Eric W. Rood, AO752907.
David W. Saxton, AO866101.
Jack C. Schwab, AO773829.
James G. Silliman, AO792353.
Lloyd D. Smith, AO590459.
Richard W. Smith, AO590144.
Andrew W. Smoak, AO800062.
Orrin W. Snyder III, AO938421.
William G. Solomon, AO766106.
William N. Steele, AO2059858.
Walter T. Steves, Jr., AO570399.
Douglas D. Stewart, AO933521.
James L. Stewart, AO2066061.
Jimmie Taylor, AO465462.
Reginald F. Thibodeau, AO828351.
Howard N. Tomchak, AO707751.
Armand L. Tremblay, AO756127.
Leslie B. Van Hoy, AO793868.
Charles D. Vollmer, AO771591.
William H. Walding, AO722402.
Joseph B. Warren, AO668675.
Audrey H. Watkins, AO823180.
William F. Welsh, AO881067.
Fielding F. West, AO734286.
Raymond E. White, AO818059.
James M. Whitler, AO1701035.
Morris F. Williams, AO772627.
Willie G. Williamson, AO2068148.
Richard C. Wilson, AO671324.
William W. Wilson, AO448075.
Thomas B. Wood, AO2034653.
William A. Wood, AO693443.
Clyde W. Younger, Jr., AO711056

To be second lieutenants

LeDewey E. Allen, Jr., AO942534.
Paul C. Arndt, AO877345.
Jacob C. Baird, AO2098450.
John C. Ball, AO693249.
James W. Barkwill, AO2058394.
Donald E. Beebe, AO812918.
Jack R. Benson, AO2020704.
Robert J. Bissell, AO709267.
Kenneth R. Bland, AO2076513.
Eugene L. Brady, AO2066793.
Albert W. Buesking, AO2101606.
Stuart R. Childs, AO667942.
Robert W. Clark, Jr., AO2076549.
George D. Cooksey, Jr., AO761041.
Arthur S. Cooper, AO785761.
Roderick W. Coward, AO8070424.
Darrell S. Cramer, AO730390.
Wallace L. Criswell, AO556380.
Clarence G. Curry, Jr., AO590504.
Robert W. Daniels, AO663869.
Samuel A. Darby, Jr., AO772031.
John Deas, AO834617.
John F. Disharoon, Jr., AO840356.
William Djinis, AO873732.
Walter L. Doerty, Jr., AO1908527.
Joe B. Dougherty, AO2017030.
Henry J. Dunn, Jr., AO841177.
Nathan B. Durham, Jr., AO2093327.
Burns R. Eastman, AO769405.
John J. Eddington, AO727704.
James I. Eden, AO587724.
James B. Fagan, AO714685.
Walter B. Favorite, AO758973.
Thomas J. Flake, Jr., AO791808.
Donald S. Floyd, AO827413.
Albert D. Fowler, AO568180.
Elwood S. Fraser, Jr., AO707255.
John T. Gaffey, AO739764.
Kenneth H. Gallagher, AO756214.
Robert J. Goebel, AO681645.
Edmond D. Gray, AO833086.
Robert G. Hageman, AO691748.
Ermine L. Hales, AO689045.
Grover L. Heater, Jr., AO1848508.
Clarence L. Hewitt, III, AO706390.
John K. Higdon, AO1847085.
William M. Higgins, AO821012.
Joseph W. Hinerman, AO825170.
John P. Honaker, Jr., AO802115.
Anderson B. Honts, Jr., AO817679.
Gene Hopkins, AO2080701.
Alden F. Hughes, Jr., AO1908681.
Milo F. Hunter, Jr., O2208626.
Kenneth D. Hurley, AO2078997.
Thomas J. Hutchison, AO859622.
Paul G. Jameson, AO729344.
Dale S. Jeffers, AO809812.
Marvin W. Johnson, AO685233.
Melvin E. Johnson, Jr., AO2080603.
Dale N. Jones, AO827212.
Ralph F. Jones, AO424965.
Richard W. Jones, AO721007.
Charles Kaiser, Jr., AO711418.
William C. Kaufman, AO2092289.
Bertram Kemp, AO2057943.
Eugene C. Kiger, Jr., AO565848.
Iven C. Kincheloe, Jr., AO1904137.
Edward E. Lane, AO773165.
Arthur M. Lilley, AO481919.
John L. Mansfield, AO842228.
Reese S. Martin, AO834845.
Ralph S. Matsen, AO2093375.
Joseph J. McCabe, AO794268.
Charles G. McCarthy, AO930112.
Richard M. McClure, AO1846838.
Carlton H. McConnell, AO729772.
Eugene P. McGlauflin, AO820530.
Thomas B. Meeker, AO664217.
Norman F. Merritt, Jr., AO649092.
William S. Miller, AO799224.
Joseph P. Minton, AO710999.
Theodore E. Mock, AO2087681.
Walter S. Moe, Jr., AO777212.
Wilner P. Moon, AO772222.
William J. Mulcahy, AO731323.
David J. Murphy, AO725631.
Naaman L. Myers, AO789587.
George H. Normand, AO927371.
James R. Norris, AO429971.
Clyde A. Northcott, Jr., AO930213.
Timothy G. O'Shea, AO1559737.
Henry G. Parrish, Jr., AO670227.
Floyd A. Peede, Jr., AO820906.
Jack I. Posner, AO834881.
Jack B. Price, AO669923.
George Rhodes, AO581130.
Paul B. Rice, AO840855.
Robert O. Rollman, AO561937.
Marvin O. Rowland, AO1848730.
Donald F. Rudolph, AO728739.
Marvin W. Russell, Jr., AO779228.
Gilmore L. Sanders, AO2057418.
Julius F. Sanks, AO2071713.
Floyd E. Saunders, AO591048.
George H. Saylor, AO713969.
Robert E. Schellhous, AO769954.
Earl C. Schmeling, AO733735.
Willis G. Shaneyfelt, AO1849148.
John L. Sherburne, AO808748.
Clayton C. Sherman, AO2093788.
Robert W. Smothers, AO927836.
Richard H. Spooner, AO701695.
Ellis E. Stanley, AO1846851.
Philip Steiner, AO1854146.
Wesley T. Stewart, AO715635.
John H. Strand, Jr., AO730988.
Carl R. Swartz, AO738498.
Milton G. Swearengin, AO861727.
Ralph J. Swofford, AO688982.
Harry W. Taylor, Jr., AO1850152.
Harvey J. Taylor, AO2030078.
Charles E. Teague, AO2059374.
Hal M. Terry, Jr., AO800968.
William G. Thomas, AO439742.
James W. Thompson, Jr., AO427791.
James E. Tidwell, AO2076041.
Artyv T. Tisdail, AO778618.
George E. Tormoen, AO743218.
Joseph M. Tyndall, AO874094.
John J. Voll, AO705511.
Ernie A. Walker, AO835728.
Ivan Ware, AO1848706.
Thomas W. Whitlock, AO1908785.
Johnny T. Williams, AO1905387.
Marshall G. Williams, AO719524.
Alvin L. Wimer, AO785038.
Voy A. Winders, AO797756.
Francis L. Wright, AO2093266.
Henry C. Yawn III, AO2068328.
William H. Young, AO833454.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 301, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be second lieutenants

Marguerite Butler, AL1908804.
Dolores J. Cleary, AL1908805.
Marjorie L. Riepma, AL1904020.
Mary B. Wilkinson, AL1853888.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

William T. Capers III
Robert J. Ford
Gene R. Johnson
Otto K. Lahlum
Donald E. Leiffert
Eugene C. Wicker

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Senior Division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Earl J. Collins
David P. Frizell
Edwin E. Lee, Jr.
Thomas C. Pinckney, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 29 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Noel Malone, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi.

POSTMASTER

ARKANSAS-TEXAS

Arthur L. Jennings, Texarkana.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

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

Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O God, for the dream that has made America great—the dream that on these shores men would find a sanctuary of freedom in which they could breathe the invigorating air of liberty. We thank Thee that here we believe man is a child of God, and not just a creature of the state; that here we believe it is the truth that sets men free, and therefore men must be free to seek the truth. We thank Thee for our freedom to acknowledge Thee according to the dictates of our conscience. Help us to use this freedom, not as a privilege to be abused but as a heritage to be preserved and to be shared with all. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 29, 1951, was dispensed with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I regret that a commitment, which has been standing for some time, will necessitate my absence from the Senate to speak at a meeting of the Association of Unemployment Compensation Officials of the several States, meeting in my State next week. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate next week.

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

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FULBRIGHT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate next week, beginning Monday.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS—THE MACARTHUR HEARINGS

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, meeting jointly, be permitted to continue their meetings during the session today.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Connecticut a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Connecticut has just asked unanimous consent, which was granted, that the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations may meet during the session of the Senate today. It is my understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], intends to bring up this afternoon the conference report on the selective service bill. I make my remarks in the form of a question, and also in somewhat the form of a statement.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I will say in reply to the Senator that the committees will probably remain in session until about 1 o'clock today.

Mr. President, I might say that we shall have to make some kind of arrangement with respect to those committees. There are 26 members of the two committees. There is other business which must be done in the Senate besides working over a subject which has been pretty well covered already. That does not mean that I am against pursuing the subject with some other witnesses, but I call attention to the fact that there is some extremely important atomic business pending in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have not been able to hold a meeting in 3 weeks. We shall have to work this conflict out somehow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Connecticut has made this statement. I am one who wants the hearings before the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services to be full and complete. I do not want anything that should be presented not presented. On the other hand, I have noticed, from reading the record, that a good portion of the time of the committees is taken up by speeches made by Senators who are members of the committee, and by repetition of questions. When almost one-third of the membership of the Senate is taken away from the Senate for the purpose of conducting these hearings it makes it very difficult to transact business on the floor of the Senate. But when the membership of the two full committees, representing nearly one-third of the Senate, is occupied in the hearings, thus taking them away from hearings that should be had by other committees, it results in slowing down the work of all the committees of the Senate. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut if the committees meeting jointly cannot find some way of expediting the hearings; so there will be fewer speeches made by Senators, and more testimony given by the witnesses, with less repetition of questions.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that we have adopted a time-limitation rule on examination which I think will facilitate the investigation. The committees have now voted to hear Mr. Acheson, Mr. Harriman, and I believe General Wedemeyer and ex-Secretary of Defense Johnson. At the end of this series of witnesses I think it will be necessary to take a very careful look, not at closing off the hearings but rather to see how we are going to integrate this business with the work of the committee.

As the Senator knows, we have the appropriation bills to consider, we have the economic aid program and the arms implementation program to consider, and we also have the matter of the extension of the National Production Defense Act to consider. We must consider other matters of prime importance. Members of these two committees, incidentally, will have to sit on much of this important legislation.

I make these observations for the RECORD to show that, however necessary this investigation may be, it is delaying the action of the Congress on extremely important legislation.

Much good has come out of these hearings. I do not want to be understood as saying that I am ready to close them. I am not. But I think the country should know that almost one-third of the Membership of the Senate is engaged in these hearings, and that is why we are not going ahead as we should be with the program which must be accelerated if we are to do a good job.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not desire to prolong the discussion now, but I think it is only fair to say that I have attended most of the hearings of the committees sitting jointly, and I believe the questions asked by members of the committees on both sides of the aisle have been very sincere and tend to bring out all factual information that is possible. While the questions have sometimes been long, and the hearings have been long, I feel that every member of the committee is making an effort to try to get to the bottom of the situation, for a better understanding by the Members of the Senate and the Congress and the people of the country as a whole. Does not the Senator from Connecticut agree with me about that?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes, I would say that I agree, but I would like to point out to the Senator from Massachusetts that the committees have never defined exactly the objectives of the investigation. Primarily I assume it is to weigh the advisability and the wisdom of certain proposals which were made to us by a five-star general now recalled. I must say that there has been a tendency to reexamine the past actions of the Government over a period of a good many years. That causes me no embarrassment whatsoever. However, it is lengthening the investigation. Primarily, as I see it, the job given the committee was to weigh the recommendations which were made by General MacArthur to see whether or not it was advisable to adopt them, and that I think could be done in a fairly short time; in fact I think the record now is complete enough to come to an adjudication of that issue. Although, lest somebody should say that the Senator from Connecticut wants to end the hearings, I hasten to add that I will sit there as long as a majority of the committee wants to keep examining into affairs past, present, and to try to peer into the future.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have heard most of what the Senator from Connecticut has had to say. I believe that no one wishes unnecessarily to delay the hearings. However, they deal with as important a subject as has ever confronted the American people. They deal with the matter of the war in Korea, this Nation being engaged in the fourth largest war in its history, without a declaration of war by the Congress. They deal with a situation in which already we have suffered more than 70,000 military casualties, plus a number almost that great incapacitated by other than military means.

I believe that the hearings are developing a great deal of information of importance not only to the Congress, but to the American people. I think we have not yet explored the things which need to be explored by the committee. If the time of almost a third of the Members of the Senate is required properly to do this job, I think the time is well spent.

It may be that with respect to some important legislation the committees, sitting jointly, may have to meet in the mornings and evenings, the Senate continuing to meet in the afternoons. Personally I would have no objection to that procedure.

However, a great deal of misinformation has been put out from time to time. For example, on the 20th of April, about 9 days after General MacArthur's summary removal—and he first heard of his removal through his wife and aide hearing it over the radio in Tokyo—a statement was issued by some unnamed Pentagon spokesman to the effect that it had been done upon the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The record is clear that at no time did any individual member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nor the Joint Chiefs as a whole, ever initiate a recommendation for General MacArthur's removal. They did concur in the removal after they had been advised that that was the desire of the President of the United States.

There are other matters with respect to which I feel there has not been an accurate presentation of the facts to the American people. I think these hearings will clear them up.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me to make reply?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have now been heard. There can be no doubt in the RECORD that they fully supported the action of their Commander in Chief, and believe that he did the right thing in the action he took in regard to General MacArthur. They have supported that decision with what I consider to be valid reasons and good common sense.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has the floor.

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

Mr. HUNT. I should like to clear up one point. I believe the Senator from California—certainly not with any intent to mislead or to leave an erroneous impression—has left a wrong impression. As I have heard the testimony by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they were called and told of the contemplated action, and were asked for their advice and reaction. They were unanimous in feeling that General MacArthur should be removed. I think that is just a little different interpretation from that of the Senator from California.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The record, I believe, is very clear. I certainly would not make a misstatement to the Senate or to the country. My statement was that at no time did the Joint Chiefs, as a body, or as individual members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff representing either the Navy, the Army, or the Air Force, or the nonvoting chairman, General Bradley, initiate a recommendation for the removal of General MacArthur. The first they even heard or contemplated that such a thing would take place was when General Bradley received a telephone call from someone—he cannot remember just who it was—on the 5th of April—indicating that the White House had that action under consideration.

I quite agree with the Senator from Connecticut that when they learned that the President of the United States was going to remove General MacArthur, and their opinion was asked from a military point of view, as to whether the job should be done, they concurred in the determination of the Commander-in-Chief, the President of the United States, to appoint a new commander.

So far as I know, no one in the Senate or in the country has questioned the constitutional right or the power of the President of the United States to remove any commander whom he desires to remove. I am merely saying that I believe it was not a fair representation to the American people for an unnamed Pentagon spokesman, on the 20th of April, to say that it was done upon the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I believe that the record and the hearings have cleared up that phase of the situation.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from California that it was done upon the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense. The action was not taken until they were invited into conference and asked for their suggestions and opinions. They all agreed that General MacArthur should be removed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. They concurred. They did not recommend the decision.

Mr. HUNT. The action was not taken until after they concurred and went along with the proposal of the President of the United States that he should be removed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for an observation?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, who are charged with a review of our policy, having in consideration global strategy, also have been shown in these hearings to be adamantly opposed, in all particulars, to certain military adventures, contrary to the stories which have been coming from various sources and which have been printed in various columns, to the effect that there was secret sympathy on the part of some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with such adventures. It has now been demonstrated beyond peradventure in the record that they have adamantly opposed the position which was taken by General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before I yield to any other Senator, I should like to make one observation.

There is one thing upon which I think we can all agree, and that is that General Ridgway and General Van Fleet are doing a wonderful job in Korea.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. I think there is another thing that we can all agree upon, and that is that no one could be doing a better job. I believe that it is for us to think a little more as to how we can strengthen them and help them, rather than to live altogether in the past. I am willing to go into these matters of the past in detail, but I do not think we ought to neglect the future. That is the important thing.

At this time I wish to say that personally I feel that General Ridgway and General Van Fleet should be highly commended for the wonderful job they are doing in Korea.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield, and if so to whom?

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Arizona that, of course, I agree that General Ridgway and General Van Fleet are doing a good job now. The basis of the inquiry by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee was, as I understand, to consider, first, the broad general questions of policy in the future, which must be based upon the experience of the past; and second, the justification and the wisdom of the dismissal of General MacArthur, and the manner in which he was dismissed.

I think we all agree that the President had the right to dismiss him. I think the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when their opinion was asked, concurred. But they did not all agree as to the manner in which General MacArthur was dismissed, even though, in broad terms, they concurred in the wisdom of the dismissal.

I think that needs to be made clear, in answer to the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Wyoming.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to be in the position of farming out time. Several Senators desire to transact routine business. If Senators wish to do so, they may speak on the subject under discussion following the transaction of routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, with which all Senators are familiar, the Senator who has the floor can yield only for a question, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. I do not wish to violate the rule by farming out time. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may transact routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair will enforce the part of the unanimous-consent agreement which provides for routine business to be transacted without debate. Senators who wish to speak formally on any subject must do so in their own time.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF REGISTRATION PROVISIONS OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration and enforcement of the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act, for the period from September 23, 1950, to May 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of its official proceedings for the year ended December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

U. S. COMMERCIAL COMPANY—AMENDMENT ADOPTED BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter from the Secretary of the Senate, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
May 31, 1951.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

I am in receipt of a letter from the Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, two certified copies of an amendment adopted on May 21, 1951, to paragraph 9 of the U. S. Commercial Company, which have been placed in the files of the Senate.

Respectfully,

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Earl N. Bathrick, of Saratoga Springs, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing assistance to the Institute for Neurological Diseases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Flushing (N. Y.) Council of Women's Organizations, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for adequate appropriation for the expansion of personnel to guard all ports of entry, etc., relating to the illegal importation of narcotics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1565. A bill for the relief of Andy Duzsik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1566. A bill for the relief of Constantin Alexander Solomonides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1567. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Ursula Rutherford Ollinger; and

S. 1568. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Mary Rutherford Spearson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1569. A bill for the relief of Dr. Klaus C. Karde and Ingeborg Karde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1570. A bill to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees; and

S. 1571. A bill to amend chapter 19, title 5, of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure Act," so as to prohibit the employment by any person of any member, official, attorney, or employee of a Government agency except under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1572. A bill to authorize the presentation of claims of the Coos (or Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (or Kalawatset), and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of Adone Lorenzetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. DUFF, Mr. GREEN, Mr. IVES, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. 1574. A bill to provide geographical equality for appointments to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1575. A bill relating to the survival of civil actions by or against public officers when such officers die, resign, or otherwise cease to hold office during the pendency of such actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1576. A bill to clarify the status of apple cider under the laws relating to alcoholic beverages and under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1577. A bill for the relief of Constantinous Tzortzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1578. A bill to amend section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to give credit in accordance with such section for service rendered by offiers and employees of a Federal home-loan bank for service for which through inadvertence no deductions from salary were made; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENTON (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1579. A bill to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GEOGRAPHICAL APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide geographical equality for appointments to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1574) to provide geograpical equality for appointments to the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 24 of the Interstate Commerce Act as reads "Not more than six commissioners shall be appointed from the same political party" (49 U. S. C., sec. 11), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ", nor shall more than four be appointed from the same geographical area. As used in this section the term "geographical area" shall mean any one of the following areas: (1) All States (excluding Wisconsin) which lie wholly east of the Mississippi River and north of the line formed by the Ohio River and the southern boundaries of West Virginia and Maryland, (2) all States which lie wholly east of the Mississippi River and south of the line formed by the Ohio River and the southern boundaries of West Virginia and Maryland, and (3) all States which lie wholly west of the Mississippi River, including Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Louisiana."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as of July 1, 1951. Commissioners serving under appointments made prior to that date shall not be required to be removed, but all appointments and reappointments made after that date shall be valid only if made in accordance with the provisions of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. O'CONOR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

I have introduced in the Senate for myself and a group of other Senators a bill to make possible equal representation of the various sections of the country in the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

For transportation purposes the United States is divided into three territories—the eastern territory, which generally is that

group of States situated east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers; the southern territory, comprised of those States east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers; and the western territory, which comprises the States lying west of the Mississippi River.

The following approximate percentage of the total United States population is located in the territories shown:

Eastern	47.25
Western	34.25
Southern	18.0

The percentage of the total freight transportation originated in the three territories is approximately the same as percentage in population located in each territory. On the basis of ton-miles of transportation performed, we find the east performing about 42 percent, the west about 43 percent, and the south about 15 percent. From the standpoint of passenger traffic, the division of passenger-miles handled is about the same as the percentage of population.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is composed of 11 members presently made up of 6 or 7 from the west, 3 from the southeastern territory, and 1 from the eastern territory. Thus a great preponderance of this membership is located in the western territory while the southeastern territory seems to have a little more than its percentage of population and transportation service performed would call for. The east with only one member, who is from the westernmost State (Illinois) in the eastern territory, is not adequately represented.

The Interstate Commerce Commission regulates transportation on a national basis but must constantly be aware of how its regulations will affect each separate section of the country. The members naturally draw on their personal experience for some of their knowledge about transportation. Thus when the collective experience of the membership barely touches on the territory comprising almost half of the population and performing almost half of the transportation service of the country, it might well be that the interests of this group are not properly represented in the deliberations of the Commission.

The purpose of the bill is to provide that not more than 4 members of the Commission should come from one of three areas described in the bill.

These areas are: (1) Eastern States, (2) Western States, (3) Southern States.

SURVIVAL OF CIVIL ACTIONS BY OR AGAINST CERTAIN PUBLIC OFFICERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the survival of civil actions by or against public officers when such officers die, resign, or otherwise cease to hold office during the pendency of such actions, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1575) relating to the survival of civil actions by or against public officers when such officers die, resign, or otherwise cease to hold office during the pendency of such actions, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Some months ago I was disturbed by a decision of the Supreme Court ruling that because of a legal technicality, the widow of a Navy petty officer was required to start all over again in her once successful effort to win a $1,365 lawsuit against the Navy. That legal technicality came about through no fault of her own but was related to the fact that the Navy had appointed a new Paymaster General and her court papers had failed to name that new appointee.

The Supreme Court, of course, undoubtedly ruled in accordance with the proper interpretation of the law. It is not for me to take issue with that. It does appear to me, however, that it would be most unfair to allow a statute to exist on the books which would interfere with the application of justice. A person who deserves a judgment on the basis of the merits of the case should not be prevented from receiving judgment simply because the holder of the office who is nominally being sued as a representative of the Government has been succeeded by another official.

The bill, which I introduced today, is designed to correct that inequity by amending the United States Code to provide that when a Government officer dies or otherwise ceases to hold office and is a party to legal action, he shall be deemed to have been substituted by his successor.

THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT—AMENDMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. NIXON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF IMMUNITY PROVISION RELATING TO TESTIMONY BY CERTAIN WITNESSES BEFORE CONGRESS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1570) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENT RELATING TO TAX AMORTIZATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S.1397) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, relating to tax amortization certificates, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the amendment by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK TO ACCOMPANY PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO S. 1397 RELATING TO TAX AMORTIZATION CERTIFICATES

This amendment does three things:

1. It requires DPA to process pending applications on a product classification basis before it can process a second application by a manufacturer who has previously been granted a tax amortization certificate for the same product.

2. After the pending backlog is cleared up, those applying for a second approval must await their turn until applications filed for the first time on that product during the same month have been processed.

3. The date by which facilities must have been completed to qualify for tax amortization is changed from December 31, 1949, to July 1, 1950, a date shortly after the outbreak of the Korean affair. Outstanding amortization certificates for facilities completed between those dates are allowed to remain in effect only for 12 months instead of 60 months.

If adopted, these amendments should have the desirable effect of requiring more orderly processing of applications for tax amortization certificates. In a recent appearance before the Joint Committee on Defense Production, Mr. Harrison, who was then Defense Production Administrator, testified there were too many pending applications which had not been processed. Nevertheless, in several instances larger corporations seem to have obtained rapid approval of their applications for a particular product. It is hoped that these amendments will accomplish a more equitable processing of tax amortization applications, especially those filed by independent small business.

The amendment also attempts to relate the granting of amortization certificates to facilities contributing to the defense emergency brought on by the outbreak of the Korean affair. On that theory the proposed date, July 1, 1950, seems very liberal from the standpoint of the industry. For those who have amortization certificates on facilities completed between December 31, 1949, and July 1, 1950, the certificates are allowed to remain valid for a consecutive 12-month period. After that the facility must be depreciated for Federal income tax purposes at normal rates.

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

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

By Mr. WILEY:

Memorial Day address delivered by him at a Memorial Day celebration in West Allis, Wis., May 30, 1951.

By Mr. LODGE:

Memorial Day address delivered by him at Mount Wollaston Cemetery, Quincy, Mass., May 30, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Memorial Day address delivered by Senator MCMAHON at Memorial Day services, Hyde Park, N. Y., May 30, 1951.

Article entitled "Americans Still Don't Understand It," regarding the war in Korea, written by Marquis Childs and published in the Washington Post of May 30, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Address by Senator LEHMAN at the Sidney Hillman Foundation dinner, Commodore Hotel, N. Y., May 25, 1951, on the occasion of the presentation to him of the Sidney

Hillman award of $1,000 for meritorious public service.

Two articles by Anne O'Hare McCormick, the first entitled "The Iran Crisis as It Touches Point 4," published in the New York Times of May 23, 1951, the second entitled "Italy Wins a Second Battle With the Communists," published in the New York Times of May 30, 1951.

A statement made by him before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Senate Resolution 127, providing for an investigation of television programing trends and policies with respect to public service and educational programs.

Editorial entitled "Voice of America," published in the New York Times of May 31, 1951.

By Mr. McMAHON:

Address by Jacob Potofsky, president of the Sidney Hillman Foundation, on the presentation of the $1,000 award for meritorious public service to Senator LEHMAN by the Sidney Hillman Foundation, at the Hotel Commodore New York City, May 25, 1951, together with the text of the citation.

Article entitled "The JCS Verdict on MacArthur," written by Ernest K. Lindley, and published in National Affairs.

Article regarding the dismissal of General MacArthur entitled "General Vandenberg Speaks," written by Walter Lippmann.

Article entitled "American Might Versus Soviet Massed Manpower," containing an interview with Senator McMAHON by Ernest K. Lindley on the significance of the recent atomic tests in Nevada and at Eniwetok.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

Address entitled "The Big Truth Versus the Big Doubt," delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, at the Democratic National Committee Midwest and Western States Conference, in Denver, Colo., dealing with the policies of the Democratic Party and world conditions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address on the subject The Racketeers of Inflation, delivered by James B. Carey, at an anti-inflation conference in Washington, D. C., on May 18, 1951.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Editorial entitled "Faith Shows the Way," from the Rapid City (S. D.) Journal.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Articles from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, and a letter from Gen. Claire L. Chennault, dealing with the award of transport planes to Chinese Communists.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Statement regarding the price of beef, by A. G. Pickett, secretary of the Kansas Livestock Association.

Article entitled "Untruth Takes Time to Expose," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 30, 1951, dealing with the MacArthur controversy.

By Mr. PASTORE:

Article entitled "We Need More Doctors," written by Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, dean of the Kansas Medical School, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of May 26, 1951, dealing with proposed grants and scholarships for medical education.

By Mr. WELKER:

Article entitled "McCARTHY in '52," written by Jim Dan Hill, Ph. D., president, Superior State College, Wisconsin.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Editorial entitled "The Governors' Trip," published in the Daily Alaska Empire of Juneau, Alaska, relating to the visit to Alaska of Governor Warren, of California.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Letter from Dean Alfange, published in the New York Times of Sunday, May 27, 1951, dealing with the necessity and desirability for a code of conduct for the guidance and direction of congressional investigating committees.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very brief statement which I have prepared with reference to Americans for Democratic Action.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I was not on the floor of the Senate on Tuesday when the junior Senator from Wisconsin made some remarks about Americans for Democratic Action and about its two top officers, former Attorney General Francis Biddle and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

To be perfectly frank, it required rather close and careful scrutiny of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to discover those remarks. I was quite surprised when I came across them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think that most Members of this body can recall the day when similar statements by my colleague from Wisconsin were easy to find on the front pages of most newspapers. They were emblazoned in black bold-face type.

I have no intention of making any lengthy comments on the remarks made last Tuesday by the gentleman from Wisconsin. There is obviously no necessity for my doing so.

But for the benefit of those select few who, like myself, are close students of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to make clear—as I have many times in the past—that I am proud of my association with Americans for Democratic Action. I am now a vice chairman of that organization. My colleague the junior Senator from New York [Senator LEHMAN] is also a vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action. I know that he too is proud of his affiliation with this group.

Americans for Democratic Action, under the leadership of men like Francis Biddle, Joseph Rauh, and many other distinguished citizens has, from its very inception fought vigorously and effectively against communism. It has fought just as courageously in defense of the rights and liberties of individuals.

I know there are some people who appear to believe that these two fights cannot be waged at the same time. If the majority of the American people agreed with them, then we would not only lose the battle against Communist totalitarianism, we would lose our own freedom in the bargain.

I can sympathize most deeply with the junior Senator from Wisconsin because his remarks of last Tuesday received so little publicity. But I am confident that he will not misunderstand me when I say that I personally do not think his remarks were very newsworthy.

In my opinion there are very few people in this country who would put any stock in a story that insinuated that men like Francis Biddle and Joseph Rauh or an organization like Americans for Democratic Action are guilty of disloyalty simply because they have the courage and determination to defend the rights and liberties of their fellow men.

THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for that purpose.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings incident to the call of the roll may be suspended, and that the order for the call of the roll may be rescinded.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the bill which is now before the Senate, authorizing the construction of the central Arizona project, has several important features which I wish to call to the attention of Senators and to discuss.

My colleague and I have, by letter addressed to Senators, set forth the need for the project in two respects. According to the Bureau of Reclamation, more than 200,000 acres of land now under cultivation in Arizona will revert to the desert unless additional water is made available. This project is needed to sustain the existing agricultural economy of the whole of central Arizona, and the only adequate source of supply of supplemental water is the Colorado River.

The Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Power Commission have estimated that the electrical energy requirements of the area to be served will be doubled within the next 7 to 15 years, which fully justifies the power features of this project.

The bill contains, in section 12, a provision for a Supreme Court determination of the water rights involved. This provision is the same as the amendment which was adopted last year when this matter was before the Senate for consideration. The provision in question was drafted by two able lawyers, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]; and I am confident that the other able lawyers in this body will listen to their explanations of what they intended to accomplish. To me, as a layman, Mr. President, it appears certain that this provision will bring California up to the snubbing post where that State must promptly participate in an action before the Supreme Court to have the disputed water rights determined.

I know the Californians do not like this provision. What they want is delay and more delay—delay for many years to come—in the hope that in the meantime more people will go to southern California and that thereby a greater need for the water may be built up. The effect of this provision is to withhold any appropriation for the purpose of construction of any irrigation works intended to bring Colorado River water into central Arizona, until the Supreme

Court decides that there is a supply of water in the Colorado River for the central Arizona project. As a consequence, at this time the total authorization in the bill is reduced in the amount of $267,000,000, at 1947 prices; but it is made clear that if the Supreme Court in due course of time decides that Arizona has a right to what she claims, then construction of the irrigation features provided for in the bill may proceed.

The provision is designed to make certain that there will be what the lawyers call a justiciable issue. After twice successfully urging the Supreme Court to find that there was no such issue, the Californians now say that one exists, despite the fact that there has been no change in the situation and will be none for years to come unless Congress authorizes the construction of the central Arizona project or some similar development.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question at that point which may be helpful?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the amendment relative to the suit the same as the provision which appeared in the bill last year?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator for his interpretation of this language. I am not a lawyer; I am a newspaper man. The Senator from Arizona may be a lawyer. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senators from Arizona reads in part as follows: *"Provided further,* That during the period of 6 months after the enactment of this act and during"—and I emphasize these words—"the pendency of any suit or suits in which the United States shall be joined as a party under and by virtue of the consent granted in section 12 of this act, no construction of works which are required solely for the purpose of diverting, transporting, and delivering water from the main stream of the Colorado River for beneficial consumptive use in Arizona authorized by this act shall be undertaken and no contract for such construction shall be entered into and no moneys shall be appropriated for such construction. The pendency of a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint shall be considered pendency of a suit or suits for the purposes of this act."

My question is this: As a layman, as I read this language and try to understand it, it seems to me that so long as a suit is pending or is on file in the Supreme Court of the United States, these certain things cannot be done. But assume that the Supreme Court decided adversely to Arizona: As I read the language of the amendment, and as I know that the bill itself authorizes this provision, it seems to me that, in that event, he might have an adverse decision of the Supreme Court and yet have an authorized project. Will the Senator please clarify that?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am no more a lawyer than is the distinguished senior Senator from California, but he also is a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as I am. I should like to ask him what he believes would be the chance of obtaining money from the Treasury of the United States with which to build a reclamation project, after the Supreme Court had decided that there was no water for it.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My observation has been that, once the camel gets his nose under the tent with an authorization, and considering the persuasive abilities of the Senator from Arizona, it is entirely possible that the political situation might be so ripe that its advocates would have an authorized project. They could start by getting small driblets and then a major avalanche of funds. So it would seem to me that if the Senator really were trying through this amendment to do what should be done, it should be made very clear that, in the event of an adverse Supreme Court decision, or until an affirmative decision with respect to Arizona's use of the water is obtained, a prohibition should be contained in the bill against any construction.

I may say to the Senator from Arizona that I have offered such an amendment today, which I think is very clear. If the Senator will permit, it says:

SEC. 13. No monies shall be appropriated or expended for construction of works provided for herein for the diversion or transportation of water from the main streams of the Colorado River for consumptive use in Arizona unless and until the Supreme Court of the United States shall have held that water is available therefor in the amount of substantially 1,200,000 acre-feet per annum.

It would seem to me that, if the Senators from Arizona would accept that amendment, it would clarify the situation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not being a lawyer, and knowing that this provision in the bill was drafted by able lawyers, I am not competent to pass upon the language which the Senator from California suggests. But let me say how it would work. Suppose a suit were filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and that the Court decided there was no justiciable issue, so that the question could not be tried in that Court; then, as I read the Senator's amendment, it would forever bar the enactment of additional legislation whereby the State of Arizona could obtain water from the Colorado River.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that both the Senator and I are now discussing legal points, though we are not lawyers. I admit there is an honest difference of opinion on this point, but I would say that we have been advised by competent counsel that there is a justiciable issue in this matter, without the authorization or construction of this project. Even assuming for the moment—which I do not assume, because we have competent legal advice to the contrary—that it would be necessary to authorize a project, our contention is that it is not necessary to authorize a project, of which the construction cost alone is in excess of $788,000,000, and the over-all cost, including the interest lost to the Government, runs well over $2,000,000,000. So it seems to me that is an expensive way of determining the existence of a justiciable issue in a matter which concerns not merely the State of California alone, but also Nevada, which happens to see eye to eye with California in this matter.

Mr. McFARLAND rose.

