 1947, section 2, relative to concurrent receipt of civilian pay and pay and allowances under provisions of law relating to the National Guard.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 16, strike out all of section 3, and insert the following:

"Sec. 3. As used in this act, the term "compensation from any office or position" shall include—

"(1) any basic salary, wages, or other emolument, including permanent additions such as statutory pay increases, but excluding any temporary additions such as overtime pay or night differential, for or on account of service as a civilian officer or employee of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, including Government owned or controlled corporations, of the government of the District of Columbia; and

"(2) retired pay on account of services as a commissioned officer in any of the services subject to the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (U. S. C., title 37, sec. 231 and the following);

but shall not include—

"(A) retired pay of enlisted men, warrant officers, and flight officers in any such service retired for any cause;

"(B) retired pay of Regular, Reserve, or temporary commissioned officers retired for disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or for disability resulting from an explosion of an instrumentality of war in line of duty during an enlistment or employment specified in Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part I, paragraph I;

"(C) retired pay of any commissioned officer, warrant officer, flight officer, or enlisted person retired under title III of the act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 810, 80th Cong.), as amended; or

"(D) compensation of teachers, school officers, and custodial employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for services rendered in connection with the operation of night or vacation schools in the public schools of the District of Columbia."

Page 5, line 3, strike out "provisions" and insert "first section."

Page 5, line 6, after the word "making", strike out the balance of the line and all of line 7, and insert in lieu thereof: "officers and employees subject to such section avail-

able for additional service." And add new section 5 and section 6, as follows:

"Sec. 5. When in the judgment of the Postmaster General the needs and interests of the postal service so require, he may employ any employee in the postal field service in a dual capacity or he may temporarily assign any employee in the postal field service to duty in any position in the postal field service; and, notwithstanding the first section of this act, any employee so employed or assigned shall be paid compensation at the rate provided by law for such services.

"Sec. 6. The first section of this act shall not apply to custodial employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia when such employees are performing work required of them in school buildings during the time these buildings are used for nonrecreational official purposes by any Federal department or agency or any department of the government of the District of Columbia other than the Board of Education, in accordance with the rules of the Board of Education governing the use of school buildings and grounds, including their use for day or evening schools; and nothing therein contained shall be deemed to prevent any custodial employee from receiving in addition to his pay, salary, or compensation as an employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia any other pay, salary, or compensation at a rate not in excess of the rate of pay received as an employee of the Board of Education, for services which may be rendered to any Federal department or agency or any department of the government of the District of Columbia other than the Board of Education, during its use of school buildings under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia."

Page 6, line 16, strike out the figure "5" and insert the figure "7."

Page 6, line 19, strike out "Acts and parts of acts" and insert "laws and parts of laws."

Page 6, line 21, strike out "205," and insert "205"; strike out "1924, 43 Stat. 245;" and insert "1924 (43 Stat. 245)."

Page 6, line 23, strike out "549;" and insert "549."

Page 8, line 5, strike out "25," and insert "5."

Page 8, line 11, strike out "to paragraph" and insert "in the paragraph under the."

Page 8, line 16, strike out all of subsection (12).

Page 8, line 20, strike out "(13)" and insert "(12)."

Page 8, line 25, strike out "Supp. V."

Page 9, line 1, strike out all of subsection (14) and insert new subsection (13) as follows:

"(13) Act of January 22, 1932, section 3, fifth sentence, as in effect on June 30, 1947 (47 Stat. 6), relative to employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

Page 9, line 7, strike out "(15)" and insert "(14)."

Page 9, line 11, strike out all of subsection (16) and insert a new subsection (15) as follows:

"(15) The first proviso in the paragraph under the heading 'Pay of the Army' in title III of the Defense Appropriation Act, 1951, the first proviso in the paragraph with the side heading 'Pay of the Army' in title III of the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950, and similar provisions in prior appropriation acts providing pay for the Army, relative to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 59b)."

Page 10, line 6, strike out "(17)" and insert "(16)."

Page 10, line 9, strike out all of subsection (b).

Page 10, line 13, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

Page 10, line 18, strike out "12" and insert "21."

Page 10, line 24, strike out "Supp. V, secs. 61a, 61a 1, a f" and insert "secs. 61a and 61a-1."