Mr. HAYDEN. Before I yield to my colleague, permit me to say that I seriously object to the Senator from California's padding my speech with his figures. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wanted to point out one thing to my colleague, and then to ask a question based upon my statement. I should like to say that this very amendment was considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, when this bill was before it. It was the opinion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who drafted this amendment, which has become a part of the bill, that, in effect it would be asking the Supreme Court for a declaratory judgment; and, inasmuch as the filing of a suit then would prevent any possibility of ever getting an appropriation, it would not be a threat of an injury, and, therefore, the Supreme Court might not take jurisdiction. All these matters were most carefully considered by the committee. Leaving out my own opinion and that of the lawyers from Arizona, it was the opinion, let me say to my colleague, of all of the lawyers who testified before the committee, except those from California, that the present language, as incorporated in the bill, was necessary in order to make a justiciable issue.

Let me ask my colleague this question: What would anyone want with a project, or want to get money for one, if the courts were to hold that there was no water for it? To me it is simply ridiculous to suggest such a thing. Who would want to build a project where there was no water? There is simply nothing to the argument. It ought again to go out the window, where it was thrown by the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the suggestion I made to the Senator from California, namely, that as a practical matter, he and I both being members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, we have yet to appropriate any money for any irrigation project which does not have a water supply. The provision in the bill we have been discussing is designed to make certain that there will be what the lawyers call a justiciable issue. After twice successfully urging the Supreme Court to find that there was no such issue, the Californians now say that an issue exists. The fact is that there has been no change in the situation, and there will be none for years to come, unless the Congress authorizes the construction of the central Arizona project or some similar development.

I never was a law student, but in my early thirties, I served for 5 years as the

sheriff of my county which gave me an opportunity to listen to legal arguments in the courtroom. It was firmly impressed upon my mind at that time that in any civil action one could not stay long in court unless he could show that something was actually being done or quite certain to be done which was to his distinct disadvantage.

About 20 years ago, the people of my State became convinced that there were powerful interests in California which desired to secure an unfair and undue share of the water of the Colorado River and thereby seriously injure Arizona. On three different occasions, in 1930 (283 U. S. 423), 1933 (292 U. S. 341), and 1935 (298 U. S. 558), the State of Arizona filed suits in the United States Supreme Court against the State of California in the hope that the Court might be willing to determine what would be Arizona's equitable share of the 8,500,000 acre-feet of water apportioned by the Colorado River compact to the States of the lower basin of which Arizona and California are a part.

Able lawyers were employed by Arizona, but in all three instances, the Supreme Court declined to entertain a suit, and in its first decision stated that "the contentions are based not upon any actual or threatened impairment of Arizona's rights but upon assumed potential invasions" (283 U. S. 425).

After three times resisting an Arizona effort to have the Supreme Court divide the waters of the Colorado River in the lower basin, the Californians have now executed an about-face and say they want the Court to do that very thing. We in Arizona have a good reason to suspect that this is just another scheme to postpone action. They say they want such a lawsuit, but they do not say when.

The record is very full and complete as to the need of this water in central Arizona. Our reservoirs are now practically dry and our farmers have available only a fraction of the water that is needed to raise a crop. One of the most distressing situations is in Pinal County, where there are 100,000 acres that should be receiving water from the Coolidge Dam on the Gila River, and there is no water behind that dam, and never has been an adequate supply since it was constructed. Fifty thousand acres of this land are owned by whites and fifty thousand by the Indians, and they are all in really bad shape. This year there will be less than one-eighth water supply for this land.

I made a request of Dr. Paul S. Burgess, dean and director of the college of agriculture of the University of Arizona, to give me the facts, based upon his own knowledge, as to why Arizona needs water and why America needs Arizona's products. Dr. Burgess is a member of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission which recently submitted a report to Congress in respect to water problems throughout the United States. This is what Dr. Burgess has written under date of March 6, 1951, and there is no one better qualified to state the facts:

When I came to Arizona 27 years ago, less than 450,000 acres were under irrigation in the entire State. In the Salt River Valley (Maricopa County) approximately 300,000 acres were irrigated and over 1,000 acres in this valley were waterlogged and out of production. In some places water was standing on the surface. The water table at that time varied from 1 foot to 20 feet below the surface with an average of 16.5 feet, and had been slowly building up for many years. On the Salt River project no pump water was then being used for irrigation. About this time (1924) 99 large wells were drilled and pumps installed for drainage purposes. As time passed, more wells were put down so that, at the present time, approximately 1,375 pumps are in almost continuous operation (500 district wells and 875 privately owned wells). At first, drainage was the objective but in later years supplemental water for irrigation has been the only reason for more and more pump installations. Today groundwater is 75 to 150 feet down and being lowered each year.

Even worse conditions exist in the Casa Grande Valley (San Carlos project), and in the adjacent areas, as well as in the upper Gila River valley around Safford. There are also some five or six smaller irrigated areas in southern Arizona, each comprising five to ten thousand acres, where the water table likewise is receding below economic pumping levels.

The reservoirs behind the Roosevelt Dam and lower dams on the Salt River furnish the irrigation water supply for the Salt River Valley. They have a combined capacity of approximately 2,000,000 acre-feet, but they haven't been full for 10 years and during the past 9 years of below-normal rainfall they have been drawn down until, at present, only 280,000 acre-feet remain for use.

The reservoir behind the Coolidge Dam on the Gila River furnishes water for the Casa Grande Valley which includes the San Carlos Project. It has a capacity of about 1,200,000 acre-feet, but at present contains but 836 acre-feet. In the last 20 years more than 990 wells have been put down in the Casa Grande Valley, including the Coolidge, Eloy, and Stanfield areas, to supplement water from the reservoir behind the Coolidge Dam on the Gila River. The groundwater table in this region has been reduced by from 80 to 125 feet during this period, and the lift in some areas at present exceeds 220 feet.

The Safford Valley now depends largely on pumped water and the use of a part of the surplus flow of the Gila River. The water table here has been rapidly receding in recent years so that many wells can only be used a part of the time to irrigate a limited acreage.

In 1948 the Arizona Legislature passed the Underground Water Code which now prevents all well drilling in critical areas where the water table is receding, but this came too late to improve the present critical situation. However, it will prevent future expansion where sufficient water is not available.

Only along the western border of Arizona where about 100,000 acres are irrigated in the Yuma and Parker districts from the Colorado River has an adequate water supply in recent years been available. During the past year more than 70 percent of all water used in the State was pumped. Farmers spent more than $15,000,000 for their 1950 supply of irrigation water.

I might say, in passing, that this situation is an exact duplicate of what happened in the San Joaquin Valley in California. There was in the beginning an ample supply of surface water. Then they had to drill wells. Then the water table went down, and it was necessary to bring water from another watershed, just as is proposed in the pending bill.

The year 1951 opens with central Arizona reservoirs almost-empty and with groundwater supplies decreased during the past 9 years by twice the capacity of these great surface reservoirs, or by nearly 7,000,000 acre feet.

This heavy pumping has lowered groundwater tables by from 70 to 200 feet in Maricopa, Pinal, and Pima counties which together represent some 785,000 acres of irrigated farm land.

Stating it another way we might say that the replenishment of water in the three counties in the 9-year period was adequate to irrigate but about one-half of the land actually irrigated during that period. Should the replenishment of water in the future be at the same rate as occurred in the 9-year period just passed, then there must be an agricultural abandonment in these three counties of about 400,000 acres, not counting such acreage as will be abandoned because of the increased city residential and industrial requirements for water. The industrial decentralization of American industry and of American population has been a factor in bringing about a great growth of Arizona's industries and cities. The population of these three counties of central Arizona—Maricopa, Pinal, and Pima—increased 78 percent from 1940 to 1950 according to the Federal census. Residential areas, industrial areas, war plants, and air fields have been built and are using much water which formerly supported agriculture.

This water famine might not be considered so serious were there any possibility of recharge from natural rainfall, but, as stated above, this is impossible. For years we have been pumping at a rate many times greater than possible recharge from a 10-inch to 20-inch average rainfall over the area. The water at present pumping levels is old, geological water that has been slowly accumulating at these lower depths for thousands of years and probably never can be replaced.

With an adequate water supply, Arizona's soils are among the richest in the world. She has attained the distinction of leading all other States in the Union for 2 years in succession in the amount of cotton produced per acre. A yield in 1950 of approximately 890 pounds of high-grade Upland cotton per acre on 231,000 acres compared with an approximate yield of 770 pounds per acre in California and a United States average of 265 pounds. Arizona also ranked seventh among the States in the amount of cotton produced in 1950. Similar high yields might be cited for long-staple cotton, small grains, alfalfa, flax, winter vegetables, and citrus.

Our country at present is in a real emergency. In order to survive as a nation we must prepare for any eventuality. One of the important products needed for defense is a good supply of long-staple American-Egyptian cotton. The Sacaton field station of the United States Department of Agriculture has developed the two best varieties of this commodity for production in this country—the Amsak and the Pima-32.

Throughout the years, Arizona has grown most of the long-staple cotton produced in the United States due to its favorable climate for this crop which requires a long-growing season and plenty of water. In 1942 when water was available, Arizona grew long-staple cotton on 129,700 acres from which it produced over 52,000 bales or about 75 percent of this cotton grown in the United States that year, and it can do it again with adequate irrigation water. A price support of $1.04 per pound recently announced should again assure adequate production this year if water is available.

Just last week, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan announced that, "The CCC will develop a program to purchase up to 5,000 tons of registered and certified cotton seed of the 1951 crop of Amsak and Pima-32 varieties of American-Egyptian cotton. This program is being undertaken in accordance with a request of the Munitions Board to assure production of sufficient extra long-staple cot-

ton in an emergency to fill military and essential civilian requirements." Arizona is the only place where the bulk of this order can be filled.

During 1950 the cash value of all products sold from the farms and ranches of Arizona amounted to over $273,000,000. Besides cotton lint and seed which amounted to about $118,000,000 meat animals (cattle and sheep) also are important to our defense effort. These sold for approximately $59,000,000. Lettuce, melons, and fresh winter vegetables brought $42,000,000, and feed grains and baled alfalfa hay shipped chiefly to Los Angeles markets for dairy production in that area sold for $20,000,000.

A 16,000,000-bale cotton crop has been requested by the Federal Government for 1951 to meet defense needs. About 400,000 acres will be planted to cotton in Arizona this year if water is available. Such an acreage should yield at least 600,000 bales.

Meats and dairy products are also requested in large amount. This is another place where this State can play an important role if water is sufficient for adequate feed production.

Arizona has millions of acres of deep, fertile soils. All that is needed to make it produce abundantly is water. It is now putting to beneficial use all the water that is presently available within its borders, and in many cases reusing it through pumping. In fact, it is consuming its principal as well as the interest and, at present rates of use, will soon be bankrupt unless another source is made available. The only new source is the Colorado River from which it is entitled to receive more than 1,000,000 additional acre-feet. Even with this welcome addition which will but firm up present acreage needs, only about 1,000,000 acres, or less than 2 percent, of the State's total area can ever be tilled.

Mr. President, in this connection I desire to clear up one other matter. It has been repeatedly stated by the opponents of this bill that the water which Arizona proposes to take out of the Colorado River would benefit comparatively few people. As a matter of fact, we have in central Arizona approximately 725,000 acres of excellent land all of which has been under irrigation and all of which would be under irrigation now if there were a water supply for it. As has happened in other States, as in California, we have exhausted the water supply in our streams by overexpansion of irrigation and we have exhausted the underground water. Our case is almost identical to that of the Central Valley project in California. Congress saved the economy and civilization of that highly productive section of California, and we ask Congress to save a similar civilization and economy in central Arizona. Every precedent which has been established in connection with the central California project applies with equal force to the central Arizona project.

What we propose to do by authorization of the central Arizona project is to bring approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River to central Arizona. The farmers will be required to pay for that water at the rate of $4.75 an acre-foot. That is a rather high rate for irrigation water which bars the cultivation of new land, but this water is not intended for new land. On the other hand, it is intended as a supplemental supply for lands heretofore irrigated. Just as is the case in California, and just as it was in the case of the eastern slope in Colorado, where water is brought through the Big Thompson Tunnel for supplemental irrigation of lands out on the plains, the final acre-foot of water is the one on which profit or loss depends and for that reason the farmers can afford a substantial price for that final acre-foot.

The productivity of the irrigated land in central Arizona is great, among the highest in the United States, and for that additional acre-foot of water the farmers can bear the charge without any difficulty at all. It is not intended that a contract will be made with individual landowners but contracts for this water will be made with organized water users associations or irrigation districts which are in effect municipal corporatons with the power to tax. They have another power which is even more effective and that is to withhold water if an assessment is not paid. That is the most effective way of obtaining payment for water anywhere in the desert region. The contracts for this water will require the contracting organizations to pay for it whether they use it or not. If it happened to be a wet year they may not use it, but must still pay as an insurance against the dry years.

In connection with the central Arizona project, there has been considerable propaganda as to the benefits that would be derived by a few land owners with large holdings. I wish to make the situation perfectly clear by saying that on the 725,000 acres of land that will be benefited by the central Arizona project, there are approximately 30,000 farmers who live on that land and this does not include the Indians on the San Carlos project in Pinal County, Ariz.

There is a further matter that I would like to mention in the southern California propaganda against the central Arizona project. A statement is repeatedly made that Colorado River water is required to supply the needs of five million. What 5,000,000 people, Mr. President? Not the people who presently live in southern California, because only a small fraction of the water used by those people now comes from the Colorado River. I wish to submit a table of figures from the United States Geological Survey showing actual diversions from the Colorado River through the metropolitan district aqueduct beginning from the year 1941 to the year 1949, inclusive:

Year:	*Acre-feet*
1941	30,700
1942	31,140
1943	34,630
1944	51,633
1945	58,350
1946	80,395
1947	85,356
1948	194,245
1949	178,597

Ever since that aqueduct was completed, approximately 8,000,000 acre-feet of water have gone to waste out of that river into the Gulf of California each year. The water was there but it was not taken by the metropolitan water district because it was not needed. It is perfectly evident from these facts that all this talk about 5,000,000 people who need the water has no legitimate relation to those who now live in southern California but is just camouflage which is being used so that another 5,000,000 people can be told that if they come to southern California there will be ample water for them. This is just another means of delaying until more people can be induced to move to southern California and thereby a claim be filed for additional need for water.

It should be borne in mind that the Colorado River water originates largely in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah, with a sizable contribution made by the States of New Mexico and Arizona and no contribution by California. Yet, in effect, California says to the people of Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, and Arizona: You cannot take any of that water even though you have good use for it in your particular State because California might need it for some 5,000,000 people who in the future may move to southern California.

While all this great interest is being shown by our sister State of California in our central Arizona project and those from southern California are developing a sad "last water hole" philosophy about Colorado River waters, I want to direct your attention to a much more progressive approach being made by A. D. Edmonston, the State engineer of California. Mr. Edmonston knows something of what he is talking about, does not let emotion overcome vision, has a responsibility for seeing that southern California gets some water. Therefore, he avoids the error so many of our southern California friends are falling into. He does not start looking for water where there is not water, but starts by looking for water where there is water—water wasting to the sea—and he has found a lot of it right in California for California's own use.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a statement by Mr. Edmonston, delivered by him at a meeting of the American Geophysical Union, section of hydrology and meteorology, Fresno, Calif., on February 9, 1951. In this report Mr. Edmonston lays to rest considerable misapprehension that might be raised by misinformation spread by some of our friends from California to the effect that the Los Angeles area in California south of the Tehachapis might at some future date be without water when the central Arizona project is completed. Mr. Edmonston points out that this will not be the case, that California has a lot of water of its own that it can develop without taking any other State's water, that the sensible thing to do is for California to get busy and develop its own water for its own use. I like that philosophy. I always have liked that philosophy from any State in the Union. That is just what we have done in Arizona, and during my years in the Senate I have had opportunity to help other States do likewise with real and tangible results. I intend to try to assist California's State engineer, Mr. A. D. Edmonston, to carry out his program, for it is just plain common sense to go get water where there is water and not try to get water where there is not water. In Mr. Edmonston's presentation to his constituents he

showed that there were millions of acre-feet of water wasting unused to the ocean from California's streams north of San Francisco while all this clamor went on over the waters of the Colorado. He went on to point out that, "On the basis of the inventory of the water resources and estimates of the ultimate water requirements so far made, adequate water supplies can be developed and regulated from California's water resources," and continued to state just how this could be done.

In his report Mr. Edmonston states that the board of which he is the chairman was created by act of the California Legislature passed in 1945, and directed to make an investigation of the water resources of the State on a State-wide basis. The data which he accumulated show a seasonal run-off in acre-feet in California amounting to 70,794,000 acre-feet. The principal sources of that run-off are the north coastal area, where 28,000,000 acre-feet is the seasonal average, and the Central Valley, where 33,000,000 acre-feet is the seasonal average. The tabulation in the report shows that division.

Mr. Edmonston states:

Comparing the ultimate water requirements of the several areas with the available water supplies therein, it is found that the north-coast and central-coast areas and the Sacramento River Basin have available water supplies in excess of their ultimate needs. On the other hand, the San Francisco Bay area, the San Joaquin River Basin—including the Tulare Lake Basin—and the South Pacific coast, Lahontan, and Colorado desert areas have ultimate water requirements far in excess of their available local water supplies.

It is quite evident, therefore, that in any plan for the ultimate development and utilization of the water resources of the State, water must be transferred from the areas of surplus water supply to areas of deficiency. The areas from which these surpluses must come are the Sacramento River Basin and the north coast.

Another paragraph reads as follows:

On the basis of the inventory of the water resources and estimates of the ultimate water requirements so far made, adequate water supplies can be developed and regulated from California's water resources, including California's rights in and to the waters of the Colorado River, in available surface reservoir sites and ground water basins to meet the probable ultimate water requirements in the State without importing water from a source outside of the State of California, such as the Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Earlier in his remarks the Senator mentioned some of the amounts of water which are running down the Colorado into the sea. Is it not a fact that under the Colorado River agreements the water was divided between the upper basin States and the lower basin States, and that the upper basin States have a clear allocation of 7,500,000 acre-feet. They have not yet had the opportunity to develop all their projects. So it is entirely possible that a large part of the water which is flowing into the sea at the moment happens to be water which, under the allocations, will go to the upper basin States. Is not that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. The point I am making is that the metropolitan water acqueduct was never filled, and was never used to its capacity at any time when water was in the Colorado River that could have been taken over the mountains into southern California.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator does not deny, does he, that the State of California has firm contracts with the Federal Government for 5,362,000 acre-feet?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do deny that. I deny the validity of the second contract. There is no doubt about the right of the State of California to use 4,400,000 acre-feet of water, which amount of water the State pledged itself to take out of the Colorado.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the so-called 3 (a) water?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. That is the 7,500,000 acre-feet of water allocated by the compact to the lower basin.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then they were to get one-half of the so-called surplus water.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the unfortunate thing is that California interests first got a contract for apportioned water and then they discovered that the amount of surplus water might not be available. My opinion is that what they are trying to do is to validate a contract for water which may not be in the river for them; and the only way to do it is to take that water away from the State of Arizona.

To continue with Mr. Edmonston's report, which is most interesting, he states:

The advantages of the proposed plan for furnishing a supplemental water supply to the western slope of the San Joaquin Valley, and the south coast and Lahontan areas are that the conduit would traverse in large part terrain underdeveloped, would not interfere with the operation of existing water supply systems, would not involve any exchange of waters, would be so located to furnish by gravity from the conduit additional water supplies to existing systems and to new areas capable of development and in need of water. It is feasible of construction from both engineering and geological standpoints, and it is believed would have a first cost less than any other plan and would be capable of serving a complete supplemental water supply for the full development of the south coast area and the desert area in Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties.

The estimated annual supplemental water that would be diverted from the delta in accord with this plan are 2,000,000 acre-feet for about 1,000,000 acres on the west and south sides of the San Joaquin Valley, 2,500,000 acre-feet for the south coast area, and 2,500,000 acre-feet for the desert area, or a total of 7,000,000 acre-feet.

In other words, by merely going to the wasting waters of California to the North, Mr. Edmonston sets forth that it would be possible to bring this water southward to irrigate great areas of California north of the Tehachapis which are now without water supply, and then continue onward by tunneling through the Tehachapi Mountains to reach the San Diego, Los Angeles, and Riverside County areas with new good sweet water, and plenty of it—in fact, millions of acre-feet of higher quality water, more than any Californian has ever said California had a right to from the Colorado Basin.

This does not take water away from anyone. It is new water, over and above future needs for anyone else, water that is now wasting from California into the Pacific Ocean.

That is 7,000,000 acre-feet of water which California can get, its own water, water from the State of California. That is almost 2,000,000 acre-feet more than the total amount of Colorado River water that anyone in California ever said California was entitled to.

I like Mr. Edmonston's idea. He has not fallen into this narrow-vision defeatist philosophy that the Colorado is southern California's last water hole and that the only way southern California can prosper is to take neighboring States' water from the Colorado. He starts to solve his problem by the more sensible method of looking for water for California where there is water in California, and to me that makes a great deal more sense than telling neighboring States they must not develop their water because California might want it some time. I am going to help him, and I am delighted to see that California's own State engineer takes such a long-visioned approach. I stand with him on a philosophy of plenty instead of a philosophy of scarcity.

Mr. Edmonston stated in his report that he has the wholehearted cooperation of Federal agencies in conducting his studies. The reclamation law, in which I have long been interested, and under which California has received many benefits, both in the Central Valley and in southern California, requires that the Secretary of the Interior investigate and report to the Congress on possibilities of irrigating arid land. I happen to know that for several years the United States Bureau of Reclamation has been conducting even more extensive studies along the same lines as are outlined by Mr. Edmonston. Those studies were undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation, not only because of the general requirement in reclamation law on the Secretary of the Interior but also at the specific instruction of the Congress in a resolution introduced by another Californian of great vision, the late Representative Richard Welch, of San Francisco.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as an exhibit at the conclusion of my remarks the entire statement made by Mr. Edmonston to which I have referred.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HAYDEN. Back in the Eightieth Congress, Dick Welch, a Republican, who served as chairman of the House Public Lands Committee, brought before his committee a resolution, which was passed by the committee, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report upon the long-

distance diversion of water from the Pacific Northwest, including northern California, to the southward to meet the requirements of southern California and Arizona. That investigation has gone forward and a report will be made to the Congress upon the results of such studies, which will be, I hope, even more complete than Mr. Edmonston's able work.

Here we have a most responsible California public official abandoning the philosophy of scarcity and laying down the thesis that California has water of its own to meet its own requirements without taking any neighbor's water from outside its own confines. I am sure that he knows what he is talking about, which is, that California can achieve its destiny with its own water supplies.

I understand that the Reclamation Bureau report, which I mentioned previously, is practically complete. In fact, I have seen newspaper reports to the effect that it is at the insistence of certain California Representatives that the report has not been made public up to this time. Perhaps they think the information it contains might be of interest to the Senate in connection with the passage of the pending bill. Be that as it may, I now insist that the Reclamation Bureau make its report public at the earliest possible date, because when the pending bill reaches the House of Representatives the information contained in the report will be of the greatest interest to the Members of that body.

There is another question which I should like to ask. Why is it that the Californians seek delay? No substantial irrigation or power development can take place on the Colorado River or its tributaries without aid from the Federal Treasury. That aid cannot be obtained except by votes in Congress and the approval of the President. The 1940 census found approximately 7,000,000 people in that State and therefore it has now 23 Representatives in Congress. The latest census shows a population of 10,586,223 which means that in 1952 there will be at least 30 California Congressmen and the State will have 32 electoral votes. As it now stands, California has a great advantage, but if any additional use of Colorado River water can be postponed until 1952, the probability of blocking further development anywhere in the basin except California will be materially enhanced.

If the central Arizona project and other projects in other States can be stalled off for another 10 years and the hoped-for 5,000,000 additional people come to southern California, the political power of that State will be further enhanced. In the meantime, the underground water upon which the people in Arizona are now relying will be exhausted and these people will be compelled to leave Arizona and will not be counted when the census taker makes his rounds.

The people who speak for New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, after making many contacts and holding fruitless conferences with the Californians, know just what they have in mind. That is why the accredited representatives of these four States have on various occasions approved resolutions supporting the central Arizona project. I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 8, 1950, such a resolution. I call attention to a similar resolution recently passed by the Upper Colorado River Commission:

Whereas, in their comments on the central Arizona project at the time the report on such project was submitted for comments pursuant to provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, the States represented on the Upper Colorado River Commission either endorsed the authorization of such project or offered no objections to such authorization; and

Whereas, having once more considered the question of the feasibility of the project, the Upper Colorado River Commission deems that the central Arizona project is feasible; and

Whereas the Upper Colorado River Commission recognizes the extreme need for the project to prevent the collapse of the economy of a sovereign State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Upper Colorado River Commission does hereby endorse authorization of the central Arizona project in accordance with the terms of S. 75 and H. R. 1500 now pending in the Congress.

The southern Californians base their claim to a greater share of their water from the Colorado River upon the needs of an ever-increasing population. The number of people in the southern half of that State has jumped from 2,932,795 in 1930 to 3,541,603 in 1940, and to 5,436,025 in 1950. With true California optimism, they confidently expect another 5,000,000 in the next 10 years. They therefore demand that Congress deny Arizona's claim to its share of Colorado River water, or at least indefinitely delay any recognition of that claim until they will be in a better position to get it.

Today there is an acute shortage of power in southern California, just as there is in Arizona. Arizona has indicated her willingness to contract for all of the commercial power that can be produced at Bridge Canyon Dam. Power from Davis Dam, which has just come on the line, was greatly oversubscribed. This power shortage is serious even without the demands that will undoubtedly be made for defense purposes.

If southern California could be assured of control over all of Bridge Canyon power without any aid for irrigation in Arizona, they would be enthusiastically supporting authorizations and appropriations for the immediate construction of that dam, silt or no silt. In proof of what I am saying, I quote from an annual report of the metropolitan water district of Los Angeles:

The department has maintained the position that no further Colorado River projects involving withdrawal of water from the lower basin should be authorized until the decision of the Nation's highest Court has finally determined the rights of the States.

In the meantime, department engineers are continuing cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation in exploring dam sites, and in urging authorization by the Congress of development of hydroelectric power. A suitable site already has been determined at Bridge Canyon, and drilling is being carried on at Glen Canyon to locate a satisfactory location.

Power dams at Bridge Canyon and Glen Canyon, neither of which involve withdrawal of water from the river, and which were included in the original plans for the development of the Colorado, are needed to supply the constantly expanding markets created by the population and industrial growth of all three lower-basin States. The combined projects, which can duplicate the contribution of Hoover Dam to the economy of the Southwest, without cost to the Government, will provide 1,535,000 kilowatts of generating capacity and utilize water power equivalent to consumption of 15,000,000 barrels of fuel oil annually—energy that will flow on, forever wasted, until harnessed for the production of electricity.

The people who live in southern California need power much more than they need water, and complete proof of that is that up until now much less than the 4,400,000 acre-feet of water which Arizona concedes to California has been put to beneficial consumptive use. Let us put this matter in another way. If there was no proposed irrigation development which required pumping, if only gravity water was taken from the Colorado River, then none of the Bridge Canyon power would be used for pumping, and if there were no irrigation subsidy in connection with the Bridge Canyon power, such power would be much cheaper. If southern California could get this cheaper power without any irrigation-subsidy burden, they would be happy. I say the principle of an irrigation subsidy from power is exactly the same at Bridge Canyon in Arizona as it is in the Central Valley project in California, the Missouri Basin, or in the Columbia Basin, or anywhere else. It is impossible to proceed with any further irrigation developments throughout the entire arid West without a substantial power subsidy, and as far as Arizona is concerned, the Bridge Canyon Dam is wholly within our State and we are willing to contract for that power at a price that will repay irrigation costs beyond the ability of the farmers to repay.

On numerous occasions the California opponents of the bill have taken the position that the proposed legislation is in conflict with a report of the Water Resources Policy Commission. An examination of this report reveals that it consists of 3 volumes.

Volume I is the actual report of the Commission and represents the result of the study made by the Commission and their conclusions. I do not want to be critical of this report, but I do want to point out that if it is carefully examined, there are a number of statements made that may be susceptible of more than one interpretation. Until there is presented to Congress for consideration, legislation to implement and put into effect the recommendations and conclusions contained in the report, there is no ground for any deliberate consideration of the report, and of course, until Congress does enact some law as a result of the report, the report can be considered nothing more than advice and recommendations to Congress. Congress, after all, has to decide the questions involved.

I understand that a bill is being drafted by the members of the Commission, and undoubtedly will be submitted to Congress, to carry out the recommendations of the Commission. The quotation which I note on the billboard behind me is not a quotation from the report of the Commission; it is a quotation from information gathered by a task force.

Volume II of the report is in effect not a report of the Commission at all. This volume is entitled "The Ten Rivers in America's Future," and in the covering letter the Commission expressly points out that this volume consists of studies prepared as a background to assist the Commission in working out the policy recommendations in volume I, and the statement is made that "although the material contained in the studies has been available to assist the members of the Commission in their work, this volume has not been reviewed in detail by all the Commissioners." So this volume is in effect a compilation of data submitted by the experts or staff members who worked for and with the Commission, and it is from this particular volume that quotations have been made from time to time by opponents of the bill now before us—quotations which these opponents contend indicate a conflict between the provisions of the pending bill and the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. This is not true. The conflict, if any, is between certain of the staff members and the bill, and not between the bill and the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

There is one final matter that I would like to discuss briefly, namely, that in the propaganda that has been used by California opponents of the bill in their effort to block its enactment, every attempt has been made to convey the impression that a very large sum of money is to be taken out of the Federal Treasury at a time when there is a great demand for economy in operation of the Government and a still greater demand for defense purposes.

The size of the sum of money mentioned in connection with this project has been violently exaggerated, and the thought is conveyed that the whole amount is to be expended in this critical time when the national debt is being increased for defense purposes.

Beyond doubt, $708,780,000 is a sizable sum of money to be made available by Congress for any purpose if it were to be used in any 1-year or 2-year period. However, despite the propaganda to the contrary, such is not the fact because the bill delays any appropriation for irrigation works, estimated to cost $267,000,000, until after the Supreme Court of the United States has had an opportunity to pass upon the question of the availability of the Colorado River water for the project. There may be eight parties to that lawsuit—the United States and the seven States of the Colorado River Basin. No one knows how long it will take all of these interested parties to prepare for and argue the case, and how long thereafter it will take the Supreme Court to decide it.

There are included in the bill a number of features on which construction will not be commenced for a number of years. When the bill becomes a law and when Congress sees fit to make appropriations for the project, common sense and orderly procedure would indicate, first, the construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam. It will take, according to the engineers' estimates, from 5 to 10 years to build that great dam. It is necessary to have the dam well on the way before any other works are undertaken. There must first be the power from the dam to lift the water into the aqueduct.

When construction of the Bridge Canyon dam is almost complete, the necessary power features will have to be installed, and all of this will take considerable time.

After all of this is done and after power is actually available, if Arizona then has been successful in the Supreme Court on the water question, the main aqueduct from Havasu Lake to McDowell Reservoir in central Arizona can be undertaken. It cannot be undertaken at an earlier date. Then, and only then, can some of the other works provided for in the bill be undertaken.

Many of the different features which are very necessary to the full development of the project will, as a matter of common sense, not be undertaken for several years. It has been estimated that completion of all of the features of this project may require as much as 15 or 20 years after work has first begun.

I should now like to take time to discuss in some detail the reason for and the effect of the amendment that my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], mentioned in his opening statement. I have joined him in submitting the amendment. It will take the place of the present section 15 of the bill. We thought that by section 15 we had provided in no uncertain terms that no construction of any portion of the project would be commenced while materials and manpower were needed for the national defense. This was always our intention, and this was what we thought section 15 provided for. However, opponents of the bill have on numerous occasions attempted to say that authorization of the project at this time would be in conflict with the national defense effort. In order that this matter may be definitely settled, in order that there can be no misunderstanding, in order that once and for all we can make it crystal clear that we are not seeking authorization for appropriations that will in any way interfere with the national defense effort, we have prepared and as my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona, has pointed out, we are offering an amendment that will definitely accomplish that result.

The amendment provides that no appropriation for any portion of the project is authorized and no construction of any portion of the project can be commenced during the period of the present national emergency when manpower and materials are needed for the defense effort. This is a simple, clear-cut provision, exactly what we always have had in mind.

In the first place, we do not want to build the project or any portion of it with the present prevailing high prices of manpower and materials. We know that the time will come when manpower and materials will not be so critically needed for national defense and when the cost of construction of the project will be decreased. These conditions may be expected on the basis of the situation that existed a little over a year ago. Construction costs reached a peak during the years 1947 and 1948, and then began to decline. Contracts were being let for less than the estimated costs based on the 1947 prices. When it became necessary for us to send troops to Korea and to manufacture munitions for them and to supply them with food and clothing, prices naturally increased. It is only reasonable to expect that costs will go down when the demand for war materials and supplies for the armed services drops off.

But more important still, under no circumstances would we have the people of the United States, and particularly Members of Congress, think that we want to build all or any portion of this project while manpower and necessary materials are needed in the national defense effort. Such was never our intention, and by this amendment we make it certain, once and for all, that not one dime can be appropriated or spent on any portion of this project until the materials and manpower necessary to build the project can be used without conflicting with the national defense effort, and, of course, until the Congress believes that in the interest of the national economy, appropriations for construction of the project are justified. Any propaganda about a raid on the Federal Treasury at this particular time is just another example of the misleading and delaying tactics that have been employed either to deefat or postpone action on this bill.

Again I emphasize that what we are trying to do by means of this bill is to secure an authorization that will enable us without further delay to have the Supreme Court of the United States take jurisdiction over the water-rights dispute that has been so long drawn out, and to get that dispute settled beyond any future question. If, as we confidently expect, the Court decides that Arizona is entitled to the water necessary for this project, and if the needs of the national defense effort are such that manpower and materials can be released, and if the national economy justifies the making of the necessary appropriations, then, as I have heretofore pointed out, we can proceed in an orderly fashion, over a period of years, to build the central Arizona project, which is of vital importance to my State, and certainly is in the national interest.

In conclusion, I emphasize: First, that this is not a new reclamation project; second, that it is a rescue project; third, that the benefits, direct or indirect, particularly the Federal taxes that will be saved and paid as a result of the authorization of the project, will greatly exceed

the cost of the project; fourth, that the United States as a whole will benefit materially from this development; and fifth, that in the interest of the economy and welfare of the United States, Congress must approve this project.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF A. D. EDMONSTON, STATE ENGINEER, AT MEETING OF AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION, SECTION OF HYDROLOGY AND METEOROLOGY, FRESNO, CALIF., FEBRUARY 9, 1951

Mr. Chairman, members of the section of hydrology and meteorology, American Geophysical Union, and friends, I wish to express my appreciation at this time for the opportunity to appear at this meeting of your organization and present a paper on the water resources of California. It is a privilege and an honor.

The setting is significant. For it is here in the Kings River delta that you have one of the earliest and now probably the most extensive and comprehensive use of water for irrigation than in any place in the United States. It is reported that the first water was turned out of the Kings River in 1867 to irrigate a small acreage. Now nearly 1,000,000 acres are under intensive cultivation producing crops having an unprocessed value of nearly $200,000,000 annually. Also, only 2 months ago, a flood of previously unrecorded proportions, 80,000 second-feet, coursed down the Kings River, causing destruction in its path. This situation however is to be corrected in the near future by the Pine Flat Dam now under construction with Federal funds, by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

In presenting or discussing the subject, Water Resources of California, I believe it is of interest to mention that California was admitted to the Union of States in 1850, 100 years ago. The area of the State, then and now, is 100,000,000 acres. The stream systems are the same and topographic conditions have not changed to any material extent. The population, on the other hand, has increased in these 100 years from 92,600 to 10,600,000. This tremendous increase in population has resulted in widespread development and utilization of water for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes to the extent that now the use of water in California aggregates 20,000,000 acre-feet annually, substantially greater than the use in any other State in the Union and approximating the domestic use in the entire United States. Approximately one-half of the water so used in California comes from surface streams and reservoirs, and one-half from ground water basins.