Page 11, line 1, strike out "third" and insert "second"; strike out "952 Stat. 1176)."

Page 11, line 3, strike out "that" and insert "such."

Page 11, line 5, after "(3)" insert:

"(3) The proviso in the fourth paragraph under the subheading 'Ordnance Stores and Equipment for Reserve Officers' Training Corps' of the act of May 12, 1917, added to such paragraph by."

Page 11, line 12, after "Corps" insert "(U. S. C., title 10, sec. 371b)."

Page 11, line 3, after "(4)" insert "That portion of section 80 of the act of June 3, 1916, added to such section by."

Page 11, line 17, after "Guard" insert "(U. S. C., title 32, sec. 75)." and the following:

"(5) Those portions of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, secs. 676 and 1022), the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, secs. 1131 and 1134), and the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 6401), relative to the employment of officers and employees and joint officers and employees by the organizations named therein, or otherwise be deemed to restrict participation by corporations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration in the payment of the salary of an officer or employee serving more than one such corporation.

"Sec. 8. Section 6 of the act of March 3, 1925 (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 162), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. Employees of the Library of Congress who perform special functions for the performance of which funds have been entrusted to the board or the librarian, or in connection with cooperative undertakings in which the Library of Congress is engaged, shall not be subject to section 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: Page 5, strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive; and on page 5, line 10, strike out "Sec. 5" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 4"; and on page 5, line 18, strike out "Sec. 6" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 5"; and on page 6, line 16, strike out "Sec. 7" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 6"; and on page 12, line 5, strike out "Sec. 8" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 7."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: At the end of section 3 insert the following: "(E) The compensation of any employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, including Government owned or controlled corporations, or of the government of the District of Columbia for services rendered in connection with activities of the District Recreation Board under the provisions of the act of April 29, 1942, 56 Statutes 261, District of Columbia Code, 1946 edition, Supplement 7, title 8, chapter 2."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this legislation, S. 2351, has been urgently requested by the executive branch because it is a measure related to the present national emergency.

For several years the executive branch and the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service have

given careful study to the revision of the laws relating to the receipt of compensation from dual employments under the Federal Government. The purpose of the legislation is to simplify and consolidate existing laws relating to this subject. Under the several statutes which presently apply, the annual salary limitation from dual Federal employments varies between \$2,000 and \$3,000 per annum. These laws were enacted on a piecemeal basis and their conflicting provisions have caused great confusion in connection with their administration. In addition, the present dual employment statutes prevent, in some cases, retired officers from the Armed Forces from taking civilian positions related to the national defense where either the retired pay or the salary of the civilian position amounts to or exceeds \$2,500 per annum.

The legislation, which was approved unanimously by the committee, provides that any person receiving compensation from any Federal office or position may be employed in a dual capacity, provided the combined amounts of annual compensation received for any period of time does not exceed the rate of \$5,000 annually. Further, the bill provides in section 1 that when the compensation of either office or position amounts to or exceeds \$5,000 per annum, such person may be eligible to receive the compensation of either office or position as he may elect. This change of existing law regarding the holding of dual offices will permit the Federal Government to utilize the service of many retired officers from the Armed Forces who are particularly qualified to render invaluable assistance in strategic and highly confidential activities in the National Defense Establishment and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The committee believed that the dual-compensation limitation of \$5,000 annually is more realistic at the present time because since the enactment of the dual-compensation statutes, between 1894 and 1932, salaries and living costs have been raised considerably. Consequently, the committee feels that raising the limitations of \$2,000, \$2,500, and \$3,000 to \$5,000 is not unjustified in the light of present-day conditions.

Based upon full and complete hearings conducted by the committee, it was believed that the pay or compensation for certain offices and positions should be excluded from the limitations imposed by the general policy of the legislation. These exclusions which are contained in present law are as follows:

First. Retired pay of enlisted men, warrant officers, and flight officers in any branch of the armed services.

Second. Retired pay of Regular, Reserve, or temporary commissioned officers retired for disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or for disability resulting from an explosion of an instrumentality of war in line of duty during an enlistment.

Third. Retired pay of any commissioned officer, warrant officer, flight officer, or enlisted person retired under title III of the act of June 29, 1948.

Fourth. Compensation of teachers, school officers, and custodial employees of the Board of Education of the Dis-

trict of Columbia for services rendered in connection with the operation of night or vacation schools in the public schools of the District of Columbia.

Fifth. Compensation of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department who serve in a dual capacity or who are temporarily assigned other duties in the postal service when such work is performed at the direction of the Postmaster General.

Sixth. The compensation of custodial employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia when such employees are performing work in school buildings when such buildings are used by any Federal department or agency or by any Department of the District of Columbia Government—except the Board of Education—for nonrecreational official purposes.

Seventh. Compensation received by joint officers and employees who are employed in corporations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

Also, the legislation retains existing law with respect to the exemption from the criminal statutes of employees of the Library of Congress when such employees perform special functions for the performance of which funds have been entrusted to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board or the Librarian, or in connection with cooperative undertakings in which the Library of Congress is engaged.

The amendments which were made to S. 2351 by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, with a few exceptions, are largely technical, perfecting, and clarifying in nature. The only amendments made by our committee which relate to the general policy of the legislation concern maintaining status quo or retaining existing law with respect to: First, the postal service; second, the corporations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; third, teachers in the District of Columbia school system; fourth, custodial employees under the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; and fifth, employees of the Library of Congress. In each case it was necessary to amend S. 2351 in order to maintain existing administrative policy with respect to the use of employees in dual capacities or on temporary assignments in these agencies who were necessarily required to be exempt from the general provisions of the bill.

The distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, who has devoted a great deal of time to this subject, has conferred with the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the other body, and I am advised that the other body will accept the amendments which have been approved by our committee. Consequently, the necessity for a conference regarding this bill will be obviated, and full operation under its provisions within the immediate future is assured.

As chairman of the subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which considered this measure, I can assure the Members that much time and diligent study has been made of this subject, and it is a vast improvement

over existing law. In the judgment of the committee, economy in government operations will result because the present laws relating to dual compensation are so complicated and confused that the departments and agencies spend much useless time in solving problems and difficulties which arise in connection with their administration. The lack of uniformity among dual compensation statutes requires the executive departments and agencies to encounter needless difficulties in making certain that the several varied dual compensation limitations and restrictions are being observed.

It appears that the laws are in such a state that the average department or agency administrator feels required to consult with the Comptroller General and his own legal department before he is certain as to how a decision should be made in any given case.

The committee believes this legislation is most desirable, and in view of the national emergency which confronts our country at this time we believe it is important that this measure be approved without delay.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed defense authorizations for tremendous appropriations for our national defense. Since World War II I have voted for similar authorizations and appropriations in the hope that they were not war measures but war preventives; and in an effort to avert war we have passed the Marshall plan, North Atlantic Pact, mutual-aid-assistance program, and many other measures which I have consistently supported.

In view of the events since the last war, many of them beyond our control, it is becoming more graphically apparent that this country cannot approach the problems of world peace, liberty, and the preservation of democratic forms of government among our allies, in the vein of what would be the most perfect or what we would like to see. As laudable as these objectives might be we must approach these problems from the angle of what we can accomplish within the limits of our own abilities and the abilities of our allies.

I therefore suggest that we immediately appraise our own present and potential military, industrial, and economic capacities, the strength and willingness of our allies to rearm and assist in this fight for survival, and then after we have determined from that appraisal what frontiers we and our allies can defend—whether that be Korea, Japan, Hawaii, the Pacific coast, Western Europe, or the Atlantic coast—defend that perimeter firmly and resolutely to the

fullest extent of our joint military might and industrial capacity.

This is a conflict of survival and not of saving face. History has proven that it is better to lose a battle and win a war than to lose a war attempting to win a battle.

The line must be established past which the diabolical march of communistic progression shall stop. We must place that line not where we would like to have it but where we can hold it not with just words but with might.

I believe that if we establish a defense policy within the limits of our ability to carry out, and let our allies know that we are determined that they too must help to their full capacity, both in armament and in manpower, we can then have force enough to back up the policy that we have established to stop Russia, prevent aggression beyond that line, and work out the survival of our own country. Russia would be far less disposed to attack a line she felt we could defend, whereas, on the other hand, if more or less single-handedly we issue proclamations and statements that we are going to defend the far-flung corners of the earth—which anyone, whether military strategist or not, knows that we cannot defend, we will weaken this country through successive setbacks down to a point where it might be difficult to defend our own Nation.