The purpose of this paper is not to review or discuss the history of this past development and the legal, engineering, and administrative problems that it generated, but to present information on a study of the water resources of the State being conducted by the State division of water resources under the direction of the State water resources board, looking to the future needs of the people of the State. This board, created by chapter 1514, Statutes of 1945, was directed by chapter 1541, Statutes of 1947, to make an investigation of the water resources of the State on a State-wide basis. The adopted investigational program has for its objective the preparation of a plan for the full practicable conservation, control, and utilization of the State's water resources, both surface and underground, to meet present and future water needs for all beneficial purposes in all areas of the State. This plan has been designated "The California Water Plan."

It is planned to submit the results of this investigation in four printed bulletins. Bulletin No. 1 is now in the process of being printed. It contains a State-wide inventory of water resources, including tabulations of precipitation, runoff, flood frequencies, and quality of surface and ground waters. Bulletin No. 2 will set forth information on present water utilization and water requirements, including data on land use, consumptive use of water, and water available under existing rights and development for present and potential water service areas throughout the State. Bulletin No. 3 will present the California water plan for the conservation, control, protection, and utilization of the waters of the State. Bulletin No. 4 will summarize in concise form, the data contained in the first three bulletins.

Field and office work has been carried on concurrently on all phases of the investigations in preparation for the foregoing bulletins. Excellent cooperation has been received from Federal and State agencies and others having an interest in the study and the prospective plan.

The data in Bulletin No. 1 relating to runoff of the stream systems in California may be summarized by the seven major geographical areas as follows:

Area	Seasonal runoff in acre-feet	
	Average season	Percent of total
North coastal	23,886,000	40.8
San Francisco Bay	1,240,000	1.8
Central coastal	2,448,000	3.4
South coastal	1,227,000	1.7
Central Valley	33,637,000	47.5
Lahontan	3,177,000	4.5
Colorado Desert	179,000	.3
Total	70,794,000	100.0

The foregoing tabulation does not include the seasonal runoff of the Colorado River, estimated at about 18,000,000 acre-feet per year at Yuma, under natural conditions and in which California has rights in the amount of 5,362,000 acre-feet annually.

The studies with reference to water utilization and water requirements have not progressed sufficiently so far as to present figures for the entire State. However, approximate preliminary estimates are available for some of the areas.

In all of the studies leading to the formulation of the plans for the development and utilization of the water resources in any particular area, first and prime consideration is given to the requirements, both present and ultimate, for all uses in the local area, before a determination is made of the amounts of surplus waters that may be available for exportation to areas of deficient supply. For example, in the north coast area provision is being made not only for domestic, municipal, irrigation and industrial uses, but also for recreational needs, and for development of hydroelectric power.

Comparing the ultimate water requirements of the several areas with the available water supplies therein, it is found that the north coast and central coast areas and the Sacramento River Basin have available water supplies in excess of their ultimate needs. On the other hand, the San Francisco Bay area, the San Joaquin River Basin (including the Tulare Lake Basin) and the South Pacific coast, Lahontan and Colorado Desert areas have ultimate water requirements far in excess of their available local water supplies.

It is quite evident, therefore, that in any plan for the ultimate development and utilization of the water resources of the State, water must be transferred from the areas of surplus water supply to areas of deficiency. The areas from which these surpluses must come are the Sacramento River Basin and the north coast. The central coast surplus exists only in the narrow coast line southerly from the Monterey Peninsula and is relatively small in total quantity and the area is lacking in suitable reservoir sites for the regulation and control of such surplus waters. On the other hand, many reservoir sites feasible of development from engineering and geologic standpoints exist in the north coast area and the Sacramento River Basin. In the north coast area, more than 50 dam and reservoir sites have been found physically feasible of development to an aggregate reservoir capacity of 16,000,000 acre-feet and capable of being utilized to produce more than 2,000,000 kilowatts of electric power, an amount almost equal to all the present hydroelectric power installations in California. In the Sacramento River Basin, reservoir sites in excess of 40 in number and capable of storing more than 15,000,000 acre-feet of water are also feasible of development. With these installations, the ultimate requirements of those two areas can be met and, in addition, provide surplus waters to areas of deficient water supply.

On the basis of the inventory of the water resources and estimates of the ultimate water requirements so far made, adequate water supplies can be developed and regulated from California's water resources, including California's rights in and to the waters of the Colorado River, in available surface reservoir sites and ground water basins to meet the probable ultimate water requirements in the State without importing water from a source outside of the State of California, such as the Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest.

The general plan proposed for the development of the water resources of the north coastal area calls for the construction of a series of multipurpose reservoirs of relatively large capacity on the major stream systems which have relatively low gradients and widely varying seasonal flow. A hydroelectric power plant would be located at each dam. The reservoirs would be operated for water conservation, flood control, power generation, maintenance of stream flows throughout the year for propagation and maintenance of fish life and recreational purposes, and providing surplus waters for exportation when needed to the areas of deficient supply. In the Sacramento River Basin, the reservoirs would be operated for domestic, municipal, irrigation, and navigation purposes, flood control, electric power generation, recreation, and propagation and maintenance of fish life.

The plan presently contemplated for serving the areas of deficiency heretofore mentioned would divert water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the central source of supply, at sea level. For the San Francisco Bay area, the point of diversion would be on Italian slough at the Alameda-Contra Costa County line. The water would be lifted by pumping to an elevation of 700 feet, whence it would be conveyed through a tunnel some 8,000 feet in length to an available regulatory storage site on the north side of Livermore Valley. Releases from this storage would be conveyed through two branch conduits. One branch would bear southerly, serving the south bay shore of Alameda County and the east side of the Santa Clara Valley, with terminal storage in a reservoir to be constructed to elevation about 500 feet on Silver Creek near Evergreen, 7 miles east of San Jose. The other branch would bear westerly to a reservoir in Crow Canyon capable of development to 80,000 acre-feet to serve supplementary water to the central bay shore area of Alameda County. It would also be physically possible to supply additional water to upper San Leandro and San Pablo Reservoirs of the East Bay Municipal Utility District and to areas in Contra Costa County through extensions of this branch. Supplementary water could be made available from the conveyance system to Livermore Valley and the Niles Cone. The distances from the intake

at Italian slough are approximately 52 miles to the Silver Creek reservoir site and approximately 26 miles to the Crow Canyon site.

The conduit to serve the west side of the San Joaquin Valley and southern California which has been studied preliminarily would divert from Old River in the San Joaquin Delta about 5 miles northwest of Tracy. The water would be lifted through four pumping plants to a canal at elevation 225 feet and would parallel the Delta-Mendota canal from one-quarter to one-half mile to the west for 85 miles to a point near the south line of Merced County, where a pumping plant would lift the water to elevation 400 feet. The canal would then follow approximately on grade contour along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley passing west of Huron and Kettleman City, to the Buena Vista Hills, a distance of about 250 miles from the point of diversion where another pumping plant would lift the water to elevation 550 feet. The canal would then extend southerly 5 miles east of Taft and thence easterly about 25 miles due south of Bakersfield. At this point a pump lift would raise the water to elevation 900 feet, and within 3 miles through another pump lift to elevation 1,300 feet to Pastoria Creek. Five pump lifts located along that creek would lift the water to elevation 3,300 feet to 6.5 mile tunnel which would convey the water through the Tehachapi Mountains to the divide between the Santa Clara River Basin and the desert, 310 miles distant from the point of diversion in the San Joaquin Delta. The canal would then follow easterly along the desert side of the mountains toward Fairmont Reservoir of the city of Los Angeles, passing that reservoir about one-half mile to the west and 250 feet above the water level of the Los Angeles aqueduct; then would follow above and south of the Antelope Valley to mile 340 where a tunnel through Portal Ridge would emerge into Amargosa Creek. The canal would follow the south side of Amargosa Creek Basin to a point south of the Palmdale Reservoir about 450 feet above that reservoir. The direction would then be south across Soledad Pass, along the south side of Antelope Valley, crossing Little Rock Creek below the Little Rock-Palmdale Dam. The course would then be easterly across the Mojave Desert above the town of Hesperia, thence southerly to a crossing of the Mojave River, and to the east portal of a 4-mile tunnel at elevation 3,250 feet, into Devils Canyon, a tributary to the Santa Ana River. The route of this conduit would then follow easterly along the south slope of the mountains about 7 miles north of San Bernardino and Redlands; thence south about 10 miles east of Redlands; then easterly to a point 3 miles northeast of Beaumont into a siphon at elevation 3,200 feet to a low of 2,525 feet elevation across the San Gorgonio Pass between Beaumont and Banning. The conduit would then extend southerly along the mountains east of the San Jacinto Valley, crossing the Riverside-San Diego County line and then toward Lake Henshaw, passing above that reservoir. From that point the route would be southerly to a crossing of headwaters of the San Diego and Sweetwater Rivers and to a terminus at a tributary of Tia Juana River at an elevation of 3,150 feet, for a total length of canal of 675 miles from the point of diversion in the San Joaquin Delta.

A conduit route that would serve Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties also has been studied. It would divert at elevation 550 feet from the conduit about 270 miles from the point of diversion in the San Joaquin Delta. Here a pumping plant would lift the water to elevation 1,000 feet, then a series of 250-foot lifts with short lengths of canal between the lifts would raise the water to elevation 3,500 feet. A 5.5-mile tunnel at the intake on Santiago Creek would discharge into Quatal Canyon which drains into the Cuyama River, with additional conduits, water could be delivered from this point to the headwaters of the Sisquoc, Santa Ynez, and Ventura Rivers.

The advantages of the proposed plan for furnishing a supplemental water supply to the western slope of the San Joaquin Valley and the south coast and Lahontan areas are that the conduit would traverse in large part terrain undeveloped, would not interfere with the operation of existing water supply systems, would not involve any exchange of waters, would be so located to furnish by gravity from the conduit additional water supplies to existing systems and to new areas capable of development and in need of water. It is feasible of construction from both engineering and geological standpoints and it is believed would have a first cost less than any other plan and would be capable of serving a complete supplemental water supply for the full development of the south coast area and the desert areas in Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties.

The estimated annual supplemental water that would be diverted from the delta in accord with this plan are 2,000,000 acre-feet for about 1,000,000 acres on the west and south sides of the San Joaquin Valley, 2,500,000 acre-feet for the south coast area, and 2,500,000 acre-feet for the desert area, or a total of 7,000,000 acre-feet.

A study of the available water supply in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta over the past 10 years shows that a demand of 600,000 acre-feet per month could have been met over and above the demands of salinity control, delta consumptive use, irrigation of delta uplands, and full continuous operation of the Delta-Mendota canal (4,600 second-feet) and Contra Costa canal (325 second-feet) for a minimum period of 5 months to a maximum of 8 months in any one year. To furnish a demand of 600,000 acre-feet per month throughout the year would require supplemental storage in the Sacramento River Basin or in the north coast area.

Analyses of the water available in the delta show that its chemical quality is class I for irrigation and that it falls well within accepted standards for drinking water. For domestic and municipal uses, however, the water would require bacteriological treatment as do practically all raw waters.

The plan of utilizing the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as the source of supply and point of diversion has many practical advantages. The point of diversion is below all riparian owners and users of water in the basin above the delta and, therefore, is not subject to objection by such owners. The delta channels are recipient of all the flood flows and return waters from an area of about 50,000 square miles. The supply to the delta, therefore, is not dependent on the vagaries of a single stream. Water developed in any part of the Sacramento or San Joaquin River Basins could find its way by gravity to the delta, and the same is true of surplus water that would be transferred from the north coastal area to the Sacramento River Basin.

In this State-wide investigation and study, being conducted by the division of water resources under the direction of the State water resources board, wholehearted cooperation is being received from Federal and State agencies and departments, private companies, and individuals. It is only through such cooperation that it will be possible to formulate a sound feasible plan for the future development and utilization of the waters of this State.

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

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to take a few minutes to clear up some of the points raised by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

In the first place, he has left the impression, perhaps, in the minds of some of his listeners that it is a matter which would concern only a fraction of the population of California, in the southern section of that State. I would say that it is a very substantial fraction which is involved, and I wish to make the record perfectly clear that it concerns not only the southern area of California, but is of concern to the entire State.

I should like to read at this time Joint Resolution No. 1, passed by the Legislature of California in January of this year. On January 12 it was passed by the State senate, and on January 16 it was passed by the assembly. It reads as follows:

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill which would authorize construction of the central Arizona reclamation project; and

Whereas no provision is made for payment by the project of any part of the interest on the national debt, which would be incurred to construct the project; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has reported that he estimates the cost of the project at $708,000,000 and the time for the recovery of the principal at 75 years and, therefore, that the project would cost the taxpayers of the United States for interest alone, at 2½ percent per annum, in excess of $2,000,000,000; and

Whereas the taxpayers of California would be required to pay in excess of $172,000,000 of such interest; and

Whereas the central Arizona project is designed to provide irrigation at exorbitant cost to grow common field crops, with the result that additional taxes would be required to pay Government subsidies on such crops and such project would not, therefore, enhance the national welfare; and

Whereas the central Arizona project would require the use of 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power annually (the equivalent to the use of 2,500,000 barrels of fuel oil) to pump irrigation water to a height of 1,000 feet, and such use would be an economic waste of an urgently needed public resource; and

Whereas the construction cost of the irrigation features of the project alone would be many times the value of the land, when irrigated and the irrigators would not repay any part of such construction cost; and

Whereas such central Arizona project is, therefore, economically unsound; and

Whereas sufficient water for such central Arizona project could be secured only by diverting to that project water now needed to serve authorized and existing projects in the lower basin of the Colorado River; and

Whereas the diversion of water from such existing projects would jeopardize the water supply of over 4,000,000 residents of California, who, in reliance on their contracts for water executed by the United States Government, have invested more than $500,000,000 to provide facilities to enable them to use their share of water and power from the Colorado River; and

Whereas the rights of California to the use of Colorado River water have been established by prior appropriations and by contracts with the Secretary of the Interior under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the Secretary of the Interior has declared that "If the contentions of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply available from the Colorado River for this diversion": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to refuse passage of any bill authorizing the Central Arizona project as proposed; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt legislation consenting to the joinder of the United States in an interstate suit in the Supreme Court for the determination of the water rights of the States of the lower basin of the Colorado River; and be it further

Resolved, That the Colorado River Board of California and all other agencies and officers of the State of California are directed to use all means within their power to carry out the objectives of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President, to the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the chairman of appropriate congressional committees, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

I merely wanted the record to be clear that the viewpoint which we have expressed is the viewpoint of the entire State of California and not the viewpoint of simply one segment of the State.

Mr. President, I think the Senate might be interested in a resolution which was adopted at the sixty-ninth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, which met in Houston, Tex., on September 18, 1950. I read from page 31 of the official proceedings of that convention:

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Resolution 29, by Delegate W. J. Bassett, Central Labor Council, Los Angeles, Calif.:

"Whereas a bill which provides for the proposed central Arizona project is now before Congress; and

"Whereas the central Arizona project, under the guise of reclamation is designed to provide irrigation at exorbitant cost for a relatively small acreage of land to grow common field crops; and

"Whereas data supplied by Secretary of the Interior, Oscar L. Chapman, reveals that the Arizona project will cost American taxpayers $2,075,729,000 for interest alone; and

"Whereas to supply irrigation through the central Arizona project would require 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power annually to lift irrigation water to a height of 1,000 feet and carry it over 300 miles in an expensive canal; and

"Whereas construction cost for irrigation features alone is estimated to be over $1,800 an acre; and

"Whereas the field crops anticipated through irrigation provided by the central Arizona project are the same crops which are now in surplus and are being subsidized by the United States Government; and

"Whereas the exorbitant cost of construction and operation of the central Arizona project will not add to the national welfare, but will create additional taxes through an increase in surplus crops which must be subsidized by the United States Government: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the sixty-ninth convention of the American Federation of Labor convening on the 18th of September 1950, in Houston, Tex., instruct the officers to oppose the adoption of this legislation which would create an unjustifiable heavy tax burden for a project that will not enhance the Nation's economy."

Referred to committee on resolutions.

It is shown on page 31 that the resolution was referred to the committee on resolutions. What I have just read was from the report of the Monday morning session, the session of the first day.

Then, in the report of the proceedings of the fifth day, the Friday morning session, on page 475, the following comment appears:

Resolution 29, by Delegate W. J. Bassett, Central Labor Council, Los Angeles, Calif., and Resolution 39, by Delegate C. J. Haggerty, California State Federation of Labor.

Resolutions 29 and 39 deal with the same subject matter. They are identical. Your committee recommends the adoption of Resolution 29. No action is necessary on Resolution 39. Committee Secretary Soderstrom moved the adoption of the committee's report. The motion was seconded and carried.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the point at which I read the resolution by the American Federation of Labor opposing the central Arizona project, a resolution which was adopted by the National Grange at its eighty-fourth annual session, in Minneapolis, Minn., November 15–25, 1950, in opposition to the central Arizona project.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE OPPOSING ARIZONA PROJECT BILL

Whereas a bill is now before the Congress which, if passed, will authorize the central Arizona project; and

Whereas the proponents of the bill admit that it is designed to rescue about 226,000 acres of land where the underground supply of water is being or has been voluntarily overdrawn; and

Whereas the construction costs of the irrigation features designed to serve the "rescued" land will amount to more than $1,800 per acre, with little, if any, of the cost being repaid by the landowners; and

Whereas Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, has officially stated to Congress that the central Arizona project will cost the American taxpayers over $2,000,000,000 for interest alone, which will not be repaid, and

Whereas the central Arizona project can be built and operated only if the established principles of economic feasibility as set forth in the national reclamation laws are grossly violated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Grange does hereby oppose the passage of this legislation and urges its defeat.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should now like to call attention to a number of other factors that have been raised during the course of the discussion. It has been stated that the central Arizona project is comparable if not identical with the Central Valley project.

In 1947 the Secretary of the Interior transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report of the Bureau of Reclamation on engineering feasibility, the total estimated capital costs, and the allocation and probable repayment of these costs of the Central Valley Project of California—House Document 146, Eightieth Congress, first session.

This report represented a payment analysis which included a proposal to use the interest component of power revenues for repayment of irrigation construction costs, just as is now proposed to be done for the central Arizona project.

But the fact is that the Congress has never acted upon or approved the cost allocation and repayment program for the Central Valley project of California as set forth in that report of the Secretary of the Interior.

Furthermore, the State of California officially neither requested such a payout plan involving such proposed use of the interest component, nor has it approved the Bureau's report above referred to. Furthermore, reports issued by the State of California on proposed projects in California have never advocated use of the interest component as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

We are convinced that the Central Valley project is financially sound and that it can pay out in a period of 50 to 60 years with reasonable rates for water and power without resort to the use of the interest component, as proposed by the Bureau.

This proposal to use the interest component for repayment of irrigation construction costs, which the Bureau of Reclamation seeks to establish, based upon an opinion issued by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior in 1944, has never been approved by the Congress.

The effect of adopting such a principle of financing for multiple purpose reclamation projects, coupled with the proposed extension of the repayment period to 75 years or more, is clearly revealed by the report of the Secretary of the Interior that the cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the central Arizona project would be over $2,000,000,000. This would be the real cost to the Nation for a project with an estimated original construction cost of about $780,000,000, even if the reimbursable cost were paid back.

Extend this same principle to the billions of dollars of other projects being planned and the result would be such an unbearable and unjustified burden on the taxpayers that it is likely to stop further reclamation development in the West.

I pointed out in my remarks made to the Senate on Monday, May 28, and again on Tuesday, May 29, some of the factors that go into making the central Arizona project, as proposed, an unsound one. I repeat that I believe an argument perhaps can be made for changing the existing reclamation laws so that instead of a 40-year period to repay, with a 10-year development period, or making a total of 50 years, the Congress of the United States, in its wisdom, because of changed economic factors, might feel that under such circumstances the reclamation law itself should be changed to extend that period, we will say to 55 years, and there could be no objection from a policy point of view if the Congress, after proper hearings, reached that determination. But my point is that if Congress should

extend the period from 50 to 55 years, the same yardstick should apply to every project in the Nation, and that every project in the Nation which comes under the reclamation law should known in advance what the standards are under which it is eligible to receive Federal aid. If Congress, in its wisdom, after hearings before the proper legislative committee, wanted to extend the period to 60 years, there could be no objection to that change being made, but if the Congress of the United States wanted to change the reclamation law and make the period 60 years, then I say that that yardstick should apply to every project in the Nation which comes under the reclamation law.

As one who has supported reclamation in the West, and supported other projects such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, my objection to this project is that if the yardstick is destroyed, then there is no basis upon which to turn down future unsound projects. It is my judgment that if the Congress takes this path, those who advocate such unsound projects will ultimately so disgust the Members of Congress, and, more important, the American people who are already overburdened with taxes, that there will be a revulsion of feeling against the whole project for reclamation and other public developments. I believe those who represent the reclamation States should be the first to insist that we establish sound standards, that those standards be honest standards of feasibility, that we should be prepared to support those of our projects which can measure up to such sound and honest standards of feasibility, and when they cannot measure up to those standards of feasibility, we in the West should be the first to turn down those projects, because otherwise the confidence of the country will be destroyed in the whole theory of reclamation.

Mr. President, the assertion has been made that—

> The California contracts exceed the quantity of water permitted California by her Limitation Act; California seeks to violate that act.

My answer to that is:

First. These statements rest in pure assertion. They cannot be proved until the Court decides the controversy. They assume that Arizona is right, and California is wrong, on all contentions in the controversy.

Second. Since the Limitation Act was adopted, California's spokesmen have without exception stated, in public and in private, that California intends to honor and abide by its provisions.

Third. In the last case in the Supreme Court between Arizona and California—Two Hundred and Ninety-eighth United States Reports, page 558—the Court said, as to the California Limitation Act:

> By its provisions the use of the water by California is restricted to 5,484,500 acre-feet annually.

The California contracts aggregate 5,362,000 acre-feet annually.

Fourth. By article 7 (h) of Arizona's water contract with the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 9, 1944, "Arizona recognizes the right of the United States and agencies of the State of California to contract" for Colorado River water provided such contracts "shall not exceed the limitation of such uses" provided in the Limitation Act.

The assertion is made that California contributes no water to the Colorado River, yet she claims the lion's share of the river. My answer to that is that anyone who knows the water law of the Western States as well as do the Senators from Arizona must be aware:

First, that the foundation of that law is the doctrine of appropriation; that is, "first in time is first in right."

Second, that under that doctrine, the one who first uses his energy, money, labor, skill, and vision to divert water for a beneficial use and continues to do so with due diligence is rewarded by title to a water right.

Third, that whether an area originates the water is utterly immaterial. In fact, typically the area on which the water is used is not the area of its origin, and may be even hundreds of miles removed.

Fourth, that beginning as far back as 1877, California pioneers appropriated, before the other States did, large quantities of Colorado River water, and have risked their substance and strength since that time in continuous and diligent application of the water to beneficial use. Her present claims are primarily based on rights which vested in her citizens long before 1900.

The assertion is made that 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 acre-feet are annually wasting into the Gulf of California. That assertion was made this afternoon by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The question is asked, Why should Arizona not be entitled to use this wasted water?

My answer is, first, the correct figure is 7,000,000 acre-feet, according to the statement of Bureau Engineer E. G. Nielsen before the House committee on February 27, 1951.

Second, 5,000,000 acre-feet of this is the unused right of the Upper Basin, which is now using not more than 2,500,000 of the 7,500,000 acre-feet perpetually allotted to it by article III (a) of the Colorado River compact. No lower basin project, be it in Arizona, California, or Nevada, can be premised on the use of that water, which does not belong to them. It belongs to the upper basin States, and no one is challenging their right to that water.

Third, the remaining 2,000,000 acre-feet will be required to serve projects in the lower basin when fully developed. Such projects are either now constructed, now authorized and under construction, or they are projects for which commitments have been made by compact or contract. In fact, there is a deficiency to meet those needs. Comments of State of Nevada, House Document 136, page 97; letter from Commissioner of Reclamation to Senator MCCARRAN, Senate Document 39, page 8; hearings S. 75, Senate committee, page 265.

The assertion is made that California will, in the future, as in the past, oppose all projects in the upper basin States. My answer is:

First, the best test of California's future conduct is her conduct in the past. California has to this date opposed no upper-basin project. On the other hand, California has affirmatively supported the Paonia project, Colorado; the Mancos project, Colorado, and the Eden project, Wyoming, which are the only projects in the upper basin that have come before Congress in recent years.

Moreover, California has not opposed the following legislation for projects in the upper basin States, but not in the basin:

(a) Provo—Deer Creek project, Utah.
(b) Weber Basin project, Utah.
(c) Fort Sumner project, New Mexico.
(d) Vermejo project, New Mexico.
(e) Big Thompson project recreation, Colorado.
(f) Upper basin compact.

Mr. President, as a Senator from California and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, on numerous occasions I have supported, and expect to support in the future, sound reclamation projects in the upper basin as well as in the lower basin, and public works projects in other sections of the Nation. I have made it a point since coming to the Senate to visit many areas of the country, including the Tennessee Valley. I have taken a personal interest in the development of other areas. I have been in the State of Missouri to look at some of the flood-control problems. During the time I have been in the Senate and on the Committee on Appropriations I have diligently supported such projects, regardless of the particular area of the country in which they may have been located.

However, I oppose the central Arizona project because I think it is fundamentally unsound. I think it would be destructive of sound public works projects all over the country, and I believe that it would undermine the confidence of the Nation in our reclamation laws. That is why I am opposing the project.

Furthermore, I believe there is an honest difference of opinion between the State of Arizona on one side, and the States of Nevada and California on the other side, as to the availability of water in the lower reaches of the Colorado River.

It is unfortunate that the question of the large State versus the small State should be raised. I am under no illusions as to why that issue is raised in the Senate. Under our constitutional system each State is represented in this body by two Senators, whether it be a smaller State such as Nevada, or the largest State, New York. I believe in our constitutional system. I believe that the framers of the Constitution of the United States were wise when they made one House of Congress based upon population and the other on the principle of equal representation of sovereign States.

I happen to represent in part one of the largest States of the Union. We must come here and present our case. We must present the facts. We recognize the fact that on some issues we may

win, and on others we may lose. But I submit that if we win or lose, we should win or lose on the merits of the case, and not on the basis of an appeal to prejudice in the Senate, arousing the smaller States, of which there are many, against the larger States.

I say, with all the conviction I possess, that the people of California have contributed mightily to the national effort in peace and war. They have contributed their sons in two World Wars, and in the war now going on in Korea. They do so on the same basis of the population which entitles them to representation in the Congress of the United States.

They contribute more than $3,000,000,000 to the Federal Treasury through taxes. I say that we should not allow in this body an appeal to prejudice, which would aline the smaller States against the larger States, merely because California happens to be a larger State, because we are honestly and sincerely presenting a point of view which we think the Senate and the country are entitled to have.

Do Senators want us to remain silent when we believe that there is involved a project which would undermine the reclamation law, a project which we believe is economically unsound, and which we believe would do a great injustice not only to the large State of California, with her ten and a half million people, but to the small State of Nevada, with her 165,000 people?

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator advise us whether S. 75 would serve merely to send this water controversy into the courts for adjudication relative to the specific rights of Arizona and California, or whether the so-called Bridge Canyon project would be authorized for construction?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Bridge Canyon project would be authorized for construction, at a cost of some $788,000,000, and at a cost to the Federal taxpayers running well over $2,000,000,000. It is my interpretation—although I am not an attorney, but a newspaperman—that the provision in the bill to send the question to the Supreme Court is not a fair method of doing so, because if there were an adverse decision in the Supreme Court, under the wording of the amendment, in my judgment the project would still be authorized.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Who would want the project authorized or built if the decision in the Supreme Court were adverse, and if there were no water for the project?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Those who advocate this project, unsound as it is, might advocate that it be built, even though the Supreme Court had decided against it.

Mr. McFARLAND. There is about as much reason in what the Senator has said as there is in the rest of his argument.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. NIXON. So far as that is concerned, if that is not the intention of the particular provision of the bill, I raise the question as to why the proponents of the bill do not change the section to say something else, if they mean something else.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I quite agree with my colleague. As he knows, he and I jointly have offered substitute language which would make it clear that the project would not be built until the Supreme Court had affirmatively decided that the State of Arizona had the right to the use of the water which it claims.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield to my good friend from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would say further that it would, in the judgment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and many other lawyers, except those from California, be asking the Supreme Court for a declaratory judgment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the only way the question can be answered is to let the Supreme Court decide it. In that way able lawyers from Arizona would have an opportunity to argue the point, and I assume that California would have able lawyers to argue the point. It is our opinion that the question can go to the Supreme Court as a judiciable issue without the passage of the pending bill. In any event, even if the Senator were correct—which I do not concede—it would be necessary to tax the taxpayers of this Nation, all 150,000,000 of them, more than $2,000,000,000. It would be possible to get a much smaller project, costing much less, to raise the issue, if it were necessary to do so.

Second. California has many times officially recorded her desire that the entire Colorado River Basin proceed as early as possible to the fullest practicable development.

Third. California expects to examine future upper basin projects on their merits and act accordingly.

The assertion has been made in the past that Imperial Valley, Calif., is wasting 1,000,000 acre-feet of water a year into Salton Sea. My answers are:

First. Except for occasional flood flows from storms, this flow is drainage water necessary to maintain "salt balance" just as in central Arizona. It is, therefore, not waste, but an operational loss—hearings on H. R. 934 before House Committee on Public Lands, Eighty-first Congress, first session, page 879.

Second. It is not excessive compared with other projects, for example, it is on an acreage basis, only a little more than half the return flow per acre from the Yuma project, Arizona—idem.

Third. The water is too salty to be used for irrigation—idem.

Fourth. At the present time, with 7,000,000 acre-feet annually flowing into the Gulf of California, the point is utterly immaterial. The amount flowing in Salton Sea has no bearing on whether Arizona has a water right for the central Arizona project.

The assertion is made that Arizona has applied for all Bridge Canyon power, and will be able to consume it when available.

My answers are:

First. Arizona's present annual power consumption is on the order of 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours—statement of K. S. Wingfield before House committee, March 15, 1951. Bridge Canyon power available for commercial sale will be about 3,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. In addition, Arizona has had available to her since 1937, and has not used, but is now getting ready to use, 18 percent of Hoover Dam firm power, reserved for her under the Boulder Canyon Project Act—House Document No. 717, Eightieth Congress, second session, page A240. Arizona has also been allocated, but has not used, half the power to be produced at Davis Dam. The sum of Arizona's Hoover and Davis power is 1,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours—statement of State engineer of Nevada before House committee March 16, 1951. That plus Bridge, 3,200,000,000, makes 4,400,000,000.

Second. That Arizona can, within, say 10 years, increase her power use from 2,000,000,000 to 6,400,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year is considered by responsible engineers as open to question.

Third. If Arizona's power consumption is trebled, it could only be as the result of a tremendous industrial expansion which would so enhance Arizona's economy that the loss of irrigation of 150,000 acres of land would be trivial to her.

The assertion has been made that the project will liquidate itself in 75 years from revenues for power and water. My answer is:

First. Cost: The cost to be liquidated is $788,000,000.

I wish to call attention to the testimony of Mr. Nielsen before the House committee, as follows:

> As of January 1, 1951, we estimated the cost to be $788,000,000.

I may say that the $788,000,000 is $80,000,000 more than the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate reported the testimony shows the project would cost. I wish to call attention to the fact that this vast project, which would cost the taxpayers of this country in excess of $2,000,000,000, was reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs within approximately 2 or 3 weeks after it was introduced in the Senate, and without any hearings being held on it whatever.

Second. Power repayment: Power revenues would pay over 99 percent of the $788,000,000. The power rate necessary to make the project feasible is "5.1715 mills per kilowatt-hour of firm energy"—Nielsen, galley CC90.

The initial production of power at Bridge Canyon was stated in the Secretary's report of 1947—House Document 136, page 176—at 4,675,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, reducing gradually to 4,114,000,000 kilowatt-hours under ultimate conditions. Witness Coe in a table

presented to the House committee March 1, 1951—galley CC31—still assumes the same power production.

The Secretary's report was written when Bluff Dam, which is in the upper basin, was a part of the project. The Watkins amendment of 1950 to section 1 of the bill—page 3, line 22—reads:

Provided, That this authorization shall not include (a) any works, dam, or reservoir at the Glen Canyon site or any other site in the upper Colorado River Basin, or (b) any dam in the lower Colorado River Basin which would flood the Glen Canyon site.

The Secretary's answer to question No. 13 on June 28, 1950, was:

Question. Without construction of up-stream storage, what would be the annual firm-power production of Bridge Canyon power plant?

Answer. * * * On the basis of these operation studies, it is estimated by the Department that the annual firm power production of the Bridge Canyon power plant would be 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours under initial conditions of operation. As outlined in the answer to question 12, which is based upon the premise that neither Bluff Dam nor Glen Canyon would be in operation, Bridge Canyon Reservoir would be substantially filled with silt within 35 to 45 years.

In other words, here is a project which its proponents estimate will be repaid in 75 years. The official testimony of Government witnesses indicates that without the construction of the upper dams it will fill with silt in half that time.

The Secretary's answer continues:

Bridge Canyon power plant would of necessity be operated thereafter as a run-of-the-river plant. So operated the firm output is estimated to be about 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

The project report and present Bureau testimony are based on the assumption that Glen Canyon Dam will be built in 15 years.

Mr. President, I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is eager to bring up the conference report on the so-called manpower bill. I have no desire to delay the Senate's consideration of that important legislation. Therefore I now ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my remarks, which I had intended to make on the pending bill, be printed as a statement at this point.

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

The remainder of Mr. KNOWLAND'S remarks are as follows:

Bureau Engineer E. G. Nielsen testified (galley CC38):

"Mr. ENGLE. Just taking this bill by its four corners, if Bluff Canyon is stricken from the project and Glen Canyon is prohibited, I ask you whether this project is feasible, within the four corners of this bill, without any assumptions. Can you answer that 'Yes' or 'No.'

"Mr. NIELSEN. No, I can't."

* * * * *

"Mr. ENGLE. Do you admit also that in your testimony last year that you stated your report was predicated upon the assumption that Glen Canyon would be built in 15 years.

"Mr. NIELSEN. Yes, and this testimony is still predicated upon that."

* * * * *

"Mr. ENGLE. Then you concluded the power revenues would be a certain figure; and if those assumptions no longer hold the power revenues would be less than those stated here?

"Mr. NIELSEN. Yes." (Nielsen, galley CC85.)

"Based upon the specified premise that neither Glen Canyon nor Bluff Dam would be in operation during the first 75 years of Bridge Canyon operation, and assuming no other regulatory facilities provided in the upper basin during the same period, initial generation at Bridge Canyon would be 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours per annum. That generation would taper off to 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours at the end of 35 to 45 years, according to the Secretary's answer to question 13. Mr. ENGLE was willing, I believe, that we bring in a response based upon the median estimate of 40 years.

* * * * *

"Analyzing the matter first on the basis of a 40-year life, in 75 years there would be available for sale 116,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours over a 75-year period. A power rate of 8.86 mills would be necessary to liquidate project costs on this premise." (Galley CC86.)

"Mr. ENGLE. * * * I see you fixed the power rate at 8.86 mills. Do you regard that as a commercial rate?

"Mr. NIELSEN. I don't think that would be a competitive rate; no, sir.

"Mr. ENGLE. In other words, you couldn't sell the power?

"Mr. NIELSEN. No.

"Mr. ENGLE. And that means, in other words, the project is infeasible.

"Mr. NIELSEN. Infeasible under the premise that Glen Canyon not be built within a 75-year period following construction of Bridge Canyon Dam."

* * * * *

"Mr. ENGLE. * * * in other words, if we are to be perfectly honest with the Congress and Members of the House who are not familiar with this legislation we would have to tell them, would we not, that if we pass this bill it is absolutely necessary in order to insure the feasibility of the project to build some up-stream projects, which will give the sediment control and the river regulation necessary to make the power features pan out?

"Mr. NIELSEN. Those up-stream features are necessary to the success of this project; yes, sir." (Galley 12AN.)

"Mr. NIELSEN. * * * we would start out initially under present-day conditions with a firm output of about 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours without Glen Canyon.

"Mr. YORTY. Now your estimate of revenue that you gave us to make the project feasible, was that based upon 3,500,000,000 or 4,500,000,000?" (Galley 13AN.)

"Mr. NIELSEN. Our estimate of the project's repayability is based upon 4,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

"Mr. YORTY. Isn't that just what I said, that there is 1,100,000,000 annually difference between the Bridge Canyon output with Glen Canyon in operation, and without it?

"Mr. NIELSEN. Yes."

* * * * *

"Mr. YORTY. Now you have assumed that Glen Canyon would be built in 15 years.

"Mr. NIELSEN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. YORTY. And have you then shown in your table that during the first 15 years at least the power output would be 3,500,000,000 instead of 4,600,000,000?

"Mr. NIELSEN. Our analysis of repayment ability is based upon initial production of 4,675,000,000 kilowatt-hours."

* * * * *

"Mr. YORTY. Well now what I want to know is, if you are assuming that Glen Canyon will be built in 15 years, * * * I cannot understand how you assume the full output of Bridge Canyon from the very start when you told Mr. ENGLE that you would have to reduce it by 1.1 billion kilowatt-hours per year if Glen Canyon were not in operation.

"Mr. NIELSEN. Frankly, I can't either.

"Mr. YORTY. In other words, then during at least the 15 years, and I say at least, because this bill prohibits Glen Canyon, and certainly there is nothing in this bill that I can see to cause the assumption that it will operate in 15 years; in other words, then, I think the committee would be very interested in that, in just assuming that it takes 15 years to get Glen Canyon in operation, 1.1 billion kilowatt-hours times 5.171 mills per kilowatt-hour, which is the estimate the Bureau gave us, equals $5,665,000 per year and they assume that Glen Canyon will be built in 15 years, and on that basis, they are in error $85,321,500 in their cost repayment period for the operation and construction of this project.

"Mr. NIELSEN. Well, I will try to find out if there is an error there or if I can explain it, or rather, if Mr. Coe can explain it to you."

The exact computation on Mr. YORTY's point is:

Four billion six hundred and seventy-five million kilowatt-hours per year minus 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year equals 1,175,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year times $0.005171 per kilowatt-hour equals $6,075,925 shortage per year.

Six million seventy-five thousand nine hundred and twenty-five dollars per year times 15 years equals $91,138,875 shortage in 15 years.

So, with respect to power revenues alone, the project wil fail to liquidate itself in accordance with the Bureau's financial plan by over $90 million.

Mr. Coe, on March 13, 1951, filed a memorandum to the effect that it "is conceivable" that Glen Canyon "may be" into operation before Bridge Canyon, instead of 15 years after Bridge Canyon and that if it commenced only 1 year after Bridge Canyon, the project would pay out as planned. Nevertheless, he still says that the 15-year assumption is "logical."

Such an evasive "explanation" of an obvious error in the financial plan of the project does not carry conviction. Mr. Coe's memorandum is as follows:

Mr. YORTY asked a question on March 7. We have not yet replied to that question because we understood from the chairman's statement that it would be satisfactory if we lumped all the remaining questions propounded by committee members and the answers together and supplied the material for the record. We assume that the chairman's instructions in this regard now apply to all questions except Mr. YORTY's.

Mr. YORTY's question is to the effect as to why there is a difference in the contemplated power output of Bridge Canyon Dam between the 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours shown in the answer to question No. 13 of the Secretary's letter to Mr. Peterson, chairman of this committee during the Eighty-first Congress, and our present estimate of 4,675,000,000 kilowatt-hours under initial conditions if Glen Canyon is not built for 15 years. I point out, first, that our assumption has been that Glen Canyon Dam would be built within 15 years. That this is a logical assumption is borne out by the fact that the Congress will have before it yet this session a report recommending the authorization of Glen Canyon Dam. It is conceivable, therefore, that Glen Canyon may be authorized and constructed prior to similar steps for Bridge Canyon. With Glen Canyon, the annual production of Bridge Canyon will be 4,675,000,000. However, being as responsive as I can to the question, I state that if Glen Canyon came into operation 1 year after Bridge Canyon, there would then be 1 year during which Bridge Canyon would produce only 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours, providing there occurred during that

year the same water-flow conditions assumed for the derivation of that figure, namely, the year 1934. The effect of 1 year's operation at this reduced output upon the pay-out analysis of the project would be negligible. It follows, however, that every year for which there is a lag the effect becomes more pronounced, still assuming that through each of those years of lag there again was maintained the minimum flow shown for the year 1934. We feel that this is not a good nor proper assumption.

3. IRRIGATION REPAYMENT

A. The irrigators would repay only $1,700,000 of the construction cost in 75 years, or two-tenths of 1 percent (galley 6AN).

"Mr. POULSON. Will the irrigators pay any part of this construction cost?

"Mr. NIELSEN. A small part—very small.

"Mr. POULSON. What part?

"Mr. NIELSEN. The irrigators will pay on the total construction cost allocated to irrigation approximately $1,700,000 throughout the 75-year period." And this is a figure within the limits of error or accuracy of the estimates. The Commissioner of Reclamation remarked of a deficiency of $5,000,000 resulting from an irrigation rate of $4.50 per acre-foot (H. Doc. 136, p. 111):

"In view of the magnitude and complexity of the proposed project and of the long-range cost-index projection involved, this 2-percent differential is considered to be well within the limits of accuracy of estimating operation, maintenance, and replacement costs, and payment by irrigators."

The amount of water delivered by the project to district headgates is estimated to be 1,082,000 acre-feet a year (H. Doc. No. 136, p. 155). This is subject to losses between district headgate and farmer's headgate of 30 percent (H. Doc. No. 136, p. 156), making the net delivery to the farmer 675,400 acre-feet. The farmer pays only for the water delivered to his headgate (H. Doc. 136, p. 111).

Bureau Engineer Coe testified on March 1, 1951, before the House committee (galley CC31):

"The estimated average annual returns from these items would be (1) from irrigation water, $3,173,500: * * *."

This sum, divided by $4.75, gives a result of 668,105, which would represent the number of acre-feet paid for. This figure is so close (1 percent) to the theoretical 675,400 acre-feet, supposed to be delivered to farmers' headgates, as to be open to serious question. It assumes throughout 75 years:

(a) Perfection in the present estimate of the quantity of water physically available for delivery to the project, i. e., that the river will never fall short;

(b) Ideal operation and maintenance of a most complex system of delivery works which spreads across Arizona from the river to New Mexico, including a power plant, transmission lines, several pumping plants, 315 miles of main canal and thousands of miles of laterals, i. e., that through mechanical failure, act of God, or human error no part of the works will ever fail to deliver the full quantity of water now estimated; responsible engineers estimate that a deduction of 200,000 acre-feet should be allowed for this factor (statement of M. J. Dowd before House committee, March 15, 1951);

(c) Unceasing demand for the water for irrigation, i. e., that the farmers will, in wet cycles, never fail to order their full allotment, although history shows that in the 1920's their lands were oversupplied and waterlogged by the local Gila-Salt River supplies; also that the farmers will never, in depressions fail to have the money to pay, although history shows a uniform condition, in times of stress, of reclamation project write-offs, moratoria, and compromises.

B. There is another and more tangible reason for challenging the Bureau's estimate of irrigation repayments. Early in the current House hearings (March 1, 1951) it developed that the Bureau has just issued to the States in the Colorado River Basin for comment a proposed report on the upper basin storage project. In that report (USBR Project Planning Report No. 4-8a-81-0, p. 56), a new estimate of the amount of the flow of the Colorado River into the lower basin at Lee Ferry appears. This figure, 15,590,000 acre-feet is 680,000 acre-feet less than the comparable figure 16,270,000 acre-feet (galley CC27; H. Doc. 136, p. 150), which is the starting point of the calculation of water supply for the central Arizone project set out in the project report and the Bureau testimony (galley CC33).

The upper basin report was prepared by region IV of the Bureau, and the central Arizona report by region III.

The result of this discrepancy is, that on the Bureau's own method of calculation, starting with region IV's figure at Lee Ferry, instead of region III's, the quantity available for central Arizona project becomes 920,000 instead of 1,200,000 acre-feet, or a shortage of nearly 25 percent (table, galley CC37).

So, with 25 percent less water to deliver, the project would collect 25 percent less revenues for irrigation water. Irrigation revenues would fall short by $740,000 a year, or $55,500,000 in 75 years. Instead of irrigation revenues paying $1,700,000 of capital cost in 75 years, they would fail by over $53,000,000 to cover operation, maintenance, and replacement costs and even these charges would have to be subsidized, or would not be paid.

No reclamation project is conceivable, in which the farmers cannot pay for the operation and maintenance of the works.

Although it is the more recent, it is not intended to accept region IV's report as correct, rather than region III's. Both may be wrong. The fact is, however, that the Bureau is supporting the central Arizona project when its last report shows that the financial plan will not work out.

4. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

The two subjects just examined relate to obvious and serious errors of the Bureau of Reclamation in estimating revenues of the project. As serious and obvious an error exists with respect to the Bureau's latest showing of an important factor of cost.

The project report, which is based on prices as of July 1, 1947, shows the total cost of the project, after eliminating Bluff Dam, to be $708,780,000 (H. Doc. No. 136, p. 200). The Bureau's present estimate of total cost, based on January 1, 1951, prices is $788,265,000, showing an increase of 11 percent. (Table I, statement of Bureau Engineer Coe before House committee March 1, 1951.)

The project report, after eliminating the item for Bluff Dam, shows annual operation and maintenance costs as $4,610,000 (H. Doc. 136, p. 209). The present estimate of the same cost is exactly the same figure, $4,610,000 (table II, Coe statement).

The error is plain. It is common knowledge that costs of labor and material used in operation and maintenance of such projects has substantially increased since July 1, 1947. Data recently submitted to the House committee show that on large water and power operations of a character similar in many respects to the central Arizona project, such as those of Imperial irrigation district, metropolitan water district and the water and power departments of city of Los Angeles, labor and material costs for operation and maintenance have increased since July 1, 1947, at various rates running from 17½ to 25 percent.

Assuming that the proper rate for the central Arizona project should be only 15 percent of the Bureau's estimated $4,610,000 a year, the Bureau has underestimated operation and maintenance costs by $691,500 a year, or $51,862,500 in 75 years. The project revenues will fail to pay out in 75 years by that amount. By the same token, irrigation revenues will fail to cover irrigation operation, maintenance and replacement reserve by $330,200 a year, or over 10 percent.

Three major errors have been shown in the Bureau's estimates. The project costs will not be liquidated from project revenues in 75 years by the following amounts:

(a) Error in Bridge Canyon power production, $91,138,875.

(b) Error in water deliveries and payments for water, $53,000,000.

(c) Error in operation and maintenance costs, $51,862,500. Someone other than the irrigators must help pay, annually, irrigation operation, maintenance and replacement reserve.

Total errors: $196,001,375.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say in conclusion that this is not a controversy between California and Arizona in connection with which there is any unfriendliness; at least, there is no unfriendliness on our part. This is a conflict between three of the lower-basin States; at least, the bulk of their area lies entirely within the lower basin. They are the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California. Two of those States—Nevada and California—see eye to eye on the situation. The State of Arizona has a different point of view. I am not quarreling because of the fact that Arizona has a different point of view. I would expect Arizona to hold out for its rights if it honestly believed it had such rights, and I attribute to Arizona that honest difference of opinion. On the other side of the controversy, the States of Nevada and California should at least be accorded the same recognition of having an honest difference of opinion.

This is a very basic matter; it is one which deeply concerns the people of all three of these States. Nevada and California have tried to negotiate this matter, but the State of Arizona has refused. Nevada and California have offered to arbitrate, but the State of Arizona has refused.

When there is a difference of opinion and a difference between sovereign States of the Union, the only way by which the matter can be settled is to have it passed upon by a court of competent jurisdiction, which in this case is the Supreme Court of the United States.

Since 1947, to my own personal knowledge since I have been a Member of the Senate, we have offered several resolutions which would have brought this matter before the Supreme Court. We were willing to agree to a time limitation in that connection, namely, that we would do so within 6 months. Had Arizona not obstructed those resolutions, which were presented by California and Nevada, we would by this time have had either (a) an adjudication of this great question before the Supreme Court of the United States, or (b) a definite determination that it was not a justiciable issue unless certain things were done. I submit that by now we would be far along with this matter if it had not been for the stand taken by the State of Arizona on this point.

Mr. President, we respect Arizona and her needs. I have been in Arizona, and I admire her people. I recognize that Arizona has a tremendous problem, as

to all the other Western States, for water is their lifeblood.

Mr. President, in the 6 years that I have been in the Senate I have tried to approach all questions on a constructive basis. I say to my colleague, the Senator from Arizona, that I would be much happier if on the floor of the Senate today I could be supporting the efforts of Arizona and could be helping her get the things she needs, as I have supported time and time again, in the Appropriations Committee, the needs of Arizona and the needs of other States of the Union. However, I cannot do so on the basis of the pending bill, because, I say again—and the RECORD amply demonstrates it—this is not a sound or an economic project, and in connection with this project it is proposed to take water which is in dispute between three sovereign States of this Union.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California are rather amusing to me, for he has stated that Arizona has attempted to block something, whereas, as a matter of fact, we have tried three times to have this question settled in court. I wish the people of California had been as earnest in attempting to have it settled as the Senator from California has suggested they have been.

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

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

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

Anderson	Hayden	McKellar
Bennett	Hendrickson	McMahon
Benton	Hennings	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Jenner	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Frear	Malone	Welker
Fulbright	Maybank	Wherry
George	McCarran	Wiley
Gillette	McCarthy	Young
Green	McFarland	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, beginning June 6.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk the report of the conference committee on S. 1, the military manpower bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the report.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see proceedings of the House of Representatives, June 7, pp. 6244–6252.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have in my hand what I am told is the only copy of the report which is available on the minority side. Looking at it very quickly, I see that it contains 15 pages of italics which purportedly constitute the new manpower draft bill or universal military training bill.

In the introduction which the clerk has read, there is no statement which permits of a comparison between the bill which was passed by the House and that which was passed by the Senate. I recognize the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the members of that committee can, undoubtedly, answer questions which any Member of the Senate might be disposed to ask this afternoon with reference to the report, but I do not know how any Member of the Senate can intelligently ask questions as to the contents of the report or the changes which have been made in the version passed by either the House or the Senate, without having some opportunity to see it in print or to have a specific comparison between the provisions of the bill as passed and the report which is here presented in the nature of a substitute.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am very reluctant to agree that the report may be taken up at this time.

I recognize that a new Member of the Senate raising an objection at this time and under these circumstances is not regarded as conforming to the customary procedure, but I submit, Mr. President, that the report deals with a bill which purports to establish the standards for the extension of the Selective Service Act and another bill to establish some sort of a program of universal military training. The latter is a measure which is a great departure from past history and past traditions, and it seems to me that the Members of the Senate, if they want to justify the reputation of the Senate as being the last stronghold of democracy and as being a great deliberative body, should have an opportunity to see the report in print and to know what it involves.

Therefore, Mr. President, unless some persuasive reason can be given for proceeding with the report at this time, and not waiting until tomorrow, when printed copies of the report will be available, I shall feel constrained to object.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can well understand how the distinguished Senator from South Dakota feels. I have always endeavored to uphold the deliberative characteristics of this body. In my opinion, that is one of the distinguishing marks of the Senate which sets it apart from any other parliamentary body in the world of which I have any knowledge.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that there is no rule of the Senate which requires that any report be made as to the comparable language of various bills. The House of Representatives has such a rule, but the Senate does not, and I have never seen in the Senate any conference report which endeavored to do that. The conference report does not contain any feature which was not in either the House or the Senate bill, but it does represent a compromise.

If the Senator from South Dakota desires to insist on his objection, I shall not move the consideration of the report. The Senator knows, of course, that in the Senate a motion to proceed to the consideration of a conference report is not debatable. I would not have one Member of this body denied the privilege of insisting upon his right to see a printed copy of the report. If the Senator desires that consideration of the report go over until tomorrow, I shall certainly be happy to agree to that.

I should like to say to the Senator that the reason why there are no printed copies of the report available is that yesterday was a holiday, and the Government Printing Office was not in operation last evening as it is on every other week night when there is no holiday.

I have been rather occupied with some other matters in the past few days. I have felt like a juggler who stands on a one-wheeled bicycle with a ball in one hand, a hoop in the other hand, and another hoop on his foot. I have not been able to keep up with all the details, and I did not know until today that copies of the report were not available. I do not think the report does violence to any provision of the Senate bill, although the Senate conferees were compelled to yield a great deal more of the provisions of the Senate bill than the Senator from Georgia liked to surrender.

If the Senator objects, I shall not move to proceed to the consideration of the report at this time, but will let it go over until tomorrow, and ask the distinguished majority leader to hold a session tomorrow afternoon. I had

hoped that we might proceed to the consideration of the report this afternoon, because certain hearings are in progress. I had hoped that we would have all day tomorrow to proceed with the hearings, which have been running along for several weeks, and from all indications, will continue for some time in the future. There are two rather important committees of the Senate which are thus unable to deal with legislative matters, and I was anxious to save every possible minute. But we can let the consideration of the report go over until tomorrow. I should prefer to do that rather than have any Senator feel that he has not had an ample opportunity to see the report in printed form and to read it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have attended some of the hearings presided over by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and he is doing a fine job. His conduct of the hearings reflects credit on him and adds to the reputation of the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. At the same time, however, it has seemed to me that in view of the far-reaching scope of the report, the Senator from Georgia and the Senate itself would be happier if the consideration of the report were to go over until tomorrow. The Senator from South Dakota does not like to put himself in the position of actually objecting. He would much rather have the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services defer consideration of the report in view of what he himself has said, that he did not know until a few moments ago that copies of the report were not available to Members of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry, but I did not make that statement. I said I did not know until this morning that printed copies were not available. I learned that fact about 8:45 or 9 o'clock this morning. But inasmuch as the report as now presented contains such slight modifications of the bill which the Senate had passed by an overwhelming vote, I did feel that the Senate might be willing to conclude consideration of it today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Georgia for being willing to postpone consideration of the conference report. It is true there is no rule requiring a printed report. It is also true that the Senate itself has adopted a rule, which has not been agreed to by the House of Representatives, requiring the submission of a joint statement by the conferees to accompany a conference report, signed by the managers on the part of the Senate as well as by the managers on the part of the House. The Senate has thus indicated its view, I think, that there should be such a statement submitted before action on a conference report is considered. I understand that the House of Representatives is not going to meet seriously until the 6th or 7th of June any way, so there will be no real delay occasioned by the Senate's postponing consideration of the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not at all persuaded, Mr. President, by the statement of the Senator from Ohio that because the Senate has adopted a rule which has not been considered in the House, we should adopt the policy he has indicated of filing a statement to accompany the report. That is not persuasive to me. But if any Senator wants the report to go over until tomorrow, on the ground that he has not had an opportunity to read the bill as reported by the conferees, that is persuasive. In view of the statement which has been made, I shall be happy to yield the floor, with the report pending, and tomorrow, as soon as I can obtain the floor, I shall proceed to discuss the report.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I had hoped that the Senator from Georgia would not yield the floor. I can well understand the view of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]; in fact, I am inclined to share that view. I think it would be wise for the Members of the Senate to have before them printed copies before they come to vote on the conference report. I do not think the Senator from South Dakota should have entertained the least bit of hesitancy in raising the point he has raised.

I should like to make a suggestion to my friend from Georgia, but before doing so I wish to say that in my opinion the greatest service rendered in the Senate of the United States at this session has been that of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] in the great leadership they have demonstrated in carrying the military manpower bill through the Senate and through conference.

Mr. President, I happen to be one who believes that this bill deals with the most important question before the country at the present time, and there should be the earliest and most expeditious consideration of the conference report. I say that as one who did not agree with the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas in regard to various features of the bill. I am very happy to find that in conference they came nearer to agreeing with me than they did on the floor of the Senate. That, however, is beside the point.

What I desired to say was that they have done a great job for the Senate. I think we should take early action on the report. I think it would help the Senate if the Senator from Georgia would take advantage of the opportunity this afternoon, even though we are not going to vote on the conference report, to give the Senate an explanation of it, so that it can be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tonight and be available to the Members of the Senate tomorrow for their study of the bill along with the report before we come to the floor of the Senate. I think it would be very helpful to us if the Senator would proceed at this time to make the explanation of the report he was planning to make so it will be in the RECORD when we come to vote tomorrow.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have been asked at what time we would take up the conference report tomorrow. Regardless of whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia makes his explanation this afternoon or tomorrow, it is my hope we can take up the conference report immediately after the Senate convenes tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon. I make that announcement now so that Senators will know at what time to be on the floor for the conference report.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I wish to say in conclusion that I deeply appreciate the courtesy shown by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I think it reflects credit on him and on the Members of this body.

I may suggest that it might be helpful if unanimous consent were obtained, if it is necessary that such consent be obtained, to have the report appear in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was just prepared to make such a request when I deferred to Senators who asked me to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the report will appear in the RECORD as a matter of course.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I, too, want to join with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in thanking the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for his courtesy and consideration in deferring consideration of the conference report for two reasons: First, the bill as it was originally introduced, as S. 1, by special consideration of Members of the Senate, was never considered by the committee.

A substitute for that bill was considered. The substitute was submitted by Mrs. Rosenberg and General Marshall.

The bill was of an entirely different character from the Russell-Malone S. 1, but the S. 1 was attached to it. When the junior Senator from Nevada found that the latter bill had been substituted for the original Russell-Malone S. 1, he immediately appeared before the committee and called attention to that situation, and that he disagreed with its provisions.

The universal military training provisions of the Russell-Malone S. 1 were a definite part of the bill and which was joined in by other Senators.

That is now the reason why I consider it very appropriate that consideration of the matter be put over until tomorrow, until all Senators may understand that the universal military training feature has been entirely separated from the bill itself, and that it is no longer a part of the legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks my statement

before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee.

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

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator MALONE. Universal military training versus universal military service: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, since the hearings are closing today, that I am disturbed by the change in the principle between the original Russell-Malone bill introduced as S. 1 and the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute. Mr. Chairman, since I was one of the sponsors of the universal military training bill, and since the substitute known as the universal military service bill, that has not even a remote resemblance to the original bill, I am compelled to appear in opposition to it.

Changes trained citizens' reserve to a professional army: The substitute completely changes the principle of the proposed military training from a trained citizens' reserve army under the UMT to a professional army under a universal military service bill.

The Defense Department conscription plan changes a civilian Reserve training policy of 4 to 6 months, or whatever the committee may have finally established, providing for alternate educational programs in colleges, academies, or officer training school, or whatever scientific training might have been chosen or to be selected, to a 27 months' continuous active service followed by 69 months Inactive Reserve duty or a total of 8 years' obligation for the entire service. The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute for the Russell-Malone bill apparently has the blessing of the State Department.

May train army in any nation any place: The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute provides for 27 months' continuous service, and that the President may send them anywhere to any nation outside of the United States for training or fighting at his discretion without consulting Congress further.

Senator JOHNSON. Training in the United States, but service can be anywhere.

Senator MALONE. I understand that nothing in the bill prohibits the President from sending the inducted troops to train or fight anywhere at any time without further approval of Congress.

Destroys civilian training units: Then automatically he enters the Reserves for approximately 6 years, after his 27 months' service. The changes destroy the National Guard and class A Organized Reserves; certainly it would tend to destroy the National Guard. The original bill would have preserved the civilian training units.

No recruits will be available to National Guard and Organized Reserves for 27 months. The civilian components will shrink to almost nothing in that time.

Practically all Reserves except Army Reserves and one-third of the National Guard have already been called to duty.

We will have a regular armed force of 3½ millions with no Organized Reserves from June 30, 1952, and thereafter. This big professional army will be too small to scare or fight Russia but it will denude our labor market and our colleges and cost billions we do not have.

The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute professional defense force will contain an estimated 1,400,000 ground troops. These cost $5,000 per year per man.

Present cost of National Guardsmen and class A Reserves is $601 per year per man.

The trained civilian army method: If all eligibles are inducted for Army training as proposed by the Defense Department bill and on completion of training one-half are chosen by lot or selection board for duty in the National Guard and Organized Reserves, the following results will obtain:

June 30, 1952

	Regular Army infantry	Civilian components
Number	1,000,000	400,000
Cost	$5,000,000,000	$240,000,000

Saving $1,760,000,000 over cost of 1,400,000 regulars.

Four hundred thousand men would have been sent home to families, jobs, and schools and for duty in the Organized Reserves.

This process can be continued until the Reserve force in being is one, two, or three million, whatever Congress thinks the threat requires.

These men will be stationed all over the United States where they will be immediately available in the event of air-borne raid or atom bombing.

Thus, we can build more long-range defensive strength against communism for less money and we can keep a large proportion of young Americans at home, on the job, and in school.

The people confused. The country is entirely confused about the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute while still retaining S. 1. My recent mail indicates the people believe that the substitute upon which the hearings have been held is the original Russell-Malone American Legion or veterans' bill, which several of us joined in introducing.

This is the third time I have joined in the introduction of the universal military training bill, but I find now the hearings are not being held on the UMT bill that was originally introduced at all. The hearings are being held on the substitute UMS bill which, while retaining the S. 1 designation, changes the entire policy and procedure and character of the Army.

The completely different principle established by the substitute UMS bill can be changed by this committee following the hearings and, of course, they can report the original bill to the Senate floor if they so desire, and I am hopeful that they will do just that.

Senator JOHNSON. The Chair would like to interject that any misapprehension the people have been laboring under is not due to anything the committee did or failed to do. We had 10 days of hearings before we had a hearing on any bill. We had hearings on the general manpower problem. At the end of that 10-day period the Department of Defense finally, at the urging of the chairman of this committee, brought forth a bill, at which time it was announced on the floor of the Senate, and in the committee, that this bill would be introduced by request. We have taken testimony on that bill, introduced by request, since that time.

It is true that the American Legion and the veterans' organizations have come here and testified on this bill, introduced as an amendment by request, and have embraced it and endorsed it, but we have never left the impression or never intended to or never wanted to convey the information to the country that we were holding hearings on the original S. 1.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you, the chairman, had never had any idea of any misrepresentation; but I will call to the attention of the chairman that the Russell-Malone universal military training bill was introduced on the first day bills were accepted on the Senate floor, and was before this committee from the beginning before any hearings were started, but the Marshall-Rosenberg bill was immediately substituted and no hearings were ever held on the Russell-Malone bill.

Not in accord with the substitute: Mr. Chairman, I considered it important to clarify the matter from my own personal standpoint, and to say that I am not in accord with the bill upon which hearings are now being held.

The committee of course may, if it so desires, revert to the original Russell-Malone universal military training bill, which the veterans of this Nation have supported in principle for 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, since the principle of S. 1, which I joined in introducing, has been changed from a trained citizens' reserve army to a professional army status, and that 18-year-old boys are to be inducted for 27 months' actual service plus 69 months' Reserve status, instead of a 4 to 6 months' training period, and then left at home until actually needed, I felt constrained to appear in opposition to it.

The bill under consideration by the subcommittee is not the Russell-Malone universal military training bill represented in S. 1, but it is the Marshall-Rosenberg bill supported by the State Department.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you a lot, sir.

Senator MALONE. Thank you very much.

Senator JOHNSON. The next witness is Mr. David Whatley, an attorney of Bethesda, Md. The committee will be glad to hear from you. Afterward we expect to go into executive session.

Mr. MALONE. Under the bill approved by the conference report a committee is to be appointed by the President to further consider universal military training at a later date.

So it is entirely different than the Russell-Malone bill introduced in the first instance, which was the legislation sponsored by the veterans' organizations for 25 years; and although certain provisions they favored such as an effective National Guard and Reserve have been put back in the bill in a left-handed way, well, sort of like stuffing rags between the dry staves of a rain barrel, they are not very effective, and could be disregarded.

So, Mr. President, I join with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in the request which was made for 1 day's delay of the report, and to which the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has agreed.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to take a minute to make an observation respecting the point just raised as to whether there is a rule which requires a conference report to be accompanied by a statement to be signed jointly by the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate. The Senate adopted a concurrent resolution, providing for such a rule on April 11; I believe that was the date. I took deep interest in that concurrent resolution. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia that it is not an effective rule by reason of the fact that the House has not adopted it. Yet I feel that I should not let this opportunity pass without calling attention to the importance of the House agreeing to the concurrent resolution. I am not speaking of its importance particularly with respect to this particular bill.

An analysis of the conference report was handed me, and I was agreeable to vote on it this afternoon, because, as the report will reveal, I am satisfied now that the bill is a much better bill than it was when it left the Senate. So I am not complaining about the bill itself or about the action of the conferees.

In view of the stellar work done by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], as was pointed out by the Senator from Oregon, I should like to call their attention—and when I refer to the Senators in this manner, I am not needling them, I am telling them the truth—to the fact that they can be helpful in bringing about action on the part of the House on the concurrent resolution. It is a pretty good thing to have the conference reports as they are brought accompanied by statements jointly signed by the conferees on the part of both Houses. I am fully in accord with the point raised by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] on that point. When we have conference reports submitted in that manner, especially reports dealing with bills covering such extensive subjects, there can be no doubt what is in minds of the conferees. Then we can use our own interpretation respecting the signed report on the part of the mangers of both the Senate and the House on a bill. The concurrent resolution is a valuable one. I hope the House can be persuaded to adopt it so that we may have a rule in both Houses which will give us the benefit of the interpretation on the part of the managers of both the House and the Senate respecting such important pieces of legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that my friend from Nebraska is slightly contradictory in his two statements. He first stated that we had been so successful in conference that the bill was much more to his liking; and he asked us to use the same persuasive powers which proved ineffective in the conference, in securing the adoption of the concurrent resolution by the House of Representatives.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not believe that the Senator has been defeated. I think he has been successful in securing a worthwhile bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am afraid my friend was a bit sarcastic when he asked us to use the same powers which had been so ineffectual in preserving all of the Senate bill, although I can assure him that the Senate conferees strove valiantly to do so. I am afraid we would not get very far with the concurrent resolution. So I suggest to my friend that he approach someone who has more influence with the House, and in that way bring about adoption of the concurrent resolution which, I may say, incidentally, is very desirable.

Mr. WHERRY. The last statement really counteracts everything the Senator has said. I still wish to let my statement stand. I know the Senator. As a conferee he suits me. I think he could get the resolution adopted in the House if he applied a little heat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall accompany every report of a committee of conference a statement, in writing and signed by at least a majority of the managers on the part of each House, explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the committee.

SEC. 2. The foregoing section shall be a rule of each House, respectively, and shall supersede any other rule thereof but only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such other rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Oregon and other Senators for the very complimentary remarks which they have made with respect to the efforts of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the subcomimttee which conducted the hearings and wrote the bill, and to me as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to obtain a truly effective military manpower bill. We have striven earnestly in our efforts to obtain such a bill.

In my opinion the Senate bill was the farthest step forward that had ever been taken by either branch of the Congress in the establishment of a dependable, long-range military program for this Nation.

It provided for the needs of the hour in continuing the operation of the Selective Service Act.

It provided for the long-range defense plans of the Nation, through a universal military training program.

The conference agreement on this bill, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, is a significant advance in our long search for a program for a permanent and economical utilization of the manpower of the United States. I believe that this report is basically sound and merits the complete endorsement of both Houses of Congress.

The Senate conferees were not able to sustain all of the more desirable features of the Senate bill. We were compelled to agree to a compromise which omits some features of the bill as it originally passed the Senate on March 9. However, in my judgment the conference agreement which has been reported today retains the major features of the Senate bill without receding on any points which are of vital importance to the operation of a military manpower act.

There were a number of points of difference between the Senate bill and the House amendment by way of a substitute. They proved rather difficult to resolve. We met in conference on a number of occasions. I would not undertake to estimate the number of hours devoted to the conference, but we had complete and full discussion of all the points of disagreement.

I must say in passing that I believe the difficulties in resolving the differences between the two bodies were more apparent than real. Basically the bills sought the same objective, even though we undertook to travel different routes to arrive at that objective.

There were approximately 20 points of difference between the two bills at the outset. Some were very important. Others were relatively trivial. I shall discuss very briefly what we regard as the more important differences.

CONTINUED LIABILITY FOR THOSE DEFERRED

There was an issue on the continued liability for induction of persons who had been deferred from service or training. The provision in the House substitute provided that an individual who had been deferred for occupational reasons should retain his liability for service until he attained the age of 35 years. The Senate bill contained no such provision, but it appeared to us that the House amendment was obviously reasonable in principle, and therefore it was adopted by the conferees.

The House version of the bill contained a provision on the cutting back of the physical and mental standards of acceptability. Under the terms of this item the physical and mental standards of acceptability for persons inducted through selective service would be cut back to the standards which prevailed in 1945. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision, it being the feeling of the Senate conferees that such a cut-back should not be undertaken until all services were meeting their personnel requirements through selective service rather than the present system of selective service for the Army and enlistment in other components. A satisfactory compromise was reached by requiring physical standards to be cut back to the 1945 level. Indeed, that provision has been in effect for some time. We reduced the mental requirements from a classification cut-off score of 70 to the equivalent of 65. The House provision would have reduced it to 60.

With reference to conscientious objectors——

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he proceeds to a new topic?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Since the Senator from Georgia has mentioned the physical and mental standards, I am wondering if he can tell us whether the conference agreement does anything to freeze into law the practice or policy announced by the Director of Selective Service, General Hershey, of instituting examinations whereby young men who attain a certain mark may be assured of deferment. Those who have written me on that subject feel that that is an unfortunate step.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator that there is a considerable depth of feeling on that subject, as reflected in my own mail. There is nothing in this bill which makes such educational deferments mandatory. In fact, the bill very carefully leaves with the local draft boards the decision as to deferment; and the examinations to which the Senator has referred are in no wise mandatory upon local draft boards.

Mr. CASE. So the report, if adopted and finally enacted into law, will not fasten upon the country the discrimination which many people feel is implicit in saying, "If you pass a special mental test with a score of 70 you can have your service deferred."

Mr. RUSSELL. The test to which I referred has nothing whatever to do with the so-called college examinations to which the Senator refers. I was referring merely to the minimum standard of mental acceptability which applies to those who are drafted, without regard to any deferment for purpose of college attendance.

Mr. CASE. They are the basic minimum mental qualifications?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Does the bill do anything with reference to freezing into practice or law the policy of granting deferments to students?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it does not. I understood the Senator's question was not directed to the provision which I was discussing.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With reference to the observation made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, does the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services have any information as to how the local draft boards would administer the proposed provision with reference to the deferment of college students? I have had a great many letters from draft boards asking whether there will be a measuring stick used throughout the country, or whether the local draft boards would be permitted to make their own rulings.