We maintained military police guards in the countries where we are given trusteeships. These troops were placed there not as military defenders but as guardians. Since the outbreak in Korea we know that in the face of aggression such a force is futile. We will never be the ones to make the attack and Russia knows that, and she, as the aggressor, calls the shots in any spot in the world which we would be required to defend with the guard force authorized under the United Nations.

No one can question the bravery of our troops, the skill of our workmen, or the patriotism of our people, but Korea has taught us that Russia's aims are to attempt to frustrate our efforts for world peace and eventually undermine our own national security.

The hour is more grave than at any time in our history but our difficulties are not insurmountable if we make an all-out effort encompassing that effort within the limits of our ability. The liberties and freedom of this great Nation must be preserved by positive and strong action—not weakened by far-flung commitments that we and our allies in their present effort and capacity cannot or will not carry out; not weakened by continuing aid to any nation that does not continue to help itself or supply troops for what must be a collective effort.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

CHRISTMAS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time for the purpose of reading into the RECORD a brief letter just received from my good friend, President John W. Davis, of West Virginia State College, on the present-day application of the meaning of Christmas.

The letter follows:

WEST VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE,
Office of the President,
Institute, W. Va., December 25, 1950.
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: The Christmas season is upon us.

The pronouncement, "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people," is the essence of our faith and hope. It is applicable to the present threat to the survival of free nations. It is the overtone to life's grim reality. It is the new birth of confidence in life and in the God of life. It is Christmas functionally alive.

This Christmas is one of dedication to the affirmation of man's high destiny—to the cause of human freedom, to the ethical imperatives of world peace, to the supremacy of love in the world dilemma now facing mankind, to a right standard of living for all peoples. Christmas warns men of good will never to accept tyranny as natural, defeat as inevitable, and society as irredeemable. Christmas bespeaks the deep longings in the hearts of men.

This is my Christmas offering to you. It is to be added to the flow of love and joy which I hope will be yours in this holy season.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DAVIS,
President.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

A FREE PRESS—FREE SPEECH

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a great principle is threatened, a real peril is imminent, writes Doris Fleeson in last night's Evening Star.

Apparently unconvinced that the American people are fully occupied by their efforts to follow sound principles which will enable them to minimize or avoid the perils of world war III, she argues that the demand of a Member of the other body, if such a demand was made, that the public boycott the products of Mr. Pearson's radio sponsor and thus cause Mr. Pearson to lose his job, endangers a free press, the free speech.

Miss Fleeson apparently attempts to arouse her fellow writers with the argument that their jobs, their opportunity for work, might be curtailed if some Member of Congress criticizes their production, protests to a sponsor.

Would she have everyone who disagrees with what a reporter, an editor, a columnist or a radio commentator may write or say remain silent, deprive them of their right of free speech, of a free press, just so professional writers and

speakers may have their utterances unquestioned? Her argument, if adopted, would have that result.

True, the Member of the other body has no right to demand of Pearson's sponsor that Pearson be fired. That is the sponsor's business. On the other hand, has he not the right to purchase the kind of a hat he wants from the store he desires to patronize? Does he not have the right to call the attention of the manufacturer to the kind of advertising that he is doing? Has he not the right to call upon his friends, those who believe as he does, to refuse to increase the business revenue of a concern which hires a man to vilify individuals the writer or commentator does not like?

Must a man confine his criticism to the product, in this case the hat—keep quiet as to the package in which it is delivered or the line of thought which goes with it?

Doris Fleeson in this article is following the same line followed by so many who attempt to influence public opinion. Apparently she is all for free speech—a free press—for one school of thought, but resents any disagreement. That is her right.

Pearson, each week, announces that Adam is the first name in hats. Adam may make, for all I know, the best hat ever produced and sell it at a price less than that fixed by any other manufacturer.

But, as Pearson speaks over the radio, announcing time after time that Adam is the first name in hats, memory takes me back to my boyhood reading. I recall another Adam—the Adam who was the first man on earth, so Holy Writ tells us. That Adam was not only the first man—he was the only man in the Garden of Eden. Unfortunately, at least we are so told, he listened to the advice of a snake and shortly found himself on the outside of what has been pictured to us as a paradise.