Mr. RUSSELL. The findings of the National Selective Service System based on such examinations are in no way binding on local draft boards. They serve merely for informational purposes. The local draft boards in the last analysis will still have to pass on the question of deferment.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the national selective-service board have some sort of measuring stock for its use?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no such thing as the national selective-service board.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean the administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Selective Service System is going ahead with the examinations. However, the pending bill would make it perfectly clear that any report which might be made as the result of such examinations would be merely informative to the draft board, and would in no way be binding or conclusive on any local boards.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the administration of the Selective Service Act by local draft boards is the proper way of handling it.

Mr. RUSSELL. So do I.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe such determinations should be made on the local level.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. How would it operate at the local level? If the question is left for determination to each draft board, how is a draft board going to arrive at deferments?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be left to each individual draft board. The problems in the various jurisdictions are different.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator think it would be much more difficult to administer?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have never favored having any kind of mass examinations held throughout the country and making the results of the examinations binding on local draft boards. I am very strongly opposed to it. I believe that in the last analysis we must depend on the local draft boards to deal with the problem. Of course, there will be some errors committed in some jurisdictions, but in the last analysis that is the best way to do it.

Mr. WHERRY. Where are such examinations given now? Are they given at the local level?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer the question. There has been no specific act passed authorizing such examinations.

Mr. WHERRY. I notice that young students are taking examinations. Will such examinations be given at the grass roots, or will the students be brought to some place to take the examinations? Does the Senator have any information on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if it is agreeable I should like to yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who can supply the information on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit me, the Director of Selective Service has announced, as the Senator from Nebraska will recall, that Selective Service System would give such tests. That announcement was made while the bill was pending. Representative KILDAY, of Texas, offered an amendment to the bill when it was being considered in the House, which was adopted. I know it will interest the Senator from Nebraska, in the light of what he has said, and if the chairman will permit me to do so, I shall read the amendment:

> No local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research—

I skip a little—

> solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government.

The purpose of the amendment was to make it abundantly clear that Congress did not intend to have the local draft board guided by any of the tests on a mandatory basis. If a local draft board decides that it wants to take the results into consideration in making various evaluations, it can of course voluntarily do so.

Mr. WHERRY. It may use the information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have gone as far as we can go to protect the local draft boards in the administration of the law.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I believe it is a good provision.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is the Senator from Maryland correct in understanding that the limitation on the number of persons to be deferred by reason of being in college has been eliminated?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me, I should like to read further. In doing so I shall touch on the point he has brought up. I will deal with it in a moment, if the Senator will be so kind as to indulge me.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

The Senate bill provided that conscientious objectors who are opposed to military service in any form should be required to do work of national importance under civilian control. In other words, Mr. President, the Senate bill contained the same provision which was in effect for conscientious objectors during World War II.

The House amendment continued the procedure provided in the existing law—I refer to the 1948 act, which has been once extended—that is, that conscientious objectors simply would be deferred. Both Houses receded from their original positions and adopted a plan whereby conscientious objectors who are opposed to military service in any form may be required by their local boards to perform for a period equal to the prescribed period of induction such civilian work contributing to the national health, safety, or interest, as the local board may deem to be appropriate. In the event the individual fails to comply, he is subject to prosecution under the penalty section of the act.

ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS

The Senate bill amended the Lodge Act so as to increase the number of aliens who may be enlisted in the Regular Army from a total of 2,500 to a figure of 25,000 per annum for 5 years. In other words, it would have been possible to enlist a total of 125,000 aliens, who of necessity would have been screened by the processes provided in the Lodge bill.

The House amendment contained no provision for the enlistment of aliens in our armed services.

The conference agreement authorizes the enlistment of not to exceed 12,500 aliens by June 30, 1955. The provisions of the existing law requiring concurrence by the Secretary of State and the Bureau of Immigration in the screening of these individuals remains in effect. These provisions are not disturbed by the conference agreement.

WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate bill suspended until July 31, 1954, the existing 2-percent limitation on women in the Regular components of the Armed Forces. The House amendment contained no similar provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language in the form in which it was passed by this body on March 9.

In other words, we suspend until 1954 any limitation on the enlistment of women in the Regular components of the armed services.

PERIOD OF INACTION

As to the period of induction, the Senate version of the bill provided for an induction period of 24 months. The House amendment specified a period of 26 months. Here, again, the House receded, and the conference agreement adopts the Senate version, namely, 24 months.

MANPOWER CEILING

As to the ceiling strength of the Armed Forces, the Senate version of the bill contained a provision which imposed a ceiling of 4,000,000 on the aggregate active-duty strength of the Armed Forces, such ceiling to remain in effect only during the period during which the authorized strength of the Armed Forces is suspended. The House substitute contained no comparable provision; in the bill as passed by the House there was no manpower ceiling whatever. This point proved to be a very difficult one upon which to reach an agreement. However, the conferees on the part of the House have accepted the principle of a manpower ceiling, and the conference report establishes the figure at 5,000,000, instead of the figure contained in the bill as passed by the Senate.

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I am particularly pleased that the principle of a ceiling, which was adopted by the Senate, has been retained in the conference report. Needless to say, I would have preferred a lower ceiling; but I wish to say that I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and all the other Senate conferees are entitled to a word of commendation on this point, because in the debate on the floor of the Senate the Senators who subsequently were appointed to be the Senate conferees were not in favor of a ceiling; and the fact that the bill as passed by the House did not contain provision for a ceiling would have made it very easy, as I think those of us who have been on conference committees know very well, for the conferees on the part of the Senate to have compromised on that particular point.

When conferees do what the conferees on the part of the Senate have done in this respect, in placing in the conference report a provision embodying a principle which has been adopted by the Senate, even though as individual Senators on the floor of the Senate they did not vote for it, certainly they are entitled to have favorable note taken of their action on the floor of the Senate; and I do so now.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I consider it to be particularly good for the country that this check is being maintained by Congress on the military. Even though the ceiling is 5,000,000, nevertheless it is a check, and it establishes in the history of our military legislation the very important point that, after all, the military must look to the Congress for checks upon the size of the military; and when they need more men they have an obligation to come to Congress and show the need.

Let me say in passing that, in my opinion, it also demonstrates that the argument of one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made by means of a letter which was read on the floor of the Senate during the closing hours of the debate, as time has gone by has proved not to be a very important argument, as I contended at the time. I refer, of course, to General Collins' argument in his letter of March 7, when he said:

> In the short range, the Army would be adversely affected as to combat effectiveness and morale.

He was speaking against a statutory ceiling. Then he said:

> For want of authority to go overstrength from time to time—a condition which cannot be accurately predicted because of battle conditions in Korea and fluctuations in current international tensions, our present plans for rotation of personnel in Korea might be completely upset.

As the Senator from Georgia knows, I did not support that argument at the time. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I knew that General Collins had already testified before the committee as to their plans for rotation under a military manpower proposal of 3,462,000, which they themselves were requesting, whereas all we were asking for was a ceiling of 4,000,000, finally; and they have gone ahead with their rotation program with an armed forces strength which today has reached only 2,600,000.

So I am glad time has proved what I thought was the obvious fallacy of the argument of General Collins, as set forth in his letter; and I hope this experience will teach the Joint Chiefs of Staff that when they throw into the debate on the floor of the Senate, in the eleventh hour, letters which they hope will influence the vote on the issue then pending, they must be a little more accurate than General Collins was in his letter.

Again I wish to say that I thank the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas for making the fight for the Senate in the conference committee, and seeing to it that the principle of a ceiling is maintained in the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, at this time I shall not debate the merits of the ceiling in the manpower bill. When the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon was pending, I stated that I thought it would be most unfortunate to have a ceiling provided in the manpower bill. That was my thought at the time when I made the statement, and I believe it to be accurate now. I did not believe it was wise to insert provision for a ceiling, and thus serve notice to the entire world as to how far we were going.

Four of the five conferees on the part of the Senate—the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]—voted against the ceiling, and I think three of us spoke against it on the floor of the Senate. However, Mr. President, I have always tried to be very careful in handling in conference an issue on which I have been defeated in a fight on the floor of the Senate; under such circumstances I always fight just a little harder in the committee of conference because I realize that at that juncture I am an agent and a representative of the Senate itself, and I feel bound to insist upon the position taken by a majority of my colleagues in the Senate, even though it does not represent my own view.

Of course, this was an issue which required considerable debate in the committee of conference, where is was discussed at great length. The House did not desire to have provision made for any ceiling. Four of the five conferees on the part of the Senate did not desire to have provision made for a ceiling, but they pressed as hard as they knew how for a ceiling because they were the agents of the Senate. That issue certainly had been debated thoroughly and voted on in four or five different ways in the Senate. There could be no doubt about the position of the Senate on it.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Wyoming, who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNT. As I interpret the conference report, I am led to believe that, regardless of the fact that the President may authorize the deferment of 75,000 students who are engaged in the study of medicine, dentistry, or any of the allied specialties, if the local draft boards do not see fit to defer such students, they will not be deferred.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wyoming is undoubtedly correct; that is what the law provides at the present time. That is my understanding of this measure—namely, that we must depend upon the judgment and the patriotism of the members of the local draft boards.

Mr. President, if I had an opportunity to do so, I should like to pay tribute to those who serve on the local boards. If there is any thankless job in any community, it is the job of serving on the local selective-service board. Those who serve on those boards realize that there is no way on earth by which they can enforce the law with any degree of satisfaction to all of their neighbors. No compensation is paid to the members of the local draft boards. They do not even receive commissions which they can frame and hang on their walls. Although at times the members of the draft boards make errors, I think they are, in the main, distinguished citizens who are trying to serve their country.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he feels it is simply impossible for every local draft board throughout the United States to keep itself well informed on the medical, dental, and other scientific needs of the Nation? I am of the opinion that in deleting from

the bill the requirement that 75,000 of such students shall be deferred, we shall be seriously injuring—perhaps indirectly—the health of the Nation, and as a result we may find ourselves in the same situation in which we were following World War II, and in which we are now, namely, we shall be faced with a tremendous shortage of physicians and dentists.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is entirely possible. I think the members of the local draft boards are kept fairly well informed by the various instructions and advice which come to them from the national headquarters. The Senator from Wyoming may know of instances where the local draft boards have not been kept well informed regarding deferment criteria. However, so far as I am advised as to conditions within my own State, I do not believe that is the case. The shortage to which the Senator from Wyoming refers is not, in my judgment, brought about by drafting the men into the service; it has been due to the lack of sufficient facilities for the education of dentists and physicians.

Mr. HUNT. That was not so, Mr. President, immediately following World War II, when we were graduating only 200 or 300 from our schools, within the first few years following the war, simply because the pre-medic and pre-dental student had been inducted into the service instead of being allowed to complete his education. We are today suffering from that procedure, and in case of a major war, if we followed the same procedure again the situation would be even worse, following a third world war, than it is at the present time, following World War II.

Mr. RUSSELL. That could be, Mr. President. It is a matter on which the Senator from Wyoming is perhaps as well informed as any man in Washington, D. C., certainly as well informed as any Member of the Senate, and I would defer to his judgment.

The Senate conferees argued vigorously in behalf of the 75,000 provision, of course, but the House conferees simply would not agree to any such project. If I recall correctly, they would not even discuss it with us after the first 5 or 10 minutes. We were left to talk it out on our own.

Mr. HUNT. I appreciate the position taken by the Senate conferees. I am greatly disappointed that they were not successful in their effort. I shall not attempt to have the Senate disapprove the conference report on this point, but I reiterate that I think we are making a very bad mistake.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I stated before, I attach great weight to the comment and opinions of the Senator from Wyoming on this issue. I do so on any issue, but particularly on this one, because he has made quite an intensive study of it. I hope that what he apprehends will not come to pass. But I am sure that no one desires that there shall be a dearth of physicians and dentists, and if it appears that the bill as now presented does not work satisfactorily or is likely to prove crippling in supplying physicians, dentists, and other scientific specialists who are essential to the maintenance of the American people and of the national interests, we can introduce a separate bill.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Georgia will not take offense at my interruption.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all. The Senator from Oregon has made a great contribution in shaping the bill. A number of his views which did not prevail in the committee or on the floor of the Senate were supported so vigorously by the conferees on the part of the House that they appear in the final report, even though they were not adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I should be less than human if I did not say that I am very much pleased to note that the conference report comes nearer to carrying out the so-called Morse amendments to the bill than was the case when the bill passed the Senate. I am glad that in several particulars the principles of my amendments are now a part of the bill.

What I rose to say was that the one thing I seek to do is to be helpful in developing the legislative history of the bill for future reference. Consideration of the handling of the specialist students, or the need of specialists in the Military Establishment, referred to by the Senator from Wyoming, causes me to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is not true that there is nothing in the bill as now presented which would prevent the Military Establishment working out with the colleges a special training course for military draftees along the lines of the V–12 program of World War II and other similar programs, if the military should want to do it. In other words, there is nothing in this bill which says that there cannot be established a special service for the training of specialists who may be needed by the military establishments in cooperation with the colleges, if the colleges and the military can only get together. Is that not true?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing whatever in the bill which would prevent any such action on the part of the military, if they had the authority.

Mr. MORSE. I may say, then, for future reference, and in the interest of the legislative history, that when the so-called deferment program for the 75,000 students was before the Armed Services Committee, there were a great many reservations in the minds of some of us as to whether that was the appropriate way to handle it. Some of us felt that it would be better to work out what we referred to as a program resulting in a marriage between the colleges and the military for special courses which would give the needed training while the young men were in uniform. I have been thinking over the problem in the months which have passed since the committee hearings, and I say now that I am not at all disturbed by the fact that the conference report does not carry the provisions of the Senate bill in this regard. To the contrary, the conference bill presents to the Military Establishment and to the colleges a great opportunity to come forward with a joint training program for the training of specialists, whether they be physicians, dentists, physicists, biochemists, engineers, or whatnot, whereby young men will receive training, in accordance with their merits, while in uniform, and will then give their military service over and above that. What the bill offers now is an opportunity, when the Military Establishment and the colleges get together on this subject for future legislation, which I think will really strengthen our whole military manpower program.

In closing, I desire to say that I hope the college presidents will face this question a little more realistically than they have done to date, because as I have come to study the attitude and the proposals of the college presidents, I have reached the conclusion that, by and large, they have missed the boat on the whole matter of special training for the specialists needed in the Military Establishment. It seems to me they have been too anxious to develop a program which did not require what I have called the direct marriage relationship between the colleges and the Military Establishment. I think they will have to come to it now, and I hope they will now get their heads together, and bring forth a program which will meet that which the Senator from Wyoming has in mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his contribution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, a member of the conference committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In furtherance of what the Senator from Wyoming has said, am I not correct in saying that the so-called Holloway plan, as concerns the Navy, is still in existence, and is not affected by this bill in any way? The Army has named a certain number of colleges, I do not know how many, as officers' training schools, and they are not in any way affected by the bill so far as concerns specialist training in medicine, biology, chemistry, and so on. Those programs are not programs of the military so much as they are programs which will be carried forward by the scientific groups where they are needed. They are not specifically military programs, and the young men will not be in uniform. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any plan at this time to establish any V–12 classes in medical training, but there is nothing in this bill to prevent its being done. Such a provision was not in conference between the two Houses. I think it would be fair to say that the basic assumption of the bill is that there will be deferments by local draft boards of a sufficient number of men to fill the requirements of the civilian population in the sciences.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] after which I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. HOLLAND. As a predicate to my questions, I should like to say to the Senator from Georgia that I compliment him and his associates warmly upon their work in connection with this difficult conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say likewise that, on this particular feature, it seems to me that the conference report is an improvement over the Senate version.

The Senator will recall that when the bill was debated on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Florida had grave doubts as to the wisdom of the provision in the Senate bill which would have required not for deferment before induction but for the giving of opportunities to not more than 75,000 of the men of each year's selection, after they had completed their basic training, and upon their having subjected themselves to a uniform examination, to be chosen by a national commission to become students in schools which turn out physicians, dentists, scientists, engineers, or even to become students in those various courses which are called the humanities. The Senator from Florida felt that program was exceedingly objectionable from several points of view. Is it now correct to say that the local boards are continued in the full jurisdiction which they had during World War II to defer before induction young men of premedical or predental training or of aptitudes in various important scientific fields so that they secure college training in those particular specialized fields?

Mr. RUSSELL. I well remember the fears expressed by the Senator from Florida when the bill was under consideration. In answer to his question, I wish to say that, in my opinion, the conference bill, if anything, strengthens the power of the local draft boards to decide upon the deferments to which the Senator refers. It contains language covering the authority of the local draft boards which was not contained in the law in effect during the war period.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. If I may be permitted to observe, I think that system will much more nearly assure fair geographic distribution of the students and also fair racial distribution of the students, it being my observation that particularly with reference to students of the Negro race, unless they are allowed to compete with members of their own race alone, they are very apt to be denied, in many cases, the opportunity to go to either medical or dental schools. The Senator will recall the interesting figures upon that subject which were developed by the Library of Congress sometime ago.

Mr. President, I have one more question. Is there anything in this measure which will in any way prohibit the armed services from proceeding with the program under which they now very frequently discharge inductees who have already received basic military training or who have gone beyond that stage, at the time when they are admitted to medical schools or dental schools in which they have had applications pending and for which they have perfected their preliminary work?

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill in nowise affects the regulations under which the discharges referred to by the Senator are made.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to make one more observation, the Senator from Florida feels that this will allow in a perfect way the continuation of a cooperative and understanding handling of individual cases between the armed services and the faculties of various institutions of learning who have heretofore worked together congenially in this field. I feel that with the very large number of students who have completed their premedical and predental work, amounting, as the Senator knows, to many more than the number who could be admitted in any one year or in several years, there is a tremendous pool to draw from under which either the local boards or the faculties of the schools, in conjunction with the commanders in the Armed Forces, will find a way to give opportunities to the best prepared young men, whether white or Negro, to take the professional or scientific training which they are ambitious to receive.

I commend the Senator from Georgia and his committee upon the program as reported in the conference report.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota, and then to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CASE. If the results of the tests are not to be obligatory or mandatory upon the local boards, why should they be given at the expense of the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry, but I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. CASE. If the results of the tests which prospective inductees were taking, and which more are soon to take, are not to be mandatory upon the local boards, so far as deferment is concerned, why should they be given?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that question with authority. I assume the local boards might use the information as a guide, even though it does not constitute a directive. There is absolutely nothing in the bill which would enable the Selective Service to make its acceptance compulsory on the local boards. The Senator knows that long before this bill was passed, while the bill was on the Senate floor, in March, it was announced that the tests were not to be given under any provision contained in the bill. They are being given under general authority of the Selective Service Director to provide deferments deemed essential to the national health, safety, or interest. The Senator from Georgia must absolve himself of any participation in the giving of tests. I did not have anything whatever to do with the giving of the test to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. CASE. It occurs to me that something should be done to correct the impression given to people generally that the tests are going to result in deferments of the prospective inductees who are taking the tests. My correspondence indicates that many take the tests with the expectation that if they reach a mark of 87, or whatever the figure may be, they will be deferred. Furthermore, colleges have been making plans to receive students on the basis of the prospective enrollees they may have as a result of the tests. If there is any way to clarify that situation, I think the press and the country generally should be advised that the tests are not obligatory upon the local boards.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are not obligatory upon the local boards. I would not have my statement understood as saying that the local boards cannot apply them. I think a great many boards will be glad to get the information afforded by the tests, and will undoubtedly use it in arriving at deferments, whether they use it in exactly the order in which the Selective Service intends or not. Perhaps some of the local boards will follow it down to the last suggestion of the Selective Service System. But there is nothing in the bill which makes the acceptance of information gleaned from the requirements or tests which the Selective Service System may offer obligatory upon the local boards. On the contrary, there is a provision which protects the jurisdiction of local boards.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, with further reference to educational deferments, in the galley-proof print of the conference report which I have before me it appears, at the bottom of page 11 and top of page 12, that there will be a deferment for prospective inductees who are in high school if they are maintaining a satisfactory course, until the time of their graduation, or until they reach the twentieth anniversary of their birth. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not know that any point had been raised about high school students. The Senate bill contained a provision which mandatorily deferred all high school students until they had graduated or had reached the age of 19 years. The House version of the bill contained a provision which deferred them until they were graduated or had attained the age of 20 years. Some figures were introduced which showed that only a small percentage failed to graduate by the time they were 19 years of age. We accepted the House provision of 20 years, which is the same as the present law.

Mr. CASE. The next paragraph deals with deferments at a college, university, or similar institution, and a hurried reading of the paragraph suggests to me that the result of the action of the conferees is to say to a person who is in college at the time he receives his call for induction and upon the presentation of those facts to the local board, that he will be deferred until the end of the particular academic year in which the call occurs, but no longer, unless he be deferred by reason of the application of regulations promulgated by the President under the section relating to the National Security Training Corps. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. If he is in college when he receives his orders, he is deferred until the end of the academic year.

Mr. CASE. But no longer.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct; but no longer.

Mr. CASE. Unless he comes in the scientific group.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, or unless he is deferred by the action of the local board.

Mr. CASE. On the basis of some other qualification?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, section 6 (h) of the present law.

Mr. CASE. But he has no mandatory deferment?

Mr. RUSSELL. He has no mandatory deferment other than for the scholastic year in which he is engaged at the time he receives his notice.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I apologize to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. I shall now be glad to deal with the matter he raised.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I am very reluctant to interrupt the Senator from Georgia because I know he would like to proceed with his explanation of the measure.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to be interrupted by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I raised the point because the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida raised the question in my mind. We have the question of a man who has completed his premedical college education. He has matriculated and been accepted in a medical school. He is also a member of the Active Reserve, and has gotten his orders to report for active duty. Is there anything that would defer that man from active duty in the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing that would make it mandatory that he be deferred, but I should think that a showing that he would be admitted to a recognized medical school, and was qualified for admission, would certainly be most persuasive in securing a delay in his call to active duty.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The case I have cited is an actual one. I feel there should be some provision in the bill to defer a man under such circumstances, and make it mandatory that he be deferred.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator again state the conditions?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The man has completed his academic education. He has matriculated and been accepted in an accredited medical school. He is also a member of the Organized Reserve, and as such has been alerted and has now received his orders for active duty. His draft board has deferred him, but he is now on the other horn of the dilemma. He is in the Active Reserve and has been called to duty. Should he not be exempted under this measure?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly think he should be deferred. I do not know whether he should be exempted, but certainly he should be deferred. I do not believe, I may say, that that is something which properly belongs in this bill. A bill will come to the Senate within a few days dealing with the Reserves. The pending bill concerns itself with the Selective Service System and the universal military training program. We will later have before us legislation dealing with the Reserve components. We hope, if the committee can get down to work on it, that we can present the matter to the Senate at an early date.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. This man went through the ROTC in his college, and was then certified to his unit after graduation, and a month or so ago was alerted, and now he has his actual orders. Meantime he has been matriculated and accepted in an accredited medical school.

Mr. RUSSELL. If he has been accepted in an accredited medical school I think the Army in which he is—it is the Third Army in my State—should have deferred the man and enabled him to go to school, but I know of no law which would give him deferment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that when a man takes an ROTC training in a college he takes it at the expense of the Government, and he agrees to give at least 3 years of service?

Mr. RUSSELL. It depends on the type of ROTC training. Under the Holloway Act, trainees receive, I believe, $50 a month and uniform. In the ROTC units in the Army, in the Air Force and the regular Naval ROTC they receive considerably less.

There is no question about his legal obligation to serve. He has such an obligation. I have known of cases of men who were in the Army, who had enlisted in the Army voluntarily, and were members of a regular component of the Army, but when they were accepted in an accredited medical school, the Army would discharge them and permit them to go to school. That is the reason why I said I thought under the facts stated it would have been the part of better judgment to have deferred the individual to whom the Senator from Maryland refers.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no mandatory provision in any law that provides for what the distinguished Senator from Maryland wants done?

Mr. RUSSELL. None so far as I know.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a question of whether or not the military authorities will defer such a man as a medical student, rather than to permit the military to take him as an active officer. Answering the Senator's question, there is not any mandatory provision that gives the relief the premedical student would like to have at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; there is absolutely no mandatory law that requires such action to be taken. But I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am quite sure such action has been taken. Deferments have been granted in some cases.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not want the Senator from Georgia to get the impression that the Army has turned down this particular man. It has not. His case is now pending. I wondered if there was anything in the proposed legislation that would protect him in this situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing whatever in the proposed legislation that would affect him in the slightest degree. But if the man's record is as the Senator has stated, my judgment is that the Army will defer him.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to labor the point respecting the deferment of college students or those who are to be given technical training. When the conference report is taken up tomorrow we will thoroughly discuss that question, I imagine. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that, for the life of me, I cannot see why the Selective Service requires the examination to which reference has been made, or gives it, if it is unnecessary or will not be made use of by the draft boards. I cannot understand yet why that is done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I stated on the floor of the Senate that there is nothing obligatory or mandatory on the local draft boards with respect to the examinations referred to. But the draft boards may, if they wish, use the information thereby obtained, as a basis for deferment.

Mr. WHERRY. Have the local draft boards asked that these examinations be given? Why does the Selective Service take the initiative and give the examinations without any request on the part of the draft boards? Of course, I can see how it would be informative to a draft board that wants to defer a student, possibly, on application. I wondered if the Senator could help me by having that point clarified either today or tomorrow. I do not understand why the examination should be given.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume it is because the Director of Selective Service thought that the information thus obtained would be helpful to the draft boards. He might have thought that this bill would emerge from Congress in such form that it would be mandatory upon the draft boards to accept these findings. The regulation was issued by the Director of Selective Service, as I recall, while this bill was pending in the Senate. When it went to the House, in order to prevent these tests from being obligatory on the local draft boards the amendment was adopted on the floor of the House in the language read by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to protect the draft boards from compulsory regulation that they abide by the examination results.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Where did the Director of Selective Service get the idea that it become obligatory?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry I cannot answer that question. I do not know whether he thinks it might become ob-

ligatory. I was giving what I thought might be a reason. I do not know what prompted the Director of Selective Service to issue the call for the examination. I have not seen him since he appeared as a witness before the Johnson subcommittee, which was several weeks before the examination order was issued. I am quite sure that the Senator from Nebraska, if he were to call the Director of Selective Service, would be given some of the reasons which prompted him to take such action.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything in the conference bill which permits the giving of these examinations and provides exemptions for certain individuals who pass the examinations?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I read the provision which prevents the Director of Selective Service from making it mandatory on the local boards. I will read it again.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it will not be necessary for the Senator to do that. I should like to know whether it is discretionary, not whether it is mandatory; whether the Director can give the examinations and then say that those in the upper grades shall be exempt and go to college, or that those below a certain mark shall go into the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is anything in the bill which would prohibit an examination from being held, but there is a provision which prevents the Director of Selective Service from requiring that the draft boards accept the results of such examinations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then one draft board may accept them and another draft board may reject them?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is so. We have that situation today. Some draft boards are more generous with educational deferments to college men than others.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there now in the bill anything which permits the giving of the examination?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the bill which would either permit or prohibit the giving of the examination. It does not concern itself with the giving of these examinations. It merely deals with the effect which such examinations might have on the local draft board.

Let me again read the language:

> Notwithstanding any provisions of this act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research—

And so forth.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that if we shall adopt the conference report, in the light of the knowledge we have as to the examinations being given and the intention of the administration to exempt from military service those attaining the upper grades, we will approve such a system, and that it will be carried into effect?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only does the Senator from Georgia not feel that way, but he thinks that would be a most far-fetched construction. This provision was written into the bill on the floor of the House, and the argument was used that it was to prevent the very thing to which the Senator from Michigan refers.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know that the opinion of the Senator from Georgia will be given great weight in interpreting what may be an ambiguity in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not consider it to be ambiguous. I think it is about as specific as it could be made, that no person shall be postponed or deferred by reason of his activity, study, or research. I continue quoting where I left off a moment ago—

> solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government.

This amendment was written to prevent these examinations from being obligatory on the local board; and I think it does so as clearly as the English language could do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then does the Senator feel that the adoption of the conference report would not be a confirmation of the proposed plan?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am confident it would not.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate having the Senator's remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not the case that one of the arguments for the provision written in in the House and confirmed by the conference committee is that the problems of the Selective Service boards vary so greatly from one community to another that in one community they might have need for every man of a certain age and of good physical qualifications to meet their quota, while in another community—even in the adjoining county or area—there might be a completely different problem, requiring the local draft boards to exercise a different descretion, depending on the specific nature of the problem which they had to meet?

Mr. RUSSELL. That could have been the reason, because that condition certainly prevails. There are great variations among the different draft boards.

Moreover, I think there was a feeling that, after all, the people who live in a man's home community, who associate with him every day and who know him, are much better qualified to pass upon the question of his deferment than someone who arrives at the result by a test given on a national basis.

The Senator from Florida and I are adherents of a group which has been threatened with extinction, namely, the Jeffersonian Democrats. Of course, we believe in the largest possible measure of local home rule and self-government in the local communities of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the program incorporated in the conference report guarantees just that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

AGE OF INDUCTION

Mr. RUSSELL. As to the induction age, the age of induction for service in the Armed Forces and for training in the National Security Training Corps was one of the major points at issue. The Senate bill had an induction age of 18 years, with, of course, the provision with which all Senators are familiar, that it would be necessary to exhaust the pool of those above 19 before coming down to 18 years 9 months, 18 years 6 months, and so forth. The House amendment placed the age at 18½ years. The compromise agreement authorizes induction for service in the Armed Forces to begin at 18½, and induction for training in the National Security Training Corps—the so-called UMT—at the age of 18.

RESERVE SERVICE

As to the total period of service liability, under the Senate bill an individual was liable for an aggregate of 8 years of service. This aggregate included both active duty service of 24 months and time spent as a member of a Reserve component.

Under the House amendment the aggregate period was 6 years. The House receded on this point, and the conference agreement establishes the aggregate service period—that is, active duty plus Reserve service—at 8 years.

AUTHORIZED PERIOD OF ACTIVE DUTY FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS

As to the active duty of reservists, the Senate bill authorized the call to active duty of reservists for the normal induction period of 24 months. The House amendment provided that such individuals could be ordered to active duty for not to exceed 21 months, regardless of the normal induction period imposed upon all other individuals. The House receded on this point, and the conference agreement authorizes members of the Reserve components to be ordered to active duty for a period of not to exceed 24 months. The authority to order the Reserve components to active duty terminates July 1, 1953.

As to the cut-off date on selective service——

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator be willing to bring out at this time, in connection with the point with regard to the Reserves, the question of calling up Reserves who have had more than a year's service in World War II, or would he prefer not to discuss it at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very glad to discuss it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does that subject come at a later point in the Senator's statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I had intended to deal with it at a later point, but I shall be glad to deal with it now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Whatever the Senator desires.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the same question. What the Senator has been referring to is the Reserve unit itself, as a unit.

Mr. RUSSELL. In effect, yes; not the volunteer or the inactive Reserves.

Mr. TAFT. The inactive reserves are different. Can the Senator tell us exactly the line between the active and inactive Reserves?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to undertake to do so now.

There is a very substantial difference between inactive or volunteer reservists and the active reservists, who are normally assigned to units. The great difference is that the inactive or volunteer reservists receive no compensation whatever. The active reservists normally receive compensation based upon their attending training for a certain number of hours each month. I may say that in some cases the training is frequently book work. In addition, they receive certain credits toward retirement, whereas the inactive reservist does not normally receive the same credit toward retirement unless associated with a volunteer unit. The difference is that the inactive reservists normally get no pay and no credit toward retirement. The active reservists receive some compensation and credit toward retirement. That is the difference between them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does a man who enlists become an inactive reservist, or is he in a different category?

Mr. RUSSELL. His enlistment would have nothing whatever to do with it. As a matter of fact, most of the men entered the Reserves when they came out of the service, at the time they were released from active duty. Many of the services urged that the men go into the inactive Reserves, and thousands of them did so.

Mr. FERGUSON. A reservist is entirely different from a man who voluntarily enlists and does not go through Selective Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. A person could well become a volunteer reservist without first being inducted through selective service. If he is in any branch of the service, whether he is a volunteer or comes in through selective service, he may later become an inactive or volunteer reservist when released from active duty.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senator answers those questions, will he include in the answer a statement as to whether or not a person who has enlisted and has been in the service, let us say for a period of 3 years, will be able voluntarily to leave the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator mean to sever his connection with the Reserve unit?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, after 3 years. Let us say that his term of 3 years expires in July of this year, and that he went in voluntarily. Would this bill keep him in longer, or could he voluntarily withdraw?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the terms of this bill when a person who has served 3 years under a voluntary enlistment comes out of the active service he is automatically placed in a reserve status for a period of 5 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then he may be taken back as a reservist?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but only in the event his recall is authorized by Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A man who enlisted for a 3-year period prior to a certain date—I forget the exact date——

Mr. RUSSELL. Prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Prior to the passage of this act. If my memory serves me correctly, when he comes out he is free from any reserve duty, is he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. He is free?

Mr. RUSSELL. He has no further obligation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does that apply to all grades?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. To officers, as well as to enlisted men?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it applies to all grades and ranks.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. As the Senator is aware, when the Korean War broke out, there was considerable difficulty caused by the calling up of reservists who were on the inactive list before calling up those who were on the active list or members of organized units.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Does the bill establish any priority of call in such situations which may arise hereafter?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it does not. There are separate bills pending in the two committees which deal with the establishment of a permanent Reserve system, which contain priorities. The only priorities which the pending bill establishes is with reference to the release of inactive or voluntary reservists who are on active duty today. It would give them prior release from duty. I can turn to that provision now if the Senator would prefer me to do so. I have not yet reached it in order.

Mr. CASE. I would prefer to have the Senator from Georgia proceed in his own way.

Mr. RUSSELL. The final major point of disagreement, or at least one of the major points of disagreement—and perhaps the word "conflict" is a better word to use—between the two versions was the House provision for arbitrarily returning members of the inactive or voluntary Reserve who qualify as World War II veterans under the 1948 act to their homes at the completion of 12 months of service.

The Senate, and more particularly the Senate conferees, recognized that many injustices have been done to thousands of our reservists, who saw long tours of duty during World War II since the recall program began in July 1950.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services has repeatedly insisted to the Chiefs of Staff and to the secretaries of the several services, as well as to the Secretary of Defense, that the services should formulate a program for the release of these inactive reservists which would alleviate such inequities at the earliest possible moment. Each of the services formulated a program for the release of such reservists. The programs went into effect within the past 30 days, I believe. The particulars of the program have been released to the public. The great bulk of the voluntary or inactive enlisted reservists who saw duty during World War II, who desire to return to civilian life will be returned to their homes or will be released according to a definite and clear-cut return program.

I think I should interpolate at this point that there are some small groups of men who are in critical specialties who are not being released under this program. However, they are relatively few in number.

Insofar as the Army and Air Force are concerned, the returns will be completed within a year after entry on active duty. Those two great branches of service, that is, the enlisted inactive and volunteer reserves will be released within 12 months. The Navy will release its inactive volunteer reservists as soon after 12 months as trained replacements are available.

Mr. TAFT. Is that 12 months after the passage of the act?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is 12 months from the time they were called to duty after June 25, 1950. None of the reservists was called back until late in July. As a practical matter, it would run from some time in late July.

Under the conference agreement a limit or deadline of 17 months is established. After the passage of that time all inactive or voluntary reservists must be returned to their homes. Of course, we make it perfectly clear by the language of this bill that this 17-month maximum period is not intended to be used as an excuse for retaining the men, but that it is to apply to those who have not yet been returned in accordance with this program, which, as I have said, is 12 months in the case of the Army and Air Force, and as soon after 12 months as the replacement is provided in the case of the Navy.