It may be true that the story carried in today's Star to the effect that Adam has decided not to renew Drew Pearson's contract when it expired, is due, in part to the action of the Member of the other body, who called attention to some of the characteristics of the man who was advertising their wares over the radio. It may also be that Adam does not appreciate Mr. Pearson. But is the principle of free speech involved in this little incident? Is the Member of the other body doing other than handing back to Drew Pearson some of the left-handed compliments that Pearson has been paying him?

Nor can I see how the discussion, or perhaps more accurately, the exchange of compliments between these two gentlemen to whom she makes reference is a real peril to any great principle.

Perhaps she overrates the importance of the controversy—that few people are very greatly interested in it; that most of us are concerned with what is happening abroad, with what our foreign policy is to be.

But enough on that subject. Permit me to proceed on another topic.

AN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Speaker, using the methods of a sound builder who starts at the foundation, places block on block until the building is finished, Wednesday night, December 20, former President Herbert Hoover, placing fact upon fact, blue-printed a plan for an American foreign policy. That outline if followed through the years will not only promote the welfare of our country, but make secure through the centuries the existence of our Republic.

True, because the proposed policy parallels the principles carried in the advice of our first President, he may be, he already has been—as he was last night by Lief Eid—characterized through inuendo as a reactionary, an isolationist.

Fortunately, the American people, especially those who have not been, shall I say, completely educated at some of the so-called higher institutions of learning, are capable of weighing the facts which now confront them, of forming a sound judgment based on those facts.

That you may have the conclusions reached by Mr. Hoover and the facts upon which they were based, I will read what he said and then add an editorial from this morning's Times-Herald.

I read:

Mr. HOOVER. I have received hundreds of requests that I appraise the present situation and give my conclusions as to our national policies.

I speak with a deep sense of responsibility. And I speak tonight under the anxieties of every American for the Nation's sons who are fighting and dying on a mission of peace and the honor of our country.

No appraisal of the world situation can be final in an unstable world. However, to find our national path we must constantly re-examine where we have arrived and at times revise our direction.

I do not propose to traverse the disastrous road by which we reached this point.

THE GLOBAL MILITARY SITUATION

We may first survey the global military situation. There is today only one center of aggression on earth. That is the Communist-controlled Asian-European land mass of 800,000,000 people. They have probably over 300 trained and equipped combat divisions with over 30,000 tanks, 10,000 tactical planes and further large reserves they can put in action in 90 days. But they are not a great sea power. Their long-range air power is limited. These congeries of over 30 different races will some day go to pieces. But in the meantime they are cannon fodder.

Facing this menace on the eastern front there are about 100,000,000 non-Communist island peoples in Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and Korea. Aside from Korea, which I will discuss later, they have probably 12 effective combat divisions with practically no tanks, air, or navy.

Facing this land mass on the south are the Indies and the Middle East of about 600,000,000 non-Communist peoples. There are about 150,000,000 non-Communist peoples in north Africa and Latin America. Except Turkey and Formosa, these 850,000,000 people have little military force which they would or could spare. But they could contribute vital economic and moral strength.

Facing this menace on the continental European front there are about 160,000,000 non-Communist people who, excluding Spain, have less than 20 combat divisions now available, few tanks, and little air or naval force. But their will to defend themselves is feeble and their disunities are manifest.

Of importance in military weight at this moment there is the British commonwealth of 150,000,000 people, with probably 30 combat divisions under arms, a superior navy, considerable air force, and a few tanks.

And there are 150,000,000 people in the United States preparing 3,500,000 men into a gigantic Air Force and Navy, with about 30 equipped combat divisions.

SOME MILITARY CONCLUSIONS

If we weigh these military forces as they stand today we must arrive at certain basic conclusions.

(a) We must face the fact that to commit the sparse ground forces of the non-Communist nations into a land war against this Communist land mass would be a war without victory, a war without a successful political terminal. Any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion, through the quicksands of China, India, or Western Europe is sheer folly. That would be the graveyard of millions of American boys and would end in the exhaustion of this Gibraltar of western civilization.

Even were Western Europe armed far beyond any contemplated program, we could never reach Moscow. The Germans failed with a magnificent army of 240 combat divisions and with powerful air and tank forces.

(b) Equally, we Americans alone with sea and air power can so control the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans that there can be no possible invasion of the Western Hemisphere by Communist armies. They can no more reach Washington in force than we can reach Moscow.

(c) In this military connection we must realize the fact that the atomic bomb is a far less dominant weapon than it was once thought to be.

(d) It is obvious that the United Nations have been defeated in Korea by the aggression of Communist China. There are no adequate forces in the world to repel them.

Even if we sacrifice more American boys to hold a bridgehead, we know we shall not succeed at the present time in the mission given to us by the 50 members of the United Nations.

OUR ECONOMIC STRENGTH

We may explore the American situation still further. The 150,000,000 American people are already economically strained by Government expenditures. It must not be forgotten that we are carrying huge burdens from previous wars, including obligations to veterans and \$260,000,000,000 of bond and currency issues from those wars. In the fiscal year 1952, Federal and local expenditures are likely to exceed \$90,000,000,000. That is more than our total savings. We must finance huge deficits by further Government issues. Inflation is already moving but we might with stern measures avoid the economic disintegration of such a load for a very few years. If we continued long on this road the one center of resistance in the world will collapse in economic disaster.

THE DIPLOMATIC FRONT

We may appraise the diplomatic front. Our great hope was in the United Nations. We have witnessed the sabotage of its primary purpose of preserving peace. It has been down to last week, a forum for continuous smear on our honor, our ideals and our purposes.

It did stiffen up against raw aggression last July in Korea. But in its call for that military action, America had to furnish over 90 percent of the foreign forces and suffer over 90 percent of their dead and injured. The effort now comes at least to a measurable military defeat by the aggression of Communist heroes.

Whether or not the United Nations is to have a moral defeat and suffer the collapse

of its whole moral stature now depends on whether it has the courage to:

(a) Declare Communist China an aggressor.

(b) Refuse admission of this aggressor to its membership.

(c) Demand that each member of the United Nations cease to furnish or transport supplies of any kind to Communist China that can aid in their military operations. Such a course honestly carried out by the non-Communist nations is not economic sanctions nor does it require military actions. But it would constitute a great pressure for rectitude.

(d) For once, pass a resolution condemning the infamous lies about the United States.

Any course short of this is appeasement. What should our policies be?

And now I come to where we should go from here.

Two months ago I suggested a tentative alternate policy for the United States. It received a favorable reception from the large majority of our press.

Since then the crisis in the world has become even more acute. It is clear that the United Nations are defeated in Korea. It is also clear that other non-Communist nations did not or could not substantially respond to the United Nations call for arms to Korea. It is clear the United Nations cannot mobilize substantial military forces. It is clear continental Europe has not in the 3 years of our aid developed that unity of purpose, and that will power necessary for its own defense. It is clear that our British friends are flirting with appeasement of Communist China. It is clear that the United Nations is in a fog of debate and indecision on whether to appease or not to appease.

In expansion of my proposals of 2 months ago, I now propose certain principles and action.

First. The foundation of our national policies must be to preserve for the world this Western Hemisphere Gibraltar of western civilization.

Second. We can, without any measure of doubt, with our own air and naval forces, hold the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with one frontier on Britain (if she wishes to cooperate); the other, on Japan, Formosa and the Philippines. We can hold open the sea lanes for our supplies.

I devoutly hope that a maximum of co-operation can be established between the British commonwealth and ourselves.

Third. To do this we should arm our air and naval forces to the teeth. We have little need for large armies unless we are going to Europe or China. We should give Japan her independence and aid her in arms to defend herself. We should stiffen the defenses of our Pacific frontier in Formosa and the Philippines. We can protect this island chain by our sea and air power.

Fourth. We could, after initial outlays for more air and Navy equipment, greatly reduce our expenditures, balance our budget and free ourselves from the dangers of inflation and economic degeneration.

Fifth. If we toil and sacrifice as the President has asked, we can continue aid to the hungry of the world. Out of our productivity we can give aid to other nations when they have already displayed spirit and strength in defense against communism. We have the stern duty to work and sacrifice to do it.