Mr. FERGUSON. The 17-month period applies to the few specialists to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. If the Secretary of one of the armed services finds that any individual—I can conceive of a man who is an interpreter, for example—is essential to the maintenance of the combat effectiveness of the service to which the individual belongs, he could hold him.

Mr. FERGUSON. For how long a period?

Mr. RUSSELL. For a period of up to 21 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. So there is, first, the 12 months, then the 17 months, and then the 21 months for the specialists who are retained by orders of the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. RUSSELL. If a finding is made that such a man is essential to the maintenance of the combat effectiveness of the Army, Air Force, or Navy.

Mr. FERGUSON. That would be up to 21 months, then?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps the Senator has made his point clear, but I am not certain he has done so. Therefore, I should like to ask him whether it is not correct to say that there is nothing in the bill which deals with the programs of the Army and the Navy with respect to the 12-month period. It is a program. The conference report only refers to the 17 months, although there is a program with respect to enlistees under which they would be released after a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I tried to make it clear that a program had been formulated in the Department of Defense, which was due to the insistence of the Committee on Armed Services as much as to any other individual factor.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the 12-month provision apply only to enlistees, and not to officers?

Mr. RUSSELL. It applies only to enlistees. The 17-month period applies to all. Take, for example, the Air Force. They had to call up many pilots who were reservists. They had specialized training in the flying of airplines. If they had to release those officer pilots, it would have been disastrous. The Air Force was trying to increase its strength from 500,000 men to more than a million. It is essential that the Air Force has trained pilots. However, within 17 months they must release the officers. The 12 months applies to enlistees in the Air Force.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could it be possible that it would be 24 months, instead of 21 months, for the so-called specialists?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be 24 months for those who would be called up hereafter. Under the existing law, it is 21 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. Those who came in afterward would have to serve 24 months?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; they could be kept in serve for 24 months if they were essential to the maintenance of the combat effectiveness of the service, whether it be the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force. It is a drastic finding, I may say.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Secretary of Defense would have to make such a finding?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Secretary of each component service. It would be the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand. I thank the Senator.

CUT-OFF DATE FOR SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as to the cut-off date on selective service, the bill as passed by the Senate contained no expiration date for selective service, whereas the House amendment provided that inductions into the Armed Forces through selective service could not be made after July 1, 1954. This issue proved to be a rather controversial one; it was the subject of long discussion. Finally the conferees agreed to the House amendment, so as to cut off inductions under the Selective Service Act on July 1, 1955, rather than July 1, 1954, as provided in the original House substitute.

PROGRAM FOR TRAINING 75,000 STUDENTS ANNUALLY FOR 3 YEARS

As to the provision for the deferment of 75,000 students, the bill as passed by the Senate contained a provision for selecting from among persons who had completed their basic training, 75,000 students during the next 3 years, and these students were to have the remainder of their military service obligation suspended until they had completed their studies or research. The House substitute did not contain a similar provision. The conferees on the part of the Senate were unable to secure any form of compromise on this program, and the conference report entirely eliminates the provision.

PROVISIONS FOR UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Although the bill as passed by the Senate and the bill as passed by the House are in complete agreement on the desirability of accepting a permanent program of universal military training, yet the measures for the implementation of such a program varied considerably as between the House and the Senate versions of the bill. The basic difference lay in the fact that the bill as passed by the Senate gave universal military training an unqualified green light as of the date of the enactment of the bill. Although the Senate was clearly aware of the fact that some implementing legislation would be necessary, the bill as passed by the Senate did not prohibit the program from getting under way until such provision had in fact been enacted.

On the other hand, the House amendment, although solidly supporting the philosophy of universal military training, required that a second look be taken at the proposition by the Congress before any inductions could be made into the National Security Training Corps.

This basic point of disagreement between the Senate provision, which adopted universal military training now, and the House provision, which required that a second look be taken, was the rock upon which the conferees almost suffered a catastrophe; we nearly foundered on that rock.

As chairman of the committee of conference, it therefore gives me great pleasure to report that this issue has finally been resolved. The conference report in no way withdraws congressional endorsement of universal military training; however, it does recognize what we have always clearly understood, namely, that some additional implementing legislation will be necessary before the program can actually begin. Some of this legislation must be put on the statute books before any inductions are made into the National Security Training Corps, to receive this training.

The conference agreement provides for establishment of the National Security Training Commission and outlines its responsibilities and duties. Particular care has been taken to assure that the Commission, although establishing the policies and standards which govern the National Security Training Corps, does not write the detailed military program. The military program is made the responsibility of those who are best qualified to prepare it, namely, the Department of Defense and the three military services.

The agreement provides that within 4 months after the Commission has been confirmed by the Senate, the Commission must submit to the Congress its legislative recommendations which will govern the policies, standards, code of conduct, death and disability benefits, and other essential elements of such a program. These legislative recommendations must be acted upon by the respective committees within 45 days and must be reported to the two Houses. After they are reported, they go on the calendar as measures of the highest privilege which may be called up at any time on the motion of any single Member of either House.

The conference agreement does not prohibit the universal military training program from getting under way until all of these legislative recommendations shall have been enacted. It does provide that it cannot get under way until two of the recommendations—the code of conduct and measures outlining death and disability benefits for trainees—are adopted by the Congress. Inductions cannot be made until these measures, and any portion of the other measures, have been enacted into law.

A final condition precedent to the making of inductions would be the finding that the period of service for persons under age 19 could be either reduced or eliminated. Of course, it would be necessary that this be done before the program could be effective.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia has finished discussing the universal-military-training item, I should like to ask a question of him, if he will yield.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps the Senator from Georgia would wish to discuss this matter more in detail. Is it not true that in connection with the legislative requirements of the code of conduct, the safety measures, and other measures, a concept of the entire policy and plan is that the military training in and of itself will not necessarily be subject to legislative recommendations. Do I make my point clear?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is essential that the training program be made the subject of legislative recommendations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; just the opposite is the case.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The theory is that under the broad outline which the Commission will have to submit within 4 months of its appointment, the military part of the program will be under

the military, and, we hope, will not be subjected to specific congressional recommendations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the intent of the committee of conference—and I may say I do not think the Senate was alone in that respect, although we differed as to the kind of language necessary to secure the desired result—was that the civilian commission should have broad, overall supervision of the national training program, but that the military aspects of the program should be under the military. That was what we sought to achieve by the language adopted in the conference report.

In other words, this is a program of military training, and we do not desire to see it become, some kind of indoctrination center for certain ideas or philosophies or a natural-education program or something in the nature of a great works-projects program. We wish to see to it that the military features of this training are military and are under the control of the military, without interfering with the general over-all supervision by the civilian commission.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is the concept of the Senator from Georgia, is it not—as it is mine—that the legislative recommendations and the legislative acts coming from them should not, we hope, prescribe and define the military training?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should think it would be most unfortunate for the Congress to undertake to write military training details. We have neither the background nor the knowledge which would enable us to prescribe for military training. In the past Congress has never sought to write out a course of military training for the Air Corps, the Marine Corps, or any other branch of the armed services; and I see no reason why we should depart from the precedents in that respect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The theory of having the Commission set forth the broad outline is to have it inform Congress as to what is planned in the form of training, so that it can establish a legal code of conduct and can provide various safety measures and all the other protective features which go with establishing a new corps. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The language is "a broad outline for a program deemed by the Commission, and approved by the Secretary of Defense, to be appropriate to assure that the training carried out under the provisions of this act shall be of a military nature; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to grant to the Commission the authority to prescribe the basic type or types of military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps." I think that makes it very clear what our purpose was. Of course, we cannot bind this Congress, not to speak of any subsequent Congresses. If they were to undertake to enter the field of writing a military program, I assume that they could do it, but in my opinion it would be a very foolish step.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I was trying to bring out in conjunction with the Senator from Georgia was the fact that we hoped the military would care for the military training, and that it would not be interfered with by the civilian members, nor by the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I got the sense of the conference, it was that each member of the conference, from both Houses, was of opinion that the military should have control of the military training aspects of this program.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, will the Commission, which is to be composed in part of military members and in part of civilians, have the right to determine the length of period of training?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. It is written out in the law. It is 6 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is prescribed in the law, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is, and it is 6 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the Commission will not have either the time or the actual mode of training under their jurisdiction. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. They will not have, as to the military details.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say it must all be military training, not civilian?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that it goes quite that far, but I certainly gave it that construction. It does not say there cannot be any civilian training, because there is a rather thin line of demarcation there.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is, if it is desired to train a man how to string a telephone wire for the Signal Corps, for example, or to give a young man training so he will be a valuable reservist in communications in the event of the outbreak of war, that would be civilian training; but the bill makes it perfectly clear that the training shall be basic military training in its nature.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore the military alone would determine what the training should be, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, as to the military training.

Mr. FERGUSON. If there were to be other kinds of training, could the Commission as well as the military determine what the other kind of training would be?

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me read the language to the Senator. I shall read the language to the Senator from Michigan:

> The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. The Commission shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of the members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. The Secretary of Defense shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.

Here is the important sentence:

> The military department or departments so designated to carry out such military training shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, determine the type or types of basic military training to be given to members of the National Security Training Corps.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Will the status of privilege which the Senator has said this bill provides for the recommendations of the Armed Services Committee prevent the consideration of amendments at that time?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. As a matter of fact, the bill specifically authorizes amendments to any part of it.

Mr. CASE. Could the affirmative action be in the nature of a concurrent resolution, or would it require a regular bill to be passed by both Houses and signed by the President?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be in the nature of a law or an act.

Mr. President, the conferees feel that the adoption of this report by both Houses and its approval by the President of the United States will not only provide for our temporary needs through the selective service, for a training and service program, but it will make it possible for the armed services to initiate their long-range planning for universal military training, and to begin developing immediately the detailed techniques which it will require.

We have provided a system for an orderly phasing in of universal military training rather than for an arbitrary initiation of the program at some future time after a complete demobilization of our present active-duty forces.

Additionally, the features most essential to the successful operation of the program—a sound code of conduct and equitable death and disability benefits—must be enacted by the Congress before inductions may commence.

Mr. President, in presenting this report in behalf of the Senate conferees and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I wish to submit that this program will enable us not only to meet the present requirements of a large active-duty force but to build an adequate and well-trained reserve over the coming years. For events have all too clearly reemphasized, since the onset of the Korean episode, that our military security is irrevocably meshed with a program for the systematic building of a reserve of trained manpower.

At the present time, while we have several million reservists, we have no real Reserve program; and the lack of such a program has resulted in the hardships of which we have heard so frequently. Here were the services, looking for re-

servists; they would reach into some community, where there might be two reservists living across the street from each other. One might have a wife and two children; the other might be unmarried. The Departments did not even have sufficient information to tell where the greater hardship lay, and, from the cases which have been brought to my attention, it seemed that their capacity for selecting the worst hardship cases was considerable, to say the least. We must establish in this country a real Reserve program. We must do it for the reason that a real and complete Reserve program will enable us in time of emergency to avoid multiplication of the hardship cases of those called to service. We must do it, Mr. President, if we would not disrupt the civilian economy of the United States.

This Nation cannot indefinitely carry the burden of maintaining an armed force of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 men on active duty, with all the costs thus incurred. We cannot do it by resorting to a large short-term civilian establishment having a rapid rotation, or by undertaking to create a large permanent professional army the members of which will follow the science of warfare as life careers. We must follow the thought which was in the contemplation of the first President of the United States, George Washington, who envisioned a system of trained Reserves rather than the maintenance at all times of a large Regular Military Establishment.

The plan which we have offered is not as direct and positive a solution of the problem as was the original Senate bill, or as I should like to see it, but I believe, Mr. President, that the plan we have suggested is sound and workable. It affords Congress an opportunity to see the nature of the code of conduct which will be put into effect, and provision will be made for benefits for men in the universal military training before any inductions are made.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I share the regret of the Senator from Georgia that the program as reported by the conference for universal military training is not as direct, definite, and certain as was provided for in the Senate bill, but if I correctly understand, the conference measure does definitely lay a predicate for a universal military training program, and with that conviction underlying, I should like to ask this question of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee:

Is it correct to say that, under the conference report, whenever the state of our national preparedness is such in relation to our international situation that the selectees, when called to service, will not be needed more than 6 months, then universal military training shall come into existence under this program which is established under the conference report?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is generally a fair statement of the effect of the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it further correct to say that the time limitation upon the machinery which was described so ably by the Senator and which is included in the conference report with the purpose of bringing back to the Congress specific measures on the code of conduct and with respect to death and disability benefits, is such that that machinery will certainly function so quickly as to have ready a completed program for universal military training before the time will be reached when the selectees need not serve more than 6 months?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly think that is the case. If we have any degree of good luck at all there is no reason why much of the machinery for this system should not be well along before the end of this session of the Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. I greatly appreciate that expression on the part of the distinguished Senator, and I should like to ask one more question on an unrelated portion of the military-manpower program. Perhaps I missed it, but I did not hear the Senator comment on that part of the Senate bill which related to the National Guard of the several States. Are we to understand that there is no change in the conference report from the provisions of the Senate bill relating to the National Guard?

Mr. RUSSELL. None whatever. Every protection thrown around the National Guard by the original Senate bill is retained in the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the conference report establish an age limit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it 18 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose a young man has not finished high school at that age; does he wait until he finishes high school?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. He is deferred.

Mr. FERGUSON. Until he finishes high school?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, or until he reaches the age of 20 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. So he cannot remain in high school longer than age 20 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think most boys ought to be able to finish high school by that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I wondered if there was a loophole there.

Mr. RUSSELL. We give them every opportunity to finish high school before they are called into service.

Mr. President, I hope that on tomorrow the report will be agreed to by the Senate and that it will then meet with favorable action on the part of the House of Representatives. I think, as I have stated, that it provides not only for the present emergency, but for a long-range military program. It will save money; but, more than that, in my opinion, it will save the lives of American youth. It will avoid again placing them in a position where it will be necessary to induct men immediately, taking them from their homes without proper training, and exposing them to enemy fire on some far-flung battlefront. It will put us in a posture of defense so that the whole world will know that we have a reserve program that will enable us within a few days—not a few months or a few years—to assemble an armed force able to function efficiently for the protection of our liberties and the discharge of our obligations as free people.

It has been said by many distinguished Americans, one of the most recent being Gen. Douglas MacArthur, that if we had had universal military training in this country it is altogether possible that World War I and World War II might have been avoided. We offer the report, Mr. President, in the hope that its adoption will avoid world war III or any other great catastrophe that might cause the whole world to be again on fire; but should these disasters come upon us, we feel that because of this program we will be better prepared to cope with them. It will save not only money, but American lives, will impose on us only a burden we are able to bear, and will contribute to the day of permanent and lasting peace on earth.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to yield the floor. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is there not one more thing? If the universal military training measure becomes effective, will it avoid the sending back into service of men who served in a previous war, thus taking them away from their families because we do not have sufficient number of trained youth?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would unless we were engaged in a world war of such proportions that it would be necessary to summon every bit of our manpower. It would certainly prevent it in such a situation as we have today.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would depend upon the size of the military force, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I have said, that we must have a force necessary to assure us victory.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to compliment the Senator from Georgia upon his excellent explanation of the conference report, and I particularly commend him for what he has had to say about universal military training. I think it is time the people of the United States realize that if we are going to have a lasting peace, we must have proper preparedness, with conditions as they are today.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator, and I associate myself completely with his statement. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will lie on the table.

DEDUCTIONS TO BE DRAWN FROM HEARINGS ON THE REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the matter of hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee which are currently under way has been discussed on the floor by a few Senators, I feel compelled to give certain views of my own, in brief summary, as to the correctness and reasonableness of deductions that can be drawn from the hearings to date. I do so at this time because apparently at least one phase of the hearings has been substantially concluded, namely, the military position and the military explanation of the administration in connection with the relief of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I think the record in broad measure should be brought up to date. I shall not attempt to document each and every occurrence by quotations from the record. That would necessitate the presentation of an interminable instrument. But I shall attempt to review what in my judgment has happened up to this time, and what the reasonable conclusions from the evidence should be.

Mr. President, for the past 5 weeks I have devoted most of my time in attendance at all the hearings of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, sitting jointly, relative to the summary recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the foreign policy of the United States in Korea and the Far East. I was tremendously impressed by General MacArthur's address to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. My opinion as to the soundness of the general's views was further strengthened by his 3 days of testimony before the committee. The record clearly shows that General MacArthur testified without any rancor toward anyone; that he was fully responsive to all questions; that he separated fact from opinion, and that he presented professional military views for attaining sound objectives in Korea which inspire me with confidence.

Senators from both sides of the aisle had unlimited opportunity to interrogate General MacArthur. In no instance was there any confusion in the information received as a result of such interrogation. There was no "policy vacuum" in General MacArthur's testimony.

Since the testimony of General MacArthur the administration has produced its official family of military stars—General Marshall, Secretary of Defense; General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and the Joint Chiefs of Staff themselves, General Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army; General Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and Admiral Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations. And unless other reasons develop, it appears as though the military testimony of the administration is at an end.

I desire to recall for the RECORD that I moved, at the close of General Bradley's testimony, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff be requested to indicate in writing where they might disagree with the evidence given by their superiors. I anticipated that there would be no substantial disagreement in any major field by the Joint Chiefs of Staff with their superior, the Chairman, or with their superior, the Secretary of Defense, and I thought that repetitious testimony by the three Joint Chiefs of Staff, merely going over and restating what their superiors had already laid down as a line of testimony, would be a waste of the committee's time and of the Senate's time, and that we might well canvass it by trying to ascertain where their disagreement occurred, and questioning them on that point.

My motion was voted down by the committee, but I submit to any candid observer that the record of the past week and a half sustains my position. I believe that the Joint Chiefs, by their own statements and definitions as to the circumstances surrounding this affair, have been placed in an untenable position. I believe their testimony has been confused and confusing.

It is my conviction that when the Secretary of State takes the stand tomorrow, as I understand he will, we shall begin to get at the heart of the matter, and at the political maneuvers surrounding Asiatic policy.

Lest we allow the testimony of the past 20 days, however, through sheer weight to becloud the issue, I believe it essential at this time concisely to state those things which have been proved thus far.

First. The question: Why was General MacArthur recalled, or as some say, Why was he fired?

(A) According to the official military testimony, after the President had indicated an intent to relieve MacArthur, the Joint Chiefs of Staff concluded that General MacArthur was not in sympathy with the decisions to try to limit the conflict in Korea. This would make it difficult for him to carry out the Joint Chiefs of Staff's objectives. It was necessary to have a commander more responsive to control from Washington.

It is to be noted, significantly, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had not concluded in this manner prior to the time they learned that the President desired to relieve General MacArthur, and prior to April 5, 1951.

Apparently, then, MacArthur had violated something, some military instruction, directive or policy, but the Joint Chiefs have never been able in their testimony to agree fully as to just what, if any, violations clearly warranted the recall of MacArthur.

Moreover, someone unknown had to point out the military significance of this violation to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, because before April 5 the Joint Chiefs, by their universal testimony, never considered that there had been violations of any significance by General MacArthur which would warrant a consideration of his dismissal.

They have also universally testified that after the 5th of April General MacArthur committed no acts which, in their opinion, would warrant his dismissal from a military standpoint. As I have tried to point out, and as others have tried to point out in the hearings, if their position is tenable or supportable, then they might well be accused of not performing their full function if conditions existed before the 5th of April which, in their opinion, would have warranted his relief, and they did not so recommend before the 5th of April. They all testified that they never considered the matter of his relief prior to the 5th of April. They made no recommendations prior to the 5th of April. They only concurred after the political heads of the Government had determined that MacArthur's political head was coming off as well as his military head.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was it ever possible to determine where the original suggestion came from that the Joint Chiefs should consider this matter?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. That is one of the mysteries which often occurs. Men in important positions quite often can remember everything that seems to sustain their position, but often they are unable to remember matters which might not contribute to sustaining their position. In this case his memory failed General Bradley as to who made the very important telephone call to him on the 5th of April that General MacArthur was going to be relieved. It occurred to me that the proposed recall of General MacArthur would be a very important thing in our whole international and global policy. I presume that in the press of other business it slipped the witness' mind as to who had made this mysterious call. Perhaps it is explainable. Nevertheless, he is unable to recall who put in the call on this very important matter.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was it shown what department called General Bradley?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. The general cannot even remember what department called him; whether it came from the White House, from the Chief of Staff of the Army, or other source. He said the other day it might have come over the ticker.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator explain what is meant by "the ticker" so the RECORD will be clear? The Senator does not mean the UP, the AP, or the International News Service, does he?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know. The record is silent on that point. The record shows that it might have come over the ticker. Perhaps the committee was a little careless in not asking what kind of a ticker it was, but that is the way the record stands. I do not know whether it was a commercial newspaper teletype machine or otherwise. But the general's memory is faulty on that point.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator have a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a further question along that line.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am wondering why the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs

of Staff would take it up with the respective members of the Chiefs of Staff organization if such a message came over a news ticker. How would that put in motion the stating of the proposal to the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator that it is mysterious to me. I shall have to confess that perhaps there was some dereliction in not pursuing that question to its ultimate. However, we did pursue it with the general to the point of fatigue, I should say, in attempting to stimulate his memory by asking if it were this person or that person. The general could not remember. He could not remember whether it came from this department or that; and the record is left that he has an absence of memory as to that particular occasion.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. At the time he originally brought up this question, in reply to a question as to when he first heard the suggestion as to the possible relief of General MacArthur, he stated that it came by telephone call.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It came from someone—someone he could not remember—over the telephone. That was his best memory at first. Later he said it might have come over the ticker.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was the next day, I think.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am a little confused on the matter myself.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe that the mention of the ticker was the next day. Does it seem probable that General Bradley would have summoned the Joint Chiefs of Staff into conference immediately, as he did, within 1 hour after the telephone call, or whatever it was which brought it to his attention, to consider whether or not they would concur in the relief of MacArthur, unless the call had come from a highly responsible authority? Is it conceivable that General Bradley would have plucked it out of the air, either from the ticker or from a casual telephone call? Is it conceivable that he would have called the Joint Chiefs of Staff together unless the call were from a highly responsible authority, presumably superior to him in the Government?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, it is inconceivable that General Bradley would have acted on an unsupported rumor reported by some person downtown in a casual telephone call to the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is inconceivable, is it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think reason would dictate—although I cannot state what the fact is, except that there is a lack of memory—that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would not call the Joint Chiefs of Staff together on the basis of an unsupported telephone call, the origin of which he cannot now remember, 2 or 3 months later.

Mr. BREWSTER. If it had been the President of the United States who had called him, does the Senator think there would have been any question that he would have recalled it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe he was asked if it was the White House or the President, and I believe he said that he could not recall.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question. I have a tentative understanding with the majority leader that I will not delay the recess of the Senate for a long time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not expect to detain the Senator. I merely wish to clarify the record.

Does not the record clearly show that after General Bradley testified on the first day when the question was taken up that he had received a telephone call but he did not remember who had called him, either that afternoon or the following day the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was closely questioned as to whether or not it was a fact that a log was kept of all telephone calls into the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and he stated, "That is correct, with the exception of the telephone calls which come from the White House. Of those no records are kept."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct, according to my memory. However, as to the statement that no logs of calls were kept with respect to the calls which come from the White House, I should want to check the record to be sure whether or not General Bradley included in the same category calls from his superior, the Secretary of Defense. My memory is not clear on that point. I remember the statement about the White House. In that respect, the Senator from California is correct. In all other cases a log is kept of the calls, showing from whom they come.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was the log for the particular day produced in the record, so that the facts could be boiled down so as to determine that the call came either from the Secretary of Defense, according to the Senator's memory of the testimony, or from the White House, according to the memory of the Senator from California?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. That log has not been requested as yet.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the record is not complete upon that point.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The record is inadequate, I may say to the Senator from Michigan.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a fact that Secretary of Defense Marshall had already testified when this question came up, so that it was not possible to inquire of him as to whether or not he had made the call?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Secretary Marshall was not fully interrogated. The Senator will recall——

Mr. BREWSTER. He is to return later.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Secretary of Defense took the stand. I do not know whether he was a third through with his testimony or half through, but he had a previous engagement on a day which had been set aside to honor him at VMI. He will be back.

Mr. BREWSTER. And it will be possible to inquire of Secretary Acheson and Ambassador Harriman as to whether or not they are familiar with the call.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. I hope that before the conclusion of the hearings we shall be able to find that memories have been stimulated or records will become available so that we can get at the facts.

Returning to the line of thought which I was developing, it became apparent from the testimony that in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as they stated, General MacArthur had failed to comply with some Presidential directive to clear statements on policy before making statements public. As the testimony reflects, this is obviously a political matter and a political field. In my view the Joint Chiefs of Staff, individually and collectively, went out of their military field in attempting to justify their position in this matter "from a military point of view." It is to be recalled that the testimony is clear. They were not asked to testify as to political justification for this act. That is, they were not asked to concur from a political standpoint. They were asked to concur solely from a military standpoint. When they went afield and went into political considerations, I believe that was outside their strictly military responsibilities.

As a corollary to the second reason, the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated that General MacArthur had also taken independent action "in proposing to negotiate directly with the enemy field commander for an armistice and had made that statement public despite the fact that he knew the President had such a proposal under consideration from a governmental level."

In the testimony the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military men all agreed that in the past, in the history of wars and battles, it has been customary from time to time for field commanders to call directly upon the enemy in the field in an effort to secure a surrender. Twice before MacArthur had done so. On one occasion he had been directed to do so, and at another time it had been suggested that he call upon the Red Chinese for a surrender in the field. It was shown by the evidence that we were scattering millions of pamphlets almost daily over the line demanding the surrender. Yet, because MacArthur again called upon the Red Chinese to surrender or to discuss the terms of surrender, his head came off, for the reason apparently that some political maneuver had been violated.

There is no military violation in calling upon the enemy to surrender. Any commander who does not do that when he thinks the enemy should surrender and when he has the power or threat of power to compel his surrender, is derelict, in my judgment, and subjects his own men to unnecessary sacrifice, death, and destruction.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has not General Ridgway been distributing similar pamphlets since taking over?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot recall any direct testimony bearing on that question. I assume he has, because it has been customary to do so since the action has been going on.

It was further made clear by the testimony that if the President had made up his mind about any proposals to be made to the Chinese, the text of the proposals was entirely unknown to the Joint Chiefs of Staff or to General MacArthur. This morning further confusion arose because, as I recall the testimony, the other Joint Chiefs of Staff said they knew nothing about the text of the proposals, and that all they knew was that the State Department was proposing a statement which the President might make. However, it is significant that this morning Admiral Sherman said, in effect, "Sure, it is right here. The message to MacArthur was written with this in mind." It is very confusing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could the Senator make it clear?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I recall the testimony of the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they said they had no knowledge of what the text of the so-called proposed statement was which the President was to make at the suggestion of the State Department. In other words, they did not know what the text was.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is, the President's proclamation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is all very mysterious. There was supposed to be a statement, proposed by the State Department, to be issued by the President, which was to be eventually approved by certain nations, calling upon the Red Chinese to surrender and to talk peace.

As the Senator will recall, a message was sent to General MacArthur by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, saying that the State Department proposed that the President issue a statement looking toward peace negotiations.

As I recall, at least two members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified that they had no knowledge of the text of that proposed statement which the State Department was getting up for the President to issue. They said they knew nothing about it. However, the testimony this morning of another member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Sherman, made the contrary clear. He did not hedge. He said, "Yes. I have it right here. It was in the Department. The message to MacArthur was based on this statement."

Mr. FERGUSON. The admiral of the Navy, who was a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, produced the document?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it a part of the public record?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not think it is a part of the public record.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is a part of the secret record?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not think it is a part of the public record. However, the document is in existence.

Mr. FERGUSON. So it is in the censored record.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am not discussing the terms of the proposal.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not asking about the terms of it. I am asking where it came from.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. According to the testimony this morning, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the testimony now indicate that the document which went to General MacArthur on the 20th of March was made up from this document?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; not necessarily. I may have inadvertently stated that. However, the notification to General MacArthur was made under the knowledge on the part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of this document. I think the evidence is clear that the document was known to them. As I shall show a little later, the terms of the proposed document were never sent to General MacArthur. All that he was told was that the State Department was preparing a proposed announcement.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything in the public record to indicate why the document itself was not sent to General MacArthur in the field?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; not that I recall. The point is that he had no knowledge of its terms. I do not know whether he has any knowledge of its terms today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As I recall the testimony, the document was being considered by Admiral Sherman and by other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as by other persons who were present, perhaps, on the question of what should be contained in the suggestions to be made to the 13 or 14 other nations involved in the Korean situation. It was never sent to MacArthur. Some of them thought it had been. In earlier testimony they implied that MacArthur had received a copy of the negotiation terms. We established definitely today and yesterday in the testimony that MacArthur never had a copy of the negotiation terms, as Admiral Sherman indicated. The only document MacArthur received was the cablegram which said that the State Department was planning a Presidential announcement to the effect that the U. N. were considering negotiations for a cease-fire order in Korea at the time, or something to that effect.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator. I believe he has substantially stated the facts.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there any testimony which shows that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were consulted as to the terms of the document which was produced by Admiral Sherman this morning, and whether they were asked for advice or consulted about it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot recall any evidence on that point. I would hesitate to answer yes or no. It is my opinion that the document was in the possession of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think the evidence shows that much. Whether they were asked for advice or counsel, I do not know.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the record is clear to this extent, that on the 20th of March they had sent to the Supreme Commander in the Far East a message which stated in effect that the State Department was preparing a Presidential announcement. I believe the record is clear to that effect. It is based on the fact that on the 19th of March they had before them an instrument which apparently had come from the State Department, about which they were consulted. The document which Admiral Sherman presented to the committee yesterday was not made public, and I think properly so, at the moment. At least it would not have been presented to the committee without that understanding. I will say in fairness that the senior Senator from California agreed that it should be made a part of the official committee hearings. He felt it would not be presented unless that kind of agreement was attached to it. It is a part of the record now. I think it is fair to say, however, that the record is not clear that the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the particular meeting at which they decided to send the message to General MacArthur the following day were discussing anything other than the Presidential pronouncement. A Presidential pronouncement is far different from terms of negotiation. I think it is important to keep the difference in mind.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from California. He has been very much interested in the details. I wish to join him at this time in saying that keeping the document thoroughly confidential or secret was agreeable to me at the moment.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has not been attempting by any of his questions to get at the terms of the document. The Senator from Michigan would like to know whether or not there is any evidence which shows that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after they received the document from the State Department, rendered an opinion or gave advice regarding that document, which opinion or advice could be used by the State Department and by the President, in getting in touch with the other nations who are our allies, so that the President and the State Department might be better able to determine what the military aspects of the negotiations were, and so that they could use such military advice in their contacts with the military and political heads of the Allied Nations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the light of the testimony of the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it may be said that the effect of their testimony was that they did not know what the

contents of this document were; and, of course, it is obvious that if they did not know what the contents were, they could not render any opinion on it.

However, in the light of the testimony which has been received today from one member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, namely, Admiral Sherman, who testified that that document was before them, it remains unclear whether they actually rendered a report on that matter.

There is testimony to the effect that General MacArthur's offer of a surrender or an armistice vitiated the whole business, and the document was withdrawn.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there any testimony in the committee record to date which shows that either our Secretary of Defense or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or both, or the Joint Chiefs of Staff themselves, ever were in conference with the military heads or any person in connection with the military establishments of the foreign powers which are allied with us in the struggle in Korea, so that they might formulate a policy on the war in Korea?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my recollection that from the military standpoint there is at least no substantial evidence along that line. It may be possible that there has been some suggestion that in regard to certain details of operations, some military person from our country talked to some others. However, so far as that point is concerned, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who now are in the Chamber, are members of the committee; and if they have a distinct recollection that there is some evidence of that sort, I should like to know it. I think there may have been some casual conversations on that subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, let me say that Admiral Sherman testified this morning that he did communicate, apparently with his opposite number, some military aide, about what he did not think was necessary.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think there are isolated instances at a lower echelon, rather than at the policy-making level. In that respect, there are indications of some conferences in regard to military operations.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is not the record clear and, in fact, in that part undisputed, that when the United Nations adopted the resolution and asked the President of the United States to appoint a supreme commander, whom he did appoint shortly thereafter, when he first appointed General MacArthur, the United States was designated in fact as the operating agency for the United Nations, and that therefore the responsibility for the military operations flows through the United States high command—the Joint Chiefs—through General Collins, the Chief of Staff of the Army, out to the supreme commander in the Far East, so that in effect we are the operating agents from a military point of view?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; that is correct.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Since we do direct the military forces in Korea, of course we direct the military operations there.

We are being told, as shown in the committee record, that from time to time things which we should like to do are not done because our Allies will not go along with us on the political or the military level in regard to certain things which, under the original appointment, we would have the power to do. Is there any evidence that there has been around-the-table discussion of the various things in which it is supposed that our Allies do not join us, either from a political or from a military aspect? That is why I inquired about the consultation, through the United Nations, between the top military officials for the United States and the top military officials for our Allies.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will permit, let me say that I agree with him. I think there is no substantial evidence on that score in the committee record to date. As I have said, I think the record is clear that we were to be the operating agent.

I agree with the first part of the Senator's statement, when he said that certain recommendations which we had made were, in effect, vetoed at Lake Success. I assume that was done at Lake Success by the political representatives of the 13 or 14 nations which are associated with us, rather than by what we might call an international high command. There is no evidence that the top military commanders of the 14 nations which are involved were the ones who made the decisions to which the Senator has referred, but those decisions were made on a political basis, perhaps after consultations with the home governments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not possible that tomorrow, when the Secretary of State, who is the head of the United States political agency which is doing the negotiating, will appear, he will be able to explain what has actually been done along that line with the United Nations and with our allies?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Whether he can explain what was done, I do not know, but I think it is clear that the Secretary of State undoubtedly will be asked for the information because on quite a number of occasions when the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have testified or when General Marshall has testified it has been pointed out that those decisions dealt with the political or the foreign-relations end of such matters, and that therefore the military witnesses were not the most competent witnesses in regard to them.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, earlier in my remarks today I pointed out that the military phase of the administration's testimony has come at least to a temporary close, and that the Secretary of State will follow, and therefore we may look forward to obtaining some view of the political manipulations which have occurred in connection with our oriental policy. So I think at least we shall be able to inquire about that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, does it not seem that matters of such great importance would have been submitted in writing by the political head, the Secretary of State, to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for their analysis and advice in writing upon these important subjects?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would think so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator now say that as the record now shows, after the investigation into the military aspects, those points were not submitted in writing, and replies or advice in reply were not received in writing?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The answer to the question as to whether they were advised in writing is made uncertain by the testimony given today by Admiral Sherman, who says that the proposed document was in the hands of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Certainly I know of no evidence that they did give their advice in writing. That point is not clear.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not clear that one point—a matter which I did not realize before—has been brought out, namely, that the United States was appointed as the agent for those operations?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. What limitations were imposed in regard to our responsibility have not been made clear, so far as I know; but is it not clear that at one point all the authorities in the United States Government—the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the President—were agreed in regard to the hot pursuit of Communist jet planes which were coming over the border and were attacking our forces? Is it not clear that they were in agreement that our planes should be permitted to engage in hot pursuit of those Communist jet planes, which had come over the border and already had shot down five of our B–29's, but that that decision was vetoed at the United Nations by five unknown, anonymous diplomats there, who said they did not approve? Is not that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have the public record before me; I do not know what was deleted from or what was put into the public record.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is that a matter which has been censored? I thought it had been widely discussed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; it has been widely discussed.

Mr. BREWSTER. If I have trespassed upon the province——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I simply do not know about the particulars. I do know the answer to the Senator's last question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I had read so much about it in the press that I thought I was more informed outside the record than I was in it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I know the answer to the Senator's question. There are deletions in some sections.