Sixth. We should have none of appeasement. Morally there is no appeasement of communism. Appeasement contains more dangers than Dunkerques. We want no more Tehrans and Yaltas. We can retrieve a battle but we cannot retrieve an appeasement. We are grateful that President Truman has denounced such a course.

Seventh. We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of defense of western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money.

You can search all the history of mankind and there is no parallel to the effort and sacrifice we have made to elevate their spirit and to achieve their unity. To this date it has failed. Their minds are confused with fears and disunities. They exclude Spain, although she has the will and means to fight. They haggle with Germany, although she is their frontier. They vacillate in the belief that they are in little danger and the hope to avoid again being a theater of war. And Karl Marx has added to their confusions. They still suffer from battle shock. Their highly organized Communist parties are a menace we must not ignore.

In both World War I and World War II (including West Germany) they placed more than 250 trained and equipped combat divisions in the field within 60 days with strong air and naval forces. They have more manpower and more productive capacity today than in either one of those wars. To warrant our further aid they should show they have spiritual strength and unity to avail themselves of their own resources. But it must be far more than pacts, conferences, paper promises, and declarations. Today it must express itself in organized and equipped combat divisions of such large numbers as would erect a sure dam against the Red flood. And that before we land another man or another dollar on their shores. Otherwise we shall be inviting another Korea. That would be a calamity to Europe as well as to us.

Our policy in this quarter of the world should be confined to a period of watchful waiting.

NATIONAL UNITY

There is a proper urge in all Americans for unity in troubled times. But unless unity is based on right principles and right action it is a vain and dangerous thing.

Honest difference of views and honest debate are not disunity. They are the vital process of policy making among freemen.

A right, a specific, an open foreign policy must be formulated which gives confidence in our own security before we can get behind it.

CONCLUSIONS

American eyes should now be opened to these hordes in Asia.

These policies I have suggested would be no isolationism. Indeed, they are the opposite. They would avoid rash involvement of our military forces in hopeless campaigns. They do not relieve us of working to our utmost. They would preserve a stronghold of Christian civilization in the world against any peradventure.

With the policies I have outlined, even without Europe, Americans have no reason for hysteria or loss of confidence in our security or our future. And in American security rests the future security of all mankind.

It would be an uneasy peace but we could carry it on with these policies indefinitely even if the Communists should attack our lines on the seas.

We can hope that in time the millions of other non-Communist peoples of the world will rise to their dangers.

We can hope that sometime the evils of communism and the disintegration of their racial controls will bring their own disintegration. It is a remote consolation, but

twice before in world history Asiatic hordes have swept over a large part of the world and their racial dissensions dissolved their empires.

Our people have braved difficult and distressing situations in these three centuries we have been on this continent. We have faced our troubles without fear and we have not failed.

We shall not fail in this, even if we have to stand alone. But we need to realize the whole truth and gird ourselves for troubled times. The truth is ugly. We face it with prayer and courage.

The editorial reads as follows:

MR. HOOVER SPEAKS FOR THE NATION

Mr. Hoover made the most important speech of his life on Wednesday night.

Nominally he was speaking to the American people. In fact, he was speaking for the American people to their new Congress. He was telling the new Congress that the Truman-Acheson foreign policy was a failure in Korea and will be a failure in Europe; that the number of lives squandered for nothing in Korea is negligible compared with the number that would be sacrificed in a vain attempt to hold Europe against a Russian attack.

This the American people know and this, we are confident, the great majority of their Congressmen know even better. The question today is whether the new Congress will yield to the hysteria of a discredited Administration led by a President whose recent letters cast doubt on his mental and emotional stability.

There is no doubt that the hystericals have made progress. The eastern internationalist press is screaming in terror. Self-appointed committees are pleading for conscription of all boys and girls on their eighteenth birthdays even though there are no camps in which to house them, and, most important of all, far from enough experienced officers and noncommissioned officers to train them. Governor Dewey, of New York, who pretends to speak for the Republican Party, demands 100 divisions without explaining what may be the need for even one.

Mr. Hoover has clarified the issues with which the Eighty-second Congress must deal. Those who acknowledge the force of his argument will conclude that:

1. Our Army in Europe should not be reinforced. Under the North Atlantic Pact we are obliged to consult with the European powers if any of them is attacked and to assist in the defense with such means as we deem necessary. We are under no obligations to keep an army in Europe of any size.