Mr. BREWSTER. I read this from the record. Then I shall take another point to inquire about.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator is positive in his own mind that this part of the matter was released for publication——

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to reserve to myself an opportunity of examining it, and I should like to examine it. I shall ask that the record here be suspended until I can verify that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER subsequently said: I may say to the Senator from Maine that I have received reliable information that the question of hot pursuit has been released in the public hearings, and that the position taken by the Senator in his question about all our military and political people in this country agreeing that hot pursuit should be put into effect, and that it was stopped by the failure of other nations to consent, is correct. The Senator's assumption is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask unanimous consent that this statement by the Senator be placed immediately at the conclusion of the earlier discussion of this matter, so it will be clear in the RECORD that there was no trespass upon the restricted matter.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I will ask whether Admiral Sherman has not stated that he has been consistently urging for 6 months that we adopt far sterner measures of control in the economic field, in regard to Chinese Communist shipments of war material, and that the Allies have declined thus far to approve. I know that is in the released record, because I have just read it there, myself.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that, in this instance, apparently, while we are the agent to conduct this operation, we have to submit many of our proposed measures to the United Nations for consideration.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. I think it is abundantly clear that in our military activities in Korea we are under the constant restraint of being required to get the approval of other nations regarding any major step which we may take there. But so far as the privilege of having American mothers' sons die in Korea for the nations of Europe and for other nations of the world, we do not have to get their approval. We are privileged to do that, without any let or restraint by the other nations of the world; but to establish a program which will end this war, at least the only sensible and sound program which has been proposed to end the fighting in Korea, we must follow the dictates of our allies, who are in token support of the physical sacrifice America is making.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything in the record—and I am always referring to the public record—which indicates why we have not set up a body of Joint Chiefs of Staff with our allies, as we are proposing to do, and as we are doing at the present time with General Eisenhower in cooperation with the other nations in Europe, where we do not have a war? We have a war in Korea, together with other nations of the United Nations. There is no body of Joint Chiefs of Staff in Korea, where we actually have war.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. But we have Joint Chiefs of Staff in Europe, where we do not have any war. Has an explanation of that been furnished for the RECORD?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That subject has not been explored, I may say to the Senator.

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Tennessee asked Admiral Sherman about that very point this morning. I believe the Senator from Iowa was not present at the time. He referred to the Joint Chiefs set up by virtue of the North Atlantic Pact, particularly under the provision for a defense council, and he explained that it would be very difficult to set up a similar arrangement under the military command of the United Nations because of hostility to the operation on the part of one of the nations having a right of veto in the Security Council. But Admiral Sherman testified that it would of course be a more satisfactory operation if a joint-chiefs arrangement between us and our allies could be established. That was in the report of his testimony this afternoon.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Tennessee a question on that point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan for that purpose without losing the floor.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything to indicate that this could not be done voluntarily among the nations who are fighting in Korea, that is to say, that we have Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that we have military advice upon important questions, so that we would not be finding continually that the political situation would not allow a certain voluntary military action to be taken, such as the matter of hot pursuit, which has been described in the record?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That matter has not been fully explored, so far as I know. Admiral Sherman said this morning that in connection with the naval operations of the campaign he had conferences with the naval personnel of other nations. But I should think it would be very difficult to set up, on a voluntary basis, an arrangement of that sort which had no political or legal backing. Although there has been very little testimony on the subject, I should think that, in order that we and the friends with whom we are associated in the struggle could have an over-all body of joint chiefs of staff, certain rules of the game would have to be laid down by law or by appropriate actions on the part of the governments of the various nations, before any decision they made could be very binding.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will check the Pearl Harbor hearings, he will find that, prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, we had voluntary agreements with Britain, Holland, and, I believe, France, under which plans were drawn up for the Pacific area; and they were all made under voluntary agreements. The several Chiefs of Staff were working together voluntarily, laying out the plans, which are a part of the official record. I am wondering why that could not be done now, when we are at war, much easier than when we were merely preparing for war, as we are doing in connection with the integration of an international army in Europe under General Eisenhower.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If I may intrude further upon the time of the Senator from Iowa, my impression from the testimony is that, to some extent, anyway, the military plans in Korea have been devised through joint consultation with some of the military personnel of our allies. Certainly that is true with regard to naval operations. I should think it would be difficult, in the absence of a treaty or other formal arrangement laying down the rules of the game, to conduct joint military operations under decisions of a joint group which would be binding upon the United States and upon all the other participating nations. But the Senator has another idea about it, and he may be right.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I was away from the hearings for about half an hour this morning, and I did not recall any questions having been asked by the Senator from Tennessee, so I apparently was away at the time he was interrogating the witnesses and I thank him for calling attention to the fact that he had explored at least a portion of that testimony, which I have not yet read.

Now, the third reason advanced by the Joint Chiefs of Staff was that—

> They * * * have felt and feel now that the military must be controlled by civilian authority in this country. They have always adhered to this principle and have felt that General MacArthur's actions were continuing to jeopardize the civilian control over the military authorities.

As a matter of fact, the record is replete with testimony indicating that the reverse is true, and that General MacArthur, beyond a shadow of doubt, in his every act, was subservient and

obedient to orders from civilian authorities of this Government. This reason advanced by the Joint Chiefs of Staff is not only completely unmilitary, but it is sheer fantasy, so far as any evidence or proof in the record is concerned.

The Joint Chiefs' military case against MacArthur fails utterly, in my judgment, when we realize that the record reveals that at no time and in no way did the Joint Chiefs of Staff or any other member of the military or civilian branch of this Government communicate with General MacArthur criticizing specifically or generally his conduct of military or administrative matters in the far eastern command. To the contrary, the record is crammed with laudatory messages from both the President and the Chiefs of Staff addressed to General MacArthur commending his conduct as a military leader and as the administrative head of the Japanese Islands.

General MacArthur, in addressing the Congress, stated that basically his military views were held by most military men, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Those were certain views which he delineated and announced. There is no doubt, from reading the record, that this point is completely and utterly sustained. There was discussion between General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff from time to time as to whether to move up to the Yalu River, as there was on other military questions, but in no instance did the Joint Chiefs disagree with General MacArthur to the extent of issuing a directive or instructions, as it was within their authority to do, asking him to perform an action with which he was in disagreement. I say again that there is no evidence in the record that that ever occurred.

I might say that the four major recommendations to which General MacArthur referred in his address at the joint meeting of the Congress were the same as were contained in a more extensive study and series of proposals submitted to him by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated January 12, and read to him by General Collins in Tokyo, in the company of General Vandenberg, I believe, on the 15th of January 1951. They were read to General MacArthur as a tentative program. The document provided that "the following steps are to be taken to implement this program." The report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that General MacArthur concurred in these proposals. So we have the Joint Chiefs proposing and General MacArthur concurring.

The evidence is clear, affirmative, and undisputed that at no time did the Joint Chiefs of Staff notify General MacArthur that these proposals had been changed, altered, or withdrawn. Therefore, when he said before the Congress, as he did, that he had reason to believe that the Joint Chiefs of Staff concurred in the proposals which he set out, the record is clear that he had every reason to conclude that they did concur, because they had been in agreement on the 15th of January as to these proposals, and he had received no word or intimation that they had ever been in disagreement from that time until the time he appeared before the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that Admiral Sherman testified this morning that 13 of the 16 points had already been carried out?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct; he so testified, as did General Marshall and as did General Bradley and other witnesses. The overwhelming majority of the points contained in the recommendation of January 12 to which General Marshall was referring when he said he was in concurrence with the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been carried out. There is no question about their concurrence.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether the present military leadership is bombing bases in North Korea?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is no question that they are bombing certain installations in North Korea. The Senator used the term "bases." I assume they are bombing marshaling points north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think they are doing that today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is one place which, for some mysterious reason, has not been bombed, except once, and then the orders were withdrawn. I have not received an adequate reason for that.

In summary of point 2, Mr. President, the question of why General MacArthur was fired remains a mystery. The testimony of the military leaders, after 5,000 pages of testimony, has proven that it was not because of any views within our Military Department, since they did not initiate the request for his removal, and because, obviously, as the testimony has revealed, the heavy hand of the State Department has made itself apparent.

On the subject of why MacArthur was removed, the words of General Collins seem to sum up the military position:

> General MacArthur's relief was not caused by any irritation between the Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur.

That, among other things, completely sustains the position that the cause was not the result of a military situation, but that the dismissal was completely a political head rolling.

Mr. President, who initiated the recommendation that General MacArthur be fired? After 5,000 pages of testimony from our military leaders, it is incontestable that in the opinion of our military men General MacArthur is one of the most brilliant military geniuses this country has produced. None of our military men had any part in initiating the recommendation that MacArthur be removed. Obviously, the action which they took was merely to justify, from a military standpoint, the preconceived action of the administration.

As yet it is impossible to determine who initiated the recommendation that General MacArthur be fired, but at least the testimony to this date has settled once and for all the question of who did not initiate it. That is just as clear as the record can be. The military did not initiate, instigate, or recommend it in advance of the decision that General MacArthur should be relieved. That much is clear, Mr. President. It is clear as to who did not initiate it in that particular segment of our Government.

How was he fired? The testimony has borne out the conclusion of the American people that MacArthur has been shabbily treated. Far from confusing this issue, the testimony has merely strengthened that conclusion. Every officer who has testified thus far has stated that in his opinion the procedure followed in the summary removal and dismissal of General MacArthur was regrettable. That is very formal military talk, in my opinion, for what some of us in Middle West would call a very "bum deal."

It is personally regrettable to me that again we are faced with "forgetful" generals. I regret that in many instances, when important questions were asked, our high ranking military leaders were either evasive or forgetful. I have come away from these hearings with the conviction that at least up to the time the President decided he was going to "sack" MacArthur, as the British so gleefully announced almost within minutes after the American people knew about it, the Joint Chiefs of Staff did not believe MacArthur's "transgressions" were of any such nature as to jeopardize the security of our forces in Korea, or to embarrass our over-all objectives or to warrant his recall or replacement, evidenced by the fact that they did not on their own initiative, at any time, individually or collectively, recommend to the Secretary of Defense or to the President that he be removed.

This leads to the indisputable conclusion that our military leaders felt compelled to concur in a political decision after it had been made. In my opinion this action and this procedure is most unfortunate.

Fourth. What differences existed between MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

After 5,000 pages of testimony it has been disclosed that on some points of strategy there are some hindsight differences of opinion between the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or some of them, and General MacArthur. Every one of the Joint Chiefs testified, however, that in the matters referred to, where temporary differences, or discussions, or disputes might have occurred, in such situations a field commander must have the greatest leeway and latitude, because he is on the ground; and MacArthur was 8,000 miles away from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington.

Furthermore, in no instance did the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider these differences to be of such a nature—and this is important—as to necessitate a directive or even a suggestion to MacArthur that other action be taken by him. It has been shown that many of the differences between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur—the differences

produced by the Joints Chiefs of Staff in justification of their "concurrence" in his removal or relief—related to political considerations which were restraining MacArthur's utilization of the potential forces at his disposal. Being in Washington, apparently the political consideration and the proximity of the State Department exerted much greater influence on the Chiefs of Staff than they did on MacArthur and his political responsibilities and problems 8,000 miles away.

Fifth. What differences existed between MacArthur and the administration?

The hearings have disclosed that there is a great difference between MacArthur's objectives in Korea and the administration's position. Acting under the United Nations instruction, we cleared North Korea of the North Korean aggressors, and achieved a victory under the objectives and the policies announced, and that war was brought to a close. The war of aggression of the North Koreans was brought to a successful close with the defeat and the routing and the disruption of the North Korean Army. So that portion of the mission was successfully carried out, and completed. But then a new element entered into the situation, namely, the invasion across the border by the Red Chinese. That was a new war. It was the entry of a new group of antagonists. From that time there has been a dispute. Up to that time there was no dispute of any substantial degree at all between MacArthur and anybody, political or otherwise, so far as I know, but from that time on, from the time of the entry of the Communist Chinese and the reverses which we suffered, there has been a substantial dispute between General MacArthur on the one hand and the administration on the other, as to implementing policies for the ending of the war and the defeat of the Red Chinese, and the destruction of their ability and will to continue aggression.

MacArthur has advocated a clear policy of destruction of the will to continue aggression by the Red Chinese. The administration to date has announced, and the United Nations has announced, no understandable policy for the bringing of this war to a successful end, with the destruction of the will further to commit aggression on the part of the Communist Chinese, and to unify and pacify and restore self-government to all of Korea. In that there is a difference between General MacArthur's program to end the war and save American lives, and the lack of policy, the lack of directive, the lack of objective which exists in the diplomatic huddles of those who call themselves our allies.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. How many of the nations who have troops or ambulance corps in Korea, who recognize the war in Korea, at the present time have diplomatic relations with Red China and representatives in Peiping?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, I think our allies, the British, who have troops being killed by the Red Chinese in Korea, recognized the Red Chinese a long time ago. The unfortunate part of the situation respecting the British is that the Red Chinese have not even seen fit to recognize Great Britain.

Mr. FERGUSON. India has recognized the Red Chinese, has she not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. India has recognized the Red Chinese, and India participates to the extent of an ambulance, or something, in Korea. Perhaps they call it a corps. I do not know.

Mr. FERGUSON. Have any of the other nations recognized Red China?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot recite the number of European nations that have recognized the Red Chinese, but of those who are participating with us, or claim that they are participating with us, I believe India and Great Britain are the only two who have recognized the Red Chinese.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know of any other nations in history who have been at war, as nations are now at war in Korea against the Red Chinese Government, who have carried on normal, regular diplomatic relations with nations with which they were at war, and with representatives of those nations in their countries?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot think of any at the moment. If there have been, I do not recall them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could that be one of the causes for the disputes and the troubles that have arisen since the Red Chinese came into the war—although it is not recognized by our allies as a war?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think probably some of the most potent objectors to our bombing of military installations in Manchuria, where the Reds can go back and rearm and return over the Yalu, are the British. I think the British have raised the greatest objection to that course of action. The British are referred to by many people as our principal ally. I have noticed that the very profitable trade carried on by the British with Red China through Hong Kong has been stepped up during the war. It may be that the British fear that they will lose some trade with Red China. They do not have very many men in the arduous fighting on the peninsula. It is rather confusing and difficult to rationalize, but that is the situation as it exists.

The administration policy, as enunciated by all the military leaders testifying for the administration, is "to kill as many Chinese Communists as possible while containing the war in Korea." Or it is to bring peace to Korea through a war of indeterminate conclusion.

We are all for peace in Korea. We are for a free Korea. If one wishes to ask, Is that the policy? The answer is, "Yes; that is the policy." But how are we going to bring the war to a conclusion? What is the program to stop it? What is the program to destroy the will of the aggressors to fight? Those are the things which we have never had laid out. Those are the things on which the United Nations cannot agree. Those are the things which make this war, in the words of General MacArthur, an "accordion war." Those are the things which make the tragic situation in Korea a great deal like a football game in which we can advance the ball up to the 50- or 60-yard line, but when we get there we cannot take it any farther toward the goal to make a touchdown. That is against the rules of the game, rules made while the game is being played. That kind of game we can never end.

I submit that this indicates a lack of policy. The idea is that we are only punishing people, without definable conclusions, or methods to reach such definable conclusions. That is not an understandable policy. It is bound to feed the grist mill of propaganda.

I am reluctant to see the United States announce such a policy. I am reluctant to see us have no other policy than the policy of indeterminate punishment without conclusion. And I am reluctant to accept a philosophy of that kind when there does not exist at the same time a clear, sound, military plan for terminating the war.

Mr. President, where has our money gone? Every responsible military leader has stated that certain military actions cannot be taken for fear of starting world war III, and that we are not fully prepared, or that we are ill-prepared, or something of that sort. The continued repetition of the statement, "We are not prepared" causes me to call to the attention of the Congress the fact that in the fiscal years 1946 through 1950 we spent approximately $85,000,000,000 on the Armed Forces of this country. Where has this money gone, if we are "not prepared," if we are weak, or if we are supine from a military standpoint? In the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 the American taxpayer is going to be called upon to appropriate and spend a total of at least $62,000,000,000 additionally on the Armed Forces. I wonder if we have any right to expect that it will be handled any more wisely than have the vast funds previously appropriated and spent.

Last, but almost vitally important, what is our policy in Korea? I have asked that question of every witness. What is our policy in Korea? Where do we go? What is our end objective? What is our purpose?

I get the answer, "Our purpose is peace." Certainly we are all against sin, but how do we go about combating sin. That is the important thing. We are all for peace, but how do we get peace? Up to date we have got increasing war, increasing sacrifice, and increasing destruction of American life. I ask the question, What is our policy? How do we implement the objectives of peace? I have not received an answer from a single witness whom the administration has sent here. I have received a plausible, and what seems to me to be a sound and optimistic, program from General MacArthur; but from no one else.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not the task of the committee to ascertain the very thing which the Senator has now asked, namely, What is the policy in Korea? I understand that the testimony of the military authorities has been completed.

Does the Senator indicate that he cannot answer that question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have just indicated that I cannot answer that question. I admit that it should be the job of the committee to find out what our policy is. However, as I have stated, I have asked every administration witness, What is our policy in Korea? How do we implement the objectives of peace? What do we do? How far do we go? Not one of them can give an answer which is understandable or objective, except to say, "Our policy is to pacify Korea and stop aggresssion. We want a peaceful Korea. We want peace, and we want to discourage aggressors."

But how are they going to bring it about? What situations will bring about the determination of a peace satisfactory in our opinion? I have been unable to get any understandable or satisfactory answer from any administration witness.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has a high regard for the military officials of our Government. Could it be that the reason why they cannot answer the Senator's question, and the question which the committee is investigating, is that they have never been told what the policy is, and how they were expected to implement any policy in Korea?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that is a very possible explanation. However, I call the Senator's attention to the most hospeful thing which I have obtained from the testimony. I refer to the definite testimony from members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they are asking, and that there is in process, a study as to what our policy is. So it has never been announced. They do not know.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not that indicate that after more than 11 months the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military authorities are trying to seek out what our policy is, and how it is to be implemented?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me make this clear. I think we had a policy which was understandable and practical, up until about October of last year, when the Red Chinese came across the Yalu. I think that policy was understandable and announced. We were going to disrupt and destroy the Red Northern Koreans' army of aggression, to unify Korea, and to establish peace in the peninsula. At that time the battle, at least technically, was between the North Koreans and South Koreans—all Korean nationals. We understood what we were going to do. When we got to the Yalu, when we destroyed the North Korean army of aggression and when we had occupied all of Korea, that was the successful end of that policy.

Then people from across the border, armies not under the control of North Koreans, a new army and a new people, began a new aggression. From that time on we have had no policy as to what the program for ending this aggression and setting up our objectives should be. That is the point I wish to try to make.

I submit that the record thus far shows that we are in a policy vacuum in Korea. The military witnesses who support the administration's action, though repeatedly asked, have not told the committee or the American people to this very hour what our military purposes are so far as concluding the affair are concerned, and what our plans are for attaining our objective in the present conflict, in which we have suffered a total of 70,000 battle casualties, and in excess of 142,000 military and nonmilitary casualties. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that General Walker is not counted as a military casualty.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a fact that General Moore also was not counted as a battle casualty, because he was killed in an accident while riding in a helicopter, and not through enemy action?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand, the helicopter in which the general was riding was flying ahead of the front lines, where the shooting was very intense. However, he did not get hit by a bullet. Therefore he is not counted as a battle casualty.

Mr. BREWSTER. The helicopter ran into a wire on the river.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. The appointed military leaders, reluctant, perhaps, to give testimony critical of their Commander in Chief, have nevertheless indicated the difficulties of conducting military operations in such a political vacuum.

We are entitled to know why we are fighting in Korea, what we hope to achieve, and how we are to achieve it. I shall, to the fullest extent of whatever ability I may have, endeavor to secure the answers to those questions from succeeding witnesses.

I invite attention to the fact that I have not attempted to go through the 5,000 pages of testimony and to cite a great number of quotations from the testimony. I have merely attempted to summarize the general impressions from the standpoint of the military phase of the matter, which has at least temporarily been concluded today. Tomorrow we go into the political phases of the matter with the Secretary of State. I hope that through his testimony and the questions that will be asked of him and of other persons in the diplomatic field, we can find out what we and the United Nations intend to do, from a practical, physical, and common sense standpoint, to defeat the aggressor and destroy his will to fight, toward the establishment of a reasonable peace in Korea, as a free nation, and to stop the loss of American lives and treasure in a war which has already been so costly and disastrous in terms of human suffering, doubt, and confusion so far as America and the world are concerned.

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT RELATING TO PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS—CONCURRENCE OF SENATOR LANGER IN MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 293)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on May 10, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself, I submitted minority views on S. 719, the price discrimination bill. Those views are printed as part 2 of Senate Report No. 293. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, is desirous of joining in these minority views and I should like to have the RECORD show that the Senator from North Dakota concurs in the minority views which have been filed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, 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 REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

William J. Storen, of Charleston, S. C., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wonder whether the nomination is unanimously reported.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Senate members of the joint committee constitute a committee for the consideration of nominations. I am sure the majority leader has consulted the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I have not done so. I have consulted with the minority leader. I have not heard any objection raised to the nomination.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So far as I know, no objection has been made to the confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Smyth.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a reappointment, is it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is a reappointment. I do not presume to speak for the committee, but I have no objection, and I have heard no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate do now recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 1, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 31 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1956.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Lord God Omnipotent, in whose hands are the issues of history and the destinies of men and nations, may we daily avail ourselves of Thy divine wisdom and power.

Grant that our minds may be God-conscious and responsive to Thy leading as we strive to find the way of the fuller and more abundant life for all mankind.

Knowing our own limitations and shortcomings, make us teachable and trustful. However dark and threatening the scenes of national and international life may be, give us a faith that is never eclipsed by despair.

We pray that our hearts may be kept free from the poison of pessimism and cynicism. May we be confident that Thou wilt not allow our souls to be mocked and betrayed by our noblest principles and loftiest aspirations.

Help us to live expectantly and hopefully. Inspire us with the vision and insight to see the foregleams and signs of a better day, despite many dismal tragedies and predictions, where men everywhere shall live together as brothers and friends.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 28, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1424) entitled "An act for the relief of T. L. Morrow"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1822) entitled "An act for the relief of Harry C. Goakes"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. JENNER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) entitled "An act to furnish emergency food aid to India"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1612) entitled "An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H. R. 3842. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, May 28, 1951, he did on Tuesday, May 29, 1951, sign the following enrolled bill:

H. R. 3842. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH JUBILEE CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 204, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to attend the Australian Commonwealth jubilee celebration to be held at Canberra, Australia, during May 1951, the following Members of the House: Mr. CARNAHAN, Missouri, chairman; Mr. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa; Mr. MERROW, New Hampshire.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF DRAFT AND UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted a conference report on the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. GOSSETT. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and amazed to see that Price Stabilizer DiSalle, perhaps with administration support, is advocating that all businesses in America be licensed. It would be interesting to know who thought up this scheme and to know what use would be made of such unprecedented plenary power of life and death over American business. Through the Defense Production Act, Congress has sought to restrain inflation. Apparently the Defense Mobilization organization is trying to control everything but inflation.

Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston and Price Stabilizer DiSalle would control all segments of American economy except organized labor. They would place a bridle on all bosses except the labor bosses. Ninety percent of the cost of most of the things we buy is labor cost. Obviously, there is no such thing as controlling inflation and holding down prices by restraints on the 10 percent and no restraints placed on the 90 percent.

Mr. Speaker, unless the Office of Defense Mobilization is going to do an honest, fair, across-the-board job of restraining price and wage increases, then we ought to abolish the whole outfit and let nature take its course.

IMPORTATION OF MEXICAN LABOR

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention at this time to a problem involving a shortage of agricultural labor that will be facing the cotton producers of this Nation, particularly those in the area in which I reside, unless this Congress takes some action on a bill introduced and approved by the House Committee on Agriculture which will fa-

cilitate the procurement of Mexican labor. At the time this bill was introduced it was estimated that in Missouri alone we would need some five to six thousand Mexican laborers to supplement the domestic labor available to help harvest our cotton crop.

Our people in that section of the country have met the request of the Department of Agriculture by planting sufficient acreage to meet the production goals set by Secretary Brannan. In the past we have relied upon this Mexican labor. We had hoped we would have the opportunity to get this labor next fall.

I am particularly familiar with the situation in the Tenth Missouri District which in the past has produced cotton crops exceeding a half million bales, and in the adjoining First District of Arkansas, which is so ably represented by my good friend the Hon. E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS, who has been one of the leaders in sponsoring and supporting this legislation.

I have a report in the form of a letter from the division of employment, State of Missouri, which has conducted a survey. They say that in my district alone we will need approximately 10,000 Mexican laborers if we are to harvest the cotton crop which has been planted. We are facing a serious problem there and I certainly hope that the Committee on Rules will grant a rule on this bill very shortly.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the acting majority leader what the program will be for the coming week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the program for the week of June 4 will be as follows:

On Monday bills on the Consent Calendar will be called and House Concurrent Resolution 57, a resolution expressing friendship of the American people for the people of the world, will be brought up under suspension of the rules.

On that day also, which is District of Columbia day, the bill H. R. 4141, the District of Columbia crime bill, will be brought up for consideration.

On Tuesday, bills on the Private Calendar will be called and also the bill H. R. 314, the Booker T. Washington Veterans' Hospital bill, will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday the House will consider the District of Columbia appropriation bill of 1952.

On Thursday the conference report on S. 1, the UMT bill, and H. R. 1179, authorizing research facilities, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Friday is undetermined, and any other program will be announced later.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman advise whether or not it is the intent or purpose to bring up any other conference report next week, such as reciprocal trade, or the India wheat bill, if the confeees come to an agreement?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The House will be given due notice as to when additional conference reports will be brought up.

TAXATION

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have presented to it a tax bill for about $7,000,000,000 of additional revenue. About that same time the President will present a request for further spending in loans and grants to foreign countries for about eight and one-half to nine billion dollars. I rise to ask the question, How in the world can the Congress impose taxes as fast as the Administration can spend? In my insertions in the RECORD today I commend to you an editorial appearing in the Omaha World-Herald and an article from Newsweek by Raymond Moley. It is doubtful if either this tax bill or this alleged aid bill are in the interest of liberty and freedom, in the light of their effect on our domestic economy.

INADEQUACY OF INFORMATION ON PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an exchange of correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan has no idea how many farmers or producers actually received payments from the Federal Government under the price-support program covering potatoes, eggs, butter, dried beans, and rice. As a result, he is, of course, not able to say whether most of the funds were paid out to a few large producers or whether they were widely distributed among many small producers. He apparently has no classification to show a breakdown of the number who received, for instance, over $100,000, the number between fifty and one hundred thousand dollars, or the number under $350.

Yet, the realized losses, suffered by the taxpayers and wage earners of this country, under the price-support program for the last two fiscal years and the first 9 months of the present fiscal year, amount to—

Potatoes	$321,360,270
Eggs	102,951,079
Butter	44,449,535
Dried beans	9,715,897
Rice	1,157,506

This amounts to a total on these five commodities of the staggering sum of $479,634,287.

This inadequacy of information was revealed through a recent exchange of correspondence with the Secretary. Attached hereto is a copy of my letter and the reply from Under Secretary McCormick.

With the huge statistical staff maintained in the Agriculture Department, it amazes me that the basic information which I requested cannot be made available. I can think of nothing more important both for legislators and the general public to know about the price-support program than the number of those who are receiving benefits and how widely spread those benefits are.

I hope that other Members of Congres will join with me in urging that appropriate steps be taken to make available this essential information about where and to whom these large sums are paid, which have to be extracted from pay envelopes, Federal sales taxes, and other sources of revenue. This is fundamental information which we should certainly have before us when we contemplate further action to impose still greater tax burdens on our people.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., Apil 30, 1951.

The Honorable CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It would be appreciated if you would furnish me a tabulation showing the information listed below with reference to the following 10 commodities: (1) Oranges, (2) prunes, (3) soybeans, (4) dried beans, (5) green beans, (6) rice, (7) eggs, (8) Irish potatoes, (9) sweetpotatoes, (10) butterfat.

How much money was spent to support the price of each of the above in 1949? In 1950? Either fiscal or calendar year would be satisfactory, whichever way your records are kept.

How many farmers or producers actually received payments for each of the above commodities under the price-support program?

I am not familiar with the manner in which you keep your records indicating how many of the producers of each of the above items received sums of varying amounts. In whatever manner would be most convenient, I would like to be furnished with the information as to how many of these producers of each item fall into the various classifications which you maintain showing the size of the payments.

I would be grateful if I might have this information at your earliest convenience.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 14, 1951.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. KEATING: This refers to your letter of April 30, 1951, in which you request information concerning the amounts of money which have been spent in supporting the price of certain commodities during 1949 and 1950. In this regard, we offer the following explanation of the material herewith enclosed.

The price-support operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation are conducted by means of loans on, the negotiation of agreements for the purchase of, or the direct purchase of agricultural commodities at announced support levels. The amount loaned or the price paid in purchasing the commodities represents an investment which is

subsequently reduced by loan repayment or sale of the commodities which are acquired.

Consequently, the cost of the price-support programs can be measured only by the gains or losses realized on the disposition of such commodities. The enclosed tabulation, "Realized Program Results—Selected Price-Support Commodities," supplies information with respect to the gains or losses which have been sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation on the items listed for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 and for the 9-month period ended March 31, 1951.

Other programs of the United States Department of Agriculture which have a price-supporting effect are: (a) The operations under section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, and (b) expenditures under section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, Public Law 396, Seventy-ninth Congress. Expenditures of funds provided under these programs for the program years 1949, 1950, and 1951 through March 31, 1951, are stated for each of the commodities you have selected in the enclosed tabulation, "Expenditures of Section 32 Funds and of Section 6 (School Lunch) Funds."

With regard to the two tabulations enclosed, the Commodity Credit Corporation did not conduct price-support operations in oranges or green beans and there were no expenditures of section 32 or section 6 funds for soybeans or rice.

As indicated above, the various price-supporting programs of the United States Department of Agriculture do not involve payments to the producer. In Commodity Credit Corporation programs, eggs were supported by means of purchases of egg powder from driers who certified that they had paid producers support prices for the shell eggs which were processed; butter is supported through purchase of the commodity in carlots from manufacturers and handlers; support for prunes was through purchase from packers and processors as well as from producers; and, potatoes were supported by purchase from both growers and dealers. Section 32 and section 6 purchases are made largely at the dealer or processor level while section 32 export payments were made to private exporters or to the Commodity Credit Corporation in reimbursement for sales at less than cost under section 112 (e) of the Foreign Assistance Acts of 1948, 1949, and 1950.

Based on Commodity Credit Corporation loan and purchase agreement operations in 1949 crop programs, it is estimated that there were approximately 40,900 participating producers of dry edible beans, 34,800 in soybeans, and 3,200 in rice. However, it is our opinion that all cooperating producers benefited directly or indirectly from our price-support operations which resulted in improved markets through regular commercial channels.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. McCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

Realized program results—Selected price-support commodities, fiscal years 1949 and 1950 and through Mar. 31, 1951

Commodity	Fiscal year		
	1949	1950	1951 through Mar. 31
Prunes	[1] 259, 236	[1] 238, 192	[1] 56, 876
Soybeans	[1] 26, 054	[1] 1, 754, 206	151, 633
Dried beans	[1] 3, 988	880, 329	8, 839, 556
Rice	[1] 1, 786	1, 293, 779	[1] 134, 487
Eggs	773, 476	41, 622, 784	60, 554, 819
Irish potatoes	203, 886, 603	75, 090, 315	42, 383, 352
Sweetpotatoes	[1] 1, 985	[1] 1, 453	773
Butter		4, 111, 861	40, 337, 674

[1] Denotes gain.

Expenditures of sec. 32 funds and of sec. 6 (school lunch) funds, selected commodities, program years 1949, 1950, and 1951 through Mar. 31, 1951

Program year and commodity	Sec. 32 funds				Sec. 6 funds
	Purchase and donations	Diversion	Export	Total	
1949:					
Oranges			$597, 407	$597, 407	$2, 000, 327
Prunes	$733, 487		3, 296, 172	4, 029, 659	
Dried beans					
Green beans	15, 064			15, 064	
Eggs	8, 816, 755		5, 036, 707	13, 853, 462	
Irish potatoes	10, 651, 812			10, 651, 812	
Sweetpotatoes	293, 817			293, 817	
Butter					
1950:					
Oranges			2, 123, 487	2, 123, 487	657, 089
Prunes	92, 481	$1, 785, 025	3, 711, 777	5, 589, 283	
Dried beans	50, 564			50, 564	
Green beans	47, 349			47, 349	335, 582
Eggs	6, 587, 945		3, 033, 833	9, 621, 778	
Irish potatoes	4, 841, 786			4, 841, 786	
Sweetpotatoes	137, 228			137, 228	
Butter	12, 752, 272			12, 752, 272	
1951:					
Oranges			1, 735, 287	1, 735, 287	2, 749, 872
Prunes			1, 848, 490	1, 848, 490	
Dried beans					737, 023
Green beans					
Eggs					
Irish potatoes					
Sweetpotatoes	122, 948			122, 948	
Butter					

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. PHILLIPS. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, two committees of the Congress are holding public hearings, on Truman administration proposals, for amending and extending the life of the Defense Production Act of 1950, which otherwise will expire at the end of June.

It is possible that time and energy are being wasted, in an effort to frame new legislation, which is certain to become worthless before ever it can be put on the statute books.

I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, in the light of several considerations. They are considerations which appear to have been overlooked by those in the administration and in the Congress, who are apparently bent on strait-jacketing business, and regimenting American people, all in the name of mobilization for national defense.

Such a mobilization, let me point out, will take no more than 15 percent of our gross national product this year, according to announced plans, and no more than 20 percent at next year's war production peak.

These are the figures, set forth by those who support the imposition, at once, of drastic wage and price controls; far more drastic than those now authorized under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

So, Mr. Speaker, here are some figures, which wage and price control adherents thus far have failed to mention:

In the decade between 1940 and 1950, the population of the United States increased by a little more than 15 percent. Our national productivity has increased by 33⅓ percent since 1946, and by approximately 75 percent since 1939. These increases, with respect to goods of all kinds, have been in terms of physical production, and not in terms of inflationary dollars. That point is important.

Therefore it follows, that even when 20 percent of our gross national production of goods is taken for war purposes, the American people will still be better off than they were in 1946; and better off by far than in 1939. Per capital availability, of both goods and services, will continue to be far in excess of those earlier years.

Admittedly the American people are buying more goods and services today than they did in 1939 or 1946, but any housewife, or the man in the street, will tell you that prices restrain them from buying much in excess of those years, even though goods of all kinds are plentiful.

Therefore it follows again, that prices are high and going higher, not because of shortages, but because of the deliberately inflationary policy pursued by the Truman administration. Government squandermania, and failure to apply adequately the so-called orthodox curbs on needless credit expansion, are the real causes.

This easy money policy has boosted prices, in spite of the fact that consumer goods pipelines are full; so full that difficulty now is being encountered in liquidating at a normal rate the huge inventories held by manufacturers and merchants alike. Advertising schedules are being expanded, and price wars are reported in the papers.

More food than ever is available to the American people, and more is being produced. Goods manufactured from raw materials required for war production are in plentiful supply. Even when production of these articles of common use is cut back 20 percent, the per capita supply will continue to exceed that of 1939, or of 1946.

In the light of these facts, the answer to ever-increasing prices over the past few years—the answer which I already have given you—becomes obvious. Price wars, as a result of elimination by the United States Supreme Court of a New Deal-spawned price-fixing law, still further support the validity of that answer.