2. As we do not intend to reinforce our garrison in Europe, there is no need to amend the draft law to take younger boys, to conscript girls, or to do anything else which would create a huge land army to tempt our administration into military adventures. Far from drafting more men, we should draft fewer or suspend the draft entirely. The volunteer system would give us all the men we need to defend our own possessions.

3. As we do not intend to fight on land in Europe, General Eisenhower should be ordered by Congress to stay home. His presence in Europe as the head of an allied military force is intended as a symbol or pledge of unlimited American support for the countries of Europe.

As Mr. Hoover said, and everybody ought to know, the nations of Western Europe lack the willingness to defend themselves. The symbol or pledge of unlimited help for those who won't help themselves should be withdrawn by any means that Congress can find for making the Nation's will manifest.

4. The Navy and the Air Force should be strengthened if there is any doubt that at

their present strength they cannot safeguard the Western Hemisphere. Likewise, the northern approaches to this country, in Alaska and Canada, should be made secure.

A Congress which would support such a program would be the most popular Congress this country has known in our lifetime. This Congress would save not only billions of dollars but the lives of a million American boys who have been condemned to futile sacrifice under the Truman-Acheson-Dewey-Eisenhower program.

Mr. Hoover's speech sought to rally common sense against hysteria. The people are with him. If Congress does not adopt his ideas, it will be because some Democrats put loyalty to Truman and Acheson above loyalty to their country and because some Republicans imagine that it is to their advantage to follow a wayward little fool like Dewey.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4653. An act for the relief of the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc.; Merck & Co., Inc.; and Mallinckrodt Chemical Works;

H. R. 4803. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers;

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of Rev. Andrew Chai Kyung Whang;

H. R. 8973. An act for the relief of Archibald Walter Campbell Seymour;

H. R. 9145. An act for the relief of Tomoko Yamaya;

H. R. 9236. An act for the relief of H. Halpern & Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass.;

H. R. 9272. An act to amend the act of October 5, 1949 (Public Law 322, 81st Cong.), so as to extend the time of permits covering lands located on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 9893. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on December 21, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9913. An act to prevent penalties and additions to tax in case of failure to meet requirements with respect to estimated tax by reason of increases imposed by the Revenue Act of 1950; and

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution amending section 3804 of the Internal Revenue Code.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Tuesday, December 26, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1800. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration, covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed with illustrations.

1801. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1802. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual financial report on the commissary activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in Alaska and other points outside the continental United States, pursuant to Public Laws Nos. 179 and 390 of the Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1803. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a law enacted by the Tenth Guam Congress, pursuant to Public Law No. 630, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands.

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. DOUGHTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 9827. A bill to provide revenue by imposing a corporate excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3231). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 9942. A bill to repeal the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Res. 892. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the farm machinery and equipment industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 893. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 892; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MORRISON introduced a bill (H. R. 9943) for the relief of Aba Szejnbejm, Mrs. Dvora Szejnbejm, Shlomo Szejnbejm, and Daniel Szejnbejm, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2414. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Edmond C. Fletcher, Washington, D. C., relative to grievances against the Government of the United States, praying the impeachment of A. Dewitt Vaneich, an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, for gross misbehavior in office, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Under the order of the 22d instant, the Chair declares that the Senate now stands in recess until Friday, December 29, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 25 seconds p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order of Friday, December 22, 1950, to Friday, December 29, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, our hearts are filled with an increasing sense of wonder and gratitude as we continue to meditate upon the glad tidings of the birth of the Saviour for whom the ages had been waiting and in whom we have the answer to our deepest needs.

Grant that the salvation and joy which He came to bring may be the blessed experience of all mankind. May men and nations everywhere accept and respond to those great ideals and principles of love and mercy, of truth and righteousness, which were realized completely in the life of our Lord.

When we are tempted to feel that the struggle for peace on earth and good will among men is futile may we find our courage and hope in the conquering love and power of the Christ of Christmas, whose name is Immanuel, God with us.

May the glory and praise be Thine for ever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 22, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9832. An act to remove marketing penalties on certain long-staple cotton.

The measure also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9794. An act to amend section 22 (d) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9798. An act to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.