Why, then, should not the new legislation take the form of a law specifically requiring adequate use of the orthodox curbs on credit expansion, and hence on the money supply, through the Federal Reserve Board? That Board is directly responsible to the Congress.

Why should not the new legislation, in view of the war emergency, provide in addition a simplified system of allocations, to channel raw materials into war production as required?

Why not these things, and nothing more?

As matters stand, it seems that Congress will be unable to get final action on any legislation, either to amend or replace the Defense Production Act of 1950, before the June 30 deadline. It may be necessary that war material allocation powers be preserved.

It has been suggested that the present law could be extended, without change, briefly. When Congress returns next fall, the proper committees can make their proposals, in the light of further experience during the change-over period to peak war production.

Those committees are in a position to discover what is necessary in the public interest. By then, Congress will undoubtedly see the common sense, the wisdom of letting the Defense Production Act, as it now stands, die a quiet death and receive a decent burial in the heavy tomes of the United States Code. There is no evidence at this moment sufficient to support a request for any longer extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. JOHNSON. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to aline myself with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] regarding the need for a migratory labor bill. The only workable bill I have seen is the Poage bill. I hope the Poage bill will come to the floor of the House and become the law of the land.

As everyone knows, many of the farmers in the Middle West, and a large number of them in the Pacific Coast States in particular, rely for the harvesting of the fabulous perishable crops they raise out there on migratory labor. One bill that has been presented and passed in the Chamber on the other side of the Capitol, in my opinion, is unworkable. It contains provisions with which a farmer simply cannot comply. At his peril he employs a wetback—an illegal entrant. He may use every precaution, and yet later find that one of his employees came into the United States illegally. If he is the victim of such circumstances it makes him subject to very severe penalties, because the bill provides that he would then be guilty of a felony. In addition to this, the bill that has passed the Senate requires every employer of farm labor to become an informer which makes him guilty of felony if he suspects the worker is illegally in the country and does not report his suspicions to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This is a throwback to the days of Hitler.

To indicate how enormous the inflow of migrant foreign labor is, I need but tell you that it is estimated that between 75,000 and 80,000 such migrants come into California each month during the fruit and vegetable season, which is from late April into the autumn when the grapes are harvested.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the Poage bill will find its way to the floor of the House soon and finally become the law of the land without crippling amendments.

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, last year this Congress passed the bill entitled "A Uniform Code of Military Justice" and today this law takes effect throughout the armed services. It is a monumental piece of legislation and is intended to correct the inequalities, inefficiencies and injustices of the old archaic system—or lack of system I should say—prevailing in the armed services.

The subcommittee of which I was chairman worked for 4 months almost daily, including many Saturdays, on this piece of legislation. We reviewed every article in the Uniform Code of Military Justice carefully, made many changes and made rewrites of it. When this bill left us in the House, I felt that it was as perfect as we could write such a measure at that time. I am grateful to the members of the subcommittee for having applied themselves most diligently and tirelessly, without fanfare or publicity whatsoever, to the extremely important job of guaranteeing justice to be done within the uniformed services.

Mr. Speaker, the public has not had confidence in justice as administered in the armed services. Rightfully or wrongfully comparisons, to the hurt of military justice, have been made with our civilian system of justice and invariably military justice has come out the loser. I believe the new Uniform Code of Military Justice will go far toward bringing the faith, confidence and esteem in our military courts to the level of that of civilian courts. Certainly fair, conscientious and wholehearted support of this program will go far toward eliminating the evils of the past.

ATTACK ON SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT TO UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain statements and excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many times before on the floor of the House I have called attention to the efforts of the Fascist-minded groups to secure the repeal of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution and supplant in its place the proposed amendment limiting taxes under our Federal laws to 25 percent on incomes, gifts, and inheritances.

At my request, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress prepared a statement on this proposed amendment, which I am inserting in the RECORD at this time. It is as follows:

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT LIMITING FEDERAL INCOME, ESTATE, AND GIFT TAXES TO A MAXIMUM OF 25 PERCENT

The proposed amendment, once popularly called the twenty-second amendment, originated in 1938 with the American Taxpayers Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. It was introduced in Congress by Representative EMANUEL CELLER (by request), on June 15, 1938 (H. J. Res. 722), but the House Judiciary Committee failed to take any action.

The next year Congress received the first petition from a State legislature requesting that a constitutional convention be called to propose an amendment to the Constitution which would limit the Federal taxing power. This method of proposing an amendment to the Constitution has never been used. The 22 amendments ratified thus far were all proposed by the Congress. Application to the Congress by State legislatures is the second or alternate method of amending the Constitution, set out in article V of the Constitution, which reads:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid * * * as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof."

The resolutions adopted by the States which have petitioned Congress on this amendment are in form similar to the following:

"*Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the State of* ———, That application be and it hereby is made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum aggregate rate of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by,

income, however, shall not exceed 25 percent. In the event that the United States shall be engaged in a war which creates a national emergency so grave as to necessitate such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each house may, while the United States is so engaged, suspend, for periods not exceeding 1 year each, such limitation with respect to income subsequently accruing or received.

" 'SEC. 3. The maximum aggregate rate of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift shall not exceed 25 percent.

" 'SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on, with respect to, or measured by, income for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

" 'SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax with respect to any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.'

"And be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States."

Several problems arise with regard to this mode of proposing a constitutional amendment, such as the form of application by the States, how long such applications shall remain effective, method of rescinding resolutions, and effectiveness in compelling Congress to call a constitutional convention.

Article V of the Constitution refers to applications by the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, but it does not state the form in which the application must be made.

The period of time such a resolution remains effective has not been determined; however, there is nothing in article V to show that the matter of calling a constitutional convention should be open for all time (*Coleman* v. *Miller* ((1939) 307 U. S. 433, 451)). In its report to the New York Bar Association (1930), the Committee To Report on Proposals Pending in Congress To Amend the Constitution stated that the calling of a convention would presumably be in response to a public demand, and it is not probable that the demand would continue unabated for an indefinite period. Further, with respect to proposed constitutional amendments, it has been held the proposals, resolution, and ratification should be treated as related steps in a single endeavor (*Dillon* v. *Glass* ((1921) 256 U. S. 368)).

Rescinding resolutions would be a fair indication of a change in public demand and are likely to be recognized by Congress as such.

Although the Constitution provides that Congress "on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution," there is no compulsion upon Congress to do so. *In re Census* ((1895) 62 N. W. 129), Professor Orfield, in The Amending of the Federal Constitution, 1942, remarks that it must not be assumed that Congress is a mere ministerial cog in the call of a convention. The convention is not the result of the acts of the State legislatures, for it is necessary that Congress act upon their applications. If Congress, one of three coordinate branches of the Government, should refuse to act, there is no valid method of coercing it to make the call (Dodd, Judicially Nonenforcible Provisions of Constitutions ((1932) 80 N. Pa. L. Rev. 82)). The Court in all probability could treat such an issue as a political question and decline to intervene (*State of Mississippi* v. *Johnson* ((1866) 4 Wall. 475)).

Resolutions petitioning Congress to call a constitutional convention

State	Endorsed (date)	Rescinded (date)	Remarks
Alabama	H. J. Res. 66, 1943		
Arkansas	S. Con. Res. 10, 1943	H. Con. Res. 4, 1945	
Connecticut			S. J. Res. 2 (1951) endorsing; pending.
Delaware	S. Con. Res. 6, 1943		
Florida	S. Con. Res. 206, 1951		See daily Congressional Record, May 10, 1951, pages 5155-5156.
Georgia			1951 endorsing; pending, passed Senate.
Idaho			1951 endorsing; pending.
Illinois	H. J. Res. 32, 1943	H. J. Res. 7, 1945	
Indiana	H. Con. Res. 10, 1943		
Iowa	H. Con. Res. 15, 1941	H. Con. Res. 9, 1945	
	S. Con. Res. 11, 1951		See daily Congressional Record, Apr. 17, 1951, pages 3939-3940.
Kansas	1951		Information from secondary source.
Kentucky	H. Res. 79, 1944		
Louisiana	1950		
Maine	1941		See Congressional Record, Apr. 29, 1949.
Massachusetts	S. Con. Res. 58, 1941		
Michigan	S. Con. Res. 20, 1941		
Minnesota			H. R. 998, S. 585 (1951) endorsing; pending; tabled.
Mississippi	S. Con. Res. 14, 1940		
Montana	H. Res. 4, 1951		Vetoed, see Congressional Record, Mar. 16, 1951.
Nebraska	1949		
Nevada	1951		Information from secondary source.
New Hampshire	Con. Res., 1943		
New Jersey	J. Res. 5, 1944		
Pennsylvania	1943		Vetoed.
Rhode Island	S. 80, 1940		
South Carolina			Endorsing (1951); passed Senate, pending.
Texas	S. Con. Res. 64, 1943		S. Con. Res. 64 adopted by Senate May 1 1943, but House motion to suspend the rules and take it up not passed. H. Con. Res. 37 adopted by House Apr. 29, 1943, but reconsidered and withdrawn.
	H. Con. Res. 37, 1943		
Wisconsin	J. Res. 75, 1943	J. Res. 11A, 1945	
Wyoming	H. J. M. 6, 1939		

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that every Member of Congress—House and Senate—will carefully read this statement, also the speech on the same subject, which I inserted in the RECORD on June 8, 1944, which follows:

MILLIONAIRES' AMENDMENT TO MAKE THE RICH RICHER AND THE POOR POORER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 weeks, I have made several speeches calling attention to the vicious and un-American activities of the Gannett-Pettengill political action committee—alias the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

Because our liberties would be almost immediately placed in jeopardy by the passage of the proposed twenty-second amendment which is sponsored by this Fascist group, I have had printed a 16-page booklet containing my speeches to date on this subject. The booklet is entitled "Most Sinister Lobby Ever Organized." I shall be glad to furnish copies upon request to interested persons.

In those speeches, I endeavored to show the following facts:

First. This proposed twenty-second amendment is a millionaires' amendment, designed to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Second. It is sponsored by a Fascist group, headed by a convicted German agent, Edward A. Rumely; a millionaire published, Frank E. Gannett; a former chairman of the Republican National Finance Committee, Samuel B. Pettengill; and a Fascist instructor by the name of McClure.

Third. It is designed to impoverish the Federal Government and to make impossible the payment of the national debt, the veterans' benefits, and social security benefits to the unemployed, the aged and other dependents.

Fourth. It will wreck small business.

Fifth. It is being vigorously and openly advocated through a national publicity campaign, but when placed before the respective State legislatures is handled in an undercover manner without benefit of public hearings before the proper committees of the various State legislatures.

Sixth. It is being offered by means of a hitherto unused clause in the Federal Constitution and has already been adopted by the legislatures of 16 States. In one State, Pennsylvania, the resolution was vetoed by the Governor.

Seventh. When 32 States have passed such a resolution, Congress will have no recourse but to call a constitutional convention upon this proposed amendment.

Eighth. This Fascist group is now forming its own local political committees in all congressional districts and has ample finances to carry on its campaign of misrepresentation and intimidation.

Ninth. Attempts were made in 10 other States, including my own State of Texas, to pass one of these resolutions in the last session of the State legislature. Texas is also among the States where local political committees are being formed by this vicious group.

Tenth. Despite the opposition of responsible small business and labor interests, the campaign to put this amendment across is making steady progress. We can assume that the effort will continue.

The time has come for us to wake up. We must, as Mr. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, says, "Smoke out the reactionaries that are trying to put over this stupid proposal," and, as he also so excellently puts it, "In this war against world fascism battles must be won on the home front as well as on the battle front."

TEXARKANA MEETING

Recently this group, following the same procedure as in other congressional districts, went to my own congressional district at Texarkana to organize a unit of the so-called Committee for Constitutional Government. On April 19, 1944, a letter was sent out from Texarkana in which it was stated:

"A limited number of business and professional leaders whom we know to be interested in the American way of life, as we have known it heretofore, are being invited to hear an address by the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, head of the National Committee for Constitutional Government, at an informal dinner meeting, Hotel Grim, in Texarkana, at 6:30 p. m., next Wednesday, April 26.

"Mr. Pettengill is an authority on constitutional government, and is well informed upon what is now being done through Government bureaus. He is a forceful speaker, and we are confident that you will find his message to be filled with worth-while information.

"At the conclusion of Mr. Pettengill's address, consideration will be given to an organized effort to promote and maintain constitutional government in these United States. Methods of financing an educational campaign will be discussed. An opportunity will be given to our guests to participate in financing this work if they should wish to do so, but no high pressure methods of raising money will be used. The primary object of the meeting will be to organize the First Congressional District of Texas as a unit of the Texas division of the Committee for Constitutional Government.

"For your convenience we have enclosed a postal card on which you may indicate your acceptance or nonacceptance so that the hotel may prepare for the number of guests expected."

It will be noticed that only a select group was being invited and confined principally to those whom they hope have been misled by such statements that the American way of life is being jeopardized.

It will also be noticed that money was to be raised at the meeting and that the primary object of the meeting was to organize the First Congressional District of Texas as a unit of the Texas division of the Committee for Constitutional Government.

It occurs to me that the intentions of this group are very plain. They desire to destroy anyone whom they cannot control.

Mr. Pettengill's speech at that meeting was worthy of his tutor, Dr. Rumely. It was in the best German propaganda tradition. Following the precept of that other master propagandist, Herr Goebbels, Pettengill uttered several prophetic statements designed to throw fear into the hearts of his listeners. Pettengill said:

"Complete control of all important business in America, the goal sought, would make the condition in this country not much different from that now existing in Nazi Germany."

Of course, in saying that, Pettengill was not talking about the goal sought by the Committee for Constitutional Government. Or, was he inadvertently pulling back the smoke screen his type so expertly uses? Was he letting a small group see behind the scenes the road which he and Dr. Rumely want them to follow?

Quoting from the newspaper which reported Pettengill's speech, it says:

"Speaking about the possibilities of a financial crash, Pettengill recalled that, after the First World War, United States bonds went down to $83, or 17 points. After this war, he said, if Government bonds go off 10 points it would ruin every bank in the country."

That state of affairs which Mr. Pettengill spoke of in alarmist fashion is just exactly what would happen if the proposed twenty-second amendment to the Constitution should become law. I quote no less an authority than the Division of Tax Research of the United States Treasury Department which has been making some study of the amendment in question and its possible effects upon the Nation and its economy. I quote from the Treasury Department analysis of this amendment, dated June 6, 1944:

"The credit of the Federal Government rests on its power to levy taxes to discharge debts—and on the fact that several times in the Nation's history this power has been used to bring about a rapid reduction of the national debt. Under the proposed 25 percent limitation * * * the Federal tax powers would not permit getting revenues much at all above the level of expenditures in a year of prosperity. In fact, the limitation would have very much the effect of a constitutional prohibition on reducing the national debt. For emergencies, unless they involved active participation in war (so that the limitation would be suspended), there would be no tax powers in reserve. In such a situation as that of 1940, for example—when rearmament became necessary but we were not actively at war—it would be necessary to increase borrowings without taking steps to increase revenue."

In other words, we would have a perpetual debt if Pettengill's and Gannett's amendment were adopted.

Now let us see what would happen to the market value of Government bonds under Pettengill's amendment. The Treasury Department report has this additional comment to offer in that connection as follows:

"It is well known that when municipal governments operate under tax limitations and have no further tax powers in reserve, their bonds commonly are regarded as second grade or lower, and in such cases emergencies may bring a sudden and sharp decline in their credit standing. To put hobbles on Federal taxing power would likewise weaken Federal credit and expose it to shocks. Since we have been through two great wars and a great depression without Federal credit being called in question, it is easy to forget that such a thing is possible. But there have been times in the past when Federal credit deteriorated and if we sacrificed the Federal Government's reserve of taxing power it might happen again (as in the instance of the 'run' on the Treasury during the silver difficulties of the 1890's).

"If Federal credit suffers, State and local credit will suffer with it. Any real shock to public faith in Federal securities would undoubtedly involve State and local securities sympathetically. Furthermore, any such shock would weaken the banks and other credit institutions and hinder them in assisting State and local governments. It must not be forgotten, either, that the support of the Federal Government was very valuable to State and local governments in the depths of the depression of the thirties and that Federal credit stood back of State and local credit in this emergency. Could a Federal Government with impaired credit have rescued mortgage debtors through HOLC and FCA in 1933–34, and enable them to pay up their back taxes? Could it have rescued the shaky bank system through RFC, the mortgage agencies, and FDIC? Could it have financed needed local public works through RFC and PWA? The confidence of investors in State and local securities rests partly on the knowledge that in a major depression emergency Federal credit would always be in reserve."

Note carefully that the Treasury report says that it is not what Mr. Pettengill and his cohorts allege to fear which will bring about a decline in war bond values and market but, on the contrary, the very plan which these people advocate which would do the very thing which they are so piously and hypocritically raising as a possible event.

WAR INTENSIFIES THEIR CAMPAIGN

You may choose to say that I am possessed of an unusual imagination and am seeing ghosts instead of real enemies of this Nation, but I say to you that it is a very strange circumstance indeed which prompted this propaganda syndicate to allow its scheme to lie relatively dormant during peacetime and to only commence its aggressive campaigning about the time that the war commenced in Europe.

No one has ever accused those who hold to the German viewpoint of not being farsighted. The planning and the preparation which went into the German scheme for the conquest of Europe in this war admittedly was bulletproof except for one thing—the failure to believe that this Nation would ever enter another European war. Hitler and his minions never thought that we would go so far. They never foresaw June 6, 1944.

When they did finally realize that this Nation meant business again in this war, they immediately brought up their Quisling reserves and issued instructions which culminated in the greater activation of their plans to sap the power and strength of this Government at its tenderest spot, its purse strings.

POLL PARROT PETTENGILL

When Poll Parrot Pettengill tells us that his amendment will raise more, not less, funds for the Government, he is once again dealing in misinformation and is relying on making his argument effective through repetition rather than through fact. The cold facts on this point are also contained in the Treasury Department analysis, above referred to. On that point, the report says as follows:

"Even with a high level of employment, income payments after the war will be less than under wartime conditions. With lower income payments all the tax bases and the revenue will be lower. The income payments will necessarily decline as overtime work paid at time and a half ceases and the highly paid war industries are demobilized. Inflation would offset the factors making for a reduction in income payments, but inflation would also push up expenditures.

"With present prices and assumed income payments of $125,000,000,000 to $130,000,000,000, the present tax system (with the excess-profits tax eliminated and with automatic postwar excise-tax rate reductions), the $40,000,000,000 wartime revenue figure points to postwar revenue somewhere in the neighborhood of $25,000,000,000, not including social-security taxes.

"On the expenditure side, many items will greatly exceed their prewar levels. The cost of interest on the public debt, the Military Establishment, the veterans, and other war-caused items will be enormously enlarged. When allowance is made for the inevitable increase in other expenditures of Government, it is clear that the leeway for tax reduction from wartime rates is insufficient to permit a 25-percent maximum rate on incomes and estates without serious danger of continuing deficits.

"If the proposed limitation were adopted, it would mean reducing to a 25-percent level the bracket rates that now exceed 25 percent. It would mean lowering the 40-percent corporate normal and surtax, sharply reducing the estate tax, and reducing all individual income-tax rates to about the present first-bracket level of 23 percent. If no other adjustments were made, such cuts would involve revenue losses in the neighborhood of $6,000,000,000 a year. This would eliminate the prospect of a budget surplus and make a deficit probable even in a prosperous year."

Of course, it can be said that this loss of revenue might be made up in other ways. Let us examine that idea a moment. On that point, the Treasury report has this to offer:

"Part of the revenue loss from rate reductions brought about by the (proposed) limitation could conceivably be made up by measures designed to increase the tax base.

In the corporation field, the carry-forward and carry-back of losses could be abandoned, percentage depletion could be eliminated, and deductions for contributions denied, along with pension trust and perhaps other deductions.

"In the individual income field, deductions (for State and local taxes, contributions, interest, and similar items) could be disallowed; forms of income not now included as taxable (for example, interest on State and local bonds and some forms of annuities) could be included in taxable income; personal exemptions could be lowered; and the especially favorable treatment of capital gains could be abandoned."

I cannot imagine that many of us would wax enthusiastic over all these proposed substitute measures. Nor can I visualize the average businessman or consumer waxing enthusiastic over the only other available substitute measure, the commodity tax. Here is what the Treasury report has to say briefly on that last resort:

"It would be possible also to make some tax increases outside the restricted field. But since the (proposed) restriction covers estates and all kinds of incomes and the Constitution already stands in the way of Federal property taxes, the only major unrestricted field is that of commodity taxes—i. e., sales taxes and excises. If one disregards considerations of equity, the repressive effects of commodity taxes on business activity and employment and competition with State taxes, substantial revenues can be raised from these sources. Under war conditions, a 5-percent Federal retail sales tax would have yielded about $3,000,000,000; under post-war conditions, with shortages of goods relieved, the figure would be somewhat higher. But in view of the necessity to avoid seriously repressive effects of commodity taxes and of the many other considerations that point toward reducing war excises below the levels provided in the Revenue Act of 1943, a net gain of more than $1,000,000,000 or so in the commodity tax field would imply drastic use of commodity taxes. Congress might prefer instead to make adjustments involving a reduction of revenue in this field."

I confess that the precise and technical language employed by the analysts of the Treasury Department does not necessarily high light in one or two sentences the dangers inherent in this proposed amendment. However, just because their language is precise and technical and just because it is the considered opinion of experts, made only after careful computations leading to these conclusions, for those reasons, I place a higher value upon their statements and their conclusions than I otherwise would.

DR. EDWARD A. RUMELY, A CONVICTED CRIMINAL, OFFICIAL OF COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC.

I have been accused of having said some unkind and unwarranted things about this political-action committee, the Gannett-Rumely-Pettengill-McClure gang—alias the Committee for Constitutional Government. I have been accused of being a little too harsh in my criticism of certain of the individuals who founded and who still run this highly efficient and Fascist-inspired propaganda machine.

Today I should like to place in the RECORD certain factual information taken from the official court records and the final decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, wherein the conviction of one Edward A. Rumely in the lower court was upheld and the judgment of the lower court was affirmed which sentenced this man to a year and a day in the Federal penitentiary for concealing his connections with the Imperial German Government at a time when this Nation was at war with Germany.

In summarizing the testimony the court paid attention to Dr. Rumely's splendid educational background which included study at Notre Dame University in this country, Oxford University in England, and, later, 4½ years at the German universities of Heidelberg and Freiburg. The court says:

"During his sojourn in Germany he appears to have lived on terms of intimacy with some of its leading men. He has been a man of affairs. In 1915 he began negotiations for the puruchase of the Evening Mail, an old and well-established newspaper in New York.

"At the time he purchased the Mail there was a feeling on the part of many German-Americans that the news from Europe was put over in a one-sided way. As he (Rumely) expressed it:

" 'There was a great deal of resentment against biased reports that were coming and that bias I had recognized was due to the absence of a news flow from the Central Powers' And the court goes on to say: He says that he saw in that 'a very great public opportunity. He thought he could get strong financial support for his proposed purchase of the Mail, as he intended in that paper to fight the British blockade' which he regarded as unwarranted and illegal."

The court record says:

"It appears that on March 18, 1915, defendant Rumely and Samuel S. McClure obtained an option to purchase the New York Evening Mail."

For this record, it should be noted that Samuel S. McClure is still associated with Dr. Rumely in his present work and is still listed as a member of the board of advisers of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

The court testimony shows that Rumely, in his defense, maintained that the funds he had used for the purchase of the Evening Mail came from two wealthy German-Americans who were residents in Germany at the time of the last war. The prosecution proved, to the obvious satisfaction of the court and the jury, that this allegation of Rumely's was untrue. One of the parties from whom Rumely said that he secured this vast sum of $1,200,000 made deposition that she, at no time, furnished to anyone any money, by subscription, loan, or otherwise, for the purchase of the New York Evening Mail, or any interest in it.

The other party from whom Rumely alleged he secured these funds for use in buying the newspaper died in Germany while we were still at war with that country. His widow, who was with him during that time, and his partners, who resided in the United States, all testified that he, Herman Siecklen, had never supplied Rumely with any funds for any purpose, either directly or indirectly.

To make the prosecution's case complete, the Government established through deposition of one Dr. Heinrich Albert, agent for the Imperial German Government in this country prior to World War No. 1, that Rumely had received his funds from Albert from funds which were the property of the Imperial German Government. Albert also testified that he paid an additional $200,000 to Rumely for an advertisement which appeared in the foreign-language press of the United States, which was entitled, "An Appeal to the American People." From the testimony of Dr. Albert which is quite lengthy, it was obvious that the entire deal through which Rumely acquired the Evening Mail was cooked up during many long conferences which Rumely and Albert had in that connection. Furthermore, it was his admitted intention and purpose in acquiring said paper to use it for the avowed purpose of propagandizing the American people and "selling" to us the cause of Germany and the Central Powers.

Now, this admitted Goebbels of a generation ago, is here with us again in the midst of this great international conflict, brazenly grinding out the insidious propaganda and pulling the strings of one of the most efficient and diabolical un-American organizations which has ever been permitted to remain in existence in this country, either in peace or in wartime.

With the greedy Gannett in the background, supplying cash and introductions to other men of wealth in the country who may be enticed into supporting this foul scheme on the grounds that their own pocketbooks will grow fatter if this millionaires' amendment to the Constitution is permitted to pass; with "Poll Parrot" Pettengill preaching the little hypocritical sermons that Rumely grinds out for him and later prints in book and pamphlet form for him on the press, America's Future, Inc., located in the same building from which the committee itself operates; with the venerable-appearing Mr. McClure to front for him on other occasions when Poll Parrot and his other henchmen are far afield at their Quislinglike work, Rumely sits at the center of the web, playing on the weaknesses of the rich and the would-be rich and works toward the day when, through the passage of his amendment, he will have finished paving the road which can only lead to poverty, disaster, and revolution in this country.

That, gentlemen, is Dr. Edward A. Rumely, convicted criminal, German-trained, admitted German sympathizer, the great brain and master mind behind the most insidious and pro-Nazi scheme yet to be offered to the American people.

I have faith in the average American citizen and his sound and sane outlook on life which will reject any scheme offered to him personally which would make the lot of his family and his fellow workers a harder one in years to come, as would this nefarious millionaires' amendment. That average American citizen, however, is being given no voice and no choice in this particular matter. He is not being consulted.

Instead, only a few of his fellow citizens are given any voice in deciding as to the wisdom of this revolutionary and feudalistic plan. These are his duly elected representatives in the various State legislatures of the country, men who were not selected so much for their knowledge of constitutional law and national financial problems as they were to do the bidding of their constituents at home who entrusted their local problems to them for disposition.

These legislators are approached quietly and through the medium of the wealthier citizens in their respective districts who have been convinced in all good faith by Dr. Rumely's minions that this proposed amendment is a stepping stone to more freedom of enterprise and more prosperity for themselves as individuals, at least. If these local legislators could only see the dangers truly inherent in this wicked scheme and could see the pitfall they are automatically digging for themselves and their own fellow citizens, the average white-collar worker or laboring man, I know that they would never cast their votes for this Fascist plan. In the absence of information to the contrary, they do not see this future danger and they cheerfully accede to the request or the suggestion of their local rich men who have received the guidance to that end which Dr. Rumely has so cleverly provided for them.

We must wake up and put an end to this unholy crusade which has already prevailed upon two-thirds of all of the State legislatures it has yet invaded to do its will. It is not too late yet, but next year it may be too late, and then will come the hour of triumph for which Rumely and his hidden backers are pointing.

Legal language is dry. People prefer the Pollyanna language of change and like to read the attractive brochures issued by the sonorous pamphleteers and look at their pretty pictures of national heroes, patriotic shrines, and other Americana they have been

taught to love and respect—the kind of attractive booklets put out by this Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.—alias Fascism in America.

Just once, however, I commend for our reading the cold, dry language of the circuit court of appeals in its final judgment in the case of Rumely et al. versus the United States. In that plain, factual story of justice wending its slow but steady way lies the history of one stage in the career of this evil character. It portrays one relatively small set-back received by him before he had perfected the use of the Goebbels technique for wartime use in this country. In our failure to ignore its implications, we may well be preparing for a debacle to come.

Appended herewith are several excerpts taken from the official decision of the court in that case which temporarily removed from public circulation the Dr. Rumely of 25 years ago. Has he changed his beliefs? Has he joined our side? I, for one, do not believe so.

"[From Federal Reporter, vol. 293]

"No. 135—RUMELY ET AL. v. UNITED STATES (CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, SECOND CIRCUIT, JULY 27, 1923)

"(Certiorari denied, 44 Sup. Ct. 38, 68 L. Ed. —)

"Rogers, circuit judge. The plaintiffs in error have been convicted under an indictment which charged them with having conspired to defraud the United States by obstructing and preventing the United States from seizing and administering a certain indebtedness of the defendant Rumely to the Imperial German Government. It was alleged as part of the conspiracy that the defendants should conceal the fact of such indebtedness to the German Government, and should make false and misleading reports to the Alien Property Custodian of the United States, and so obstruct and prevent the transfer and and payment of that indebtedness to such Custodian. The defendants were acquitted on the first three counts, but convicted on the fourth and fifth. The jury accompanied their verdict with a strong recommendation for mercy.

* * * * *

"The trial began on November 3, 1920, and occupied 30 court days. During the trial 166 witnesses were examined, 670 exhibits were received in evidence, and the record fills 4 volumes, of 2,139 printed pages. There are 249 assignments of error, which occupy 116 printed pages. Of these assignments of error, 206 relate to the admission or exclusion of evidence, 24 to the charge to the jury, 7 to the denial of motions to set aside the verdict, 8 to the denial of motions to dismiss the indictment, and 3 to the denial of motions requiring the Government to elect on which counts it would go to trial. We have on several occasions condemned the practice of taking so numerous assignments of error. The practice is not conducive to the administration of justice in appellate courts. Many such assignments of error are inconsequential, and of so little importance that the court should not be asked to review them.

* * * * *

"It appears that on March 18, 1915, defendant Rumely and Samuel S. McClure obtained an option to purchase the New York Evening Mail, a paper published in the city of New York.

* * * * *

"The fourth count of the indictment, after reciting various matters not necessary now to refer to, and that Edward A. Rumely, at the times specified, then and there being within the United States, was indebted in the sum of $1,301,700 to an enemy of the United States, the Imperial German Government, and that the three defendants, each well knowing all the matters and things alleged, 'unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, feloniously, and corruptly did conspire and agree with each other, and with divers other persons whose names are to the grand jurors unknown, to defraud the United States, by obstructing, impeding, hindering, and delaying the United States in, and preventing the United States from seizing, capturing, receiving, holding, administering, assuming the control of and title to said indebtedness of the said Edward A. Rumely in the sum of $1,301,700 as aforesaid, to the said Imperial German Government, an enemy of the United States as aforesaid.'

" 'That is was a part of said conspiracy and agreement that the defendants should conceal from the Alien Property Custodian the fact that the said Edward R. Rumely was indebted as aforesaid to said Imperial German Government; that it was part of said conspiracy and agreement that the defendant, S. Walter Kaufmann, on behalf of the firm of Hays, Kaufmann & Lindheim, should make and render to said Alien Property Custodian a misleading, false, and fraudulent report and statement with respect to said indebtedness; that it was a part of said conspiracy and agreement that the defendants, Norvin R. Lindheim and Edward A. Rumely, should make a misleading, false, and fraudulent report and statement to said Alien Property Custodian with respect to said indebtedness; that it was a part of said conspiracy that the defendants should withhold and conceal from the United States and from the Alien Property Custodian the true facts with respect to said indebtedness; and that it was further a part of said conspiracy and agreement that the defendants should obstruct, impede, hinder, delay, and prevent the transfer, assignment, and payment of said indebtedness to the said Alien Property Custodian.'

"The fifth count of the indictment, after reciting various matters not necessary now to consider, and that by virtue of the Trading With the Enemy Act, passed by Congress and approved on October 6, 1917, it became and was the duty of every person in the United States who was indebted in any way to an enemy of the United States to report the fact to the official of the Government of the United States known as the Alien Property Custodian, and setting forth the time within which such report had to be filed, and after stating that at the times specified the defendant, Rumely, then and there being within the United States, was indebted in the sum of $1,451,700 to an enemy of the United States, to wit, the Imperial German Government, continued as follows:

" 'That on October 6, 1917, and continuously thereafter to and including December 20, 1917, the said Edward A. Rumely, S. Walter Kaufmann, and Norvin R. Lindheim, herein indicted and hereinafter called the defendants; and the said S. S. McClure Newspaper Corp., which is not herein indicted, each well knowing all the matters and things hereinabove alleged, at the southern district of New York and within the jurisdiction of this court, unlawfully, knowingly, willfully, feloniously, and corruptly did conspire and agree with each other, and with divers other persons whose names are to the grand jurors unknown, to commit an offense against the United States; that is to say, the said persons did conspire and agree that the said Edward A. Rumely, being indebted as aforesaid to the said enemy, should fail, neglect, and omit to report to said Alien Property Custodian within the period prescribed by law as aforesaid, and the extension thereof by the President as hereinbefore set forth, the fact that he was indebted as aforesaid to said enemy.'

"It becomes necessary, therefore, to consider whether the omission to charge that the defendants conspired that defendant Rumely should willfully fail, neglect, and omit to report to the Alien Property Custodian made the indictments invalid.

* * * * *

"4. It is objected that the fifth count is insufficient, because it failed to allege that the debt due to the enemy of the United States, and which it was necessary to report to the Alien Property Custodian, had become due. It is said that section 7 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act did not require the report as to a debt until 30 days after such debt shall become due. That portion of the act herein involved may be found in the margin. The allegation in the count is that Rumely was indebted in the sum of $1,451,700 to an enemy of the United States. And the contention is that the word 'due' means 'matured,' and that under the statute it was not necessary that fixed obligations payable in future should be reported. We are not able to concur in this view. The word 'due' signifies a simple indebtedness, without reference to the time of payment. This is the primary meaning of the word, and we think that it was used in this sense in the section of the act under consideration. It appears to us that Congress intended that the Alien Property Custodian should be given information as to all debts to alien enemies whether they had or had not matured. Such a construction of the act promotes efficiency in the collection of the debts owing to enemies, and the statute must be construed with reference to the object which it was intended to accomplish, and given that construction which is best calculated to advance its object. We see no sufficient reason for supposing, as the plaintiffs in error contend, that it was the intention of Congress that an indebtedness need not be reported until 30 days after its maturity.

* * * * *

"It is evident 'due' and 'owed' have been used as equivalents.

* * * * *

"The omission of comment upon all the errors assigned must not be construed as due to the failure of the court to consider them. We have examined this case carefully, the indictment, the admission and exclusion of evidence, the charge of the court, and whatever errors have been assigned. We have found no sufficient reason, in any of the errors assigned, which would justify this court in setting the judgment aside. The defendants had a fair trial under a valid indictment. The jury has found them guilty, and we cannot say that there was no evidence which could justify the verdict which has been rendered.

"Judgment affirmed."

QUIETLY AND WITHOUT PUBLICITY

I should also like to insert in the RECORD the following editorials and a letter taken from the press of recent weeks. The first is a letter from a Delaware taxpayer to the editor of the Wilmington, Del., Sunday Star, on May 28. It is obvious that the first news that this taxpayer had of this vicious amendment was at the time that I first called it to the attention of the Congress a few weeks ago. You will note that this correspondent is even now still unaware that the legislature of his own State, Delaware, has already adopted one of these resolutions and that his own Governor approved the resolution as long ago as April 22, 1943. That is how these alleged defenders of the Constitution work—quietly and without publicity.

The other two inserts are editorials from the New Republic of May 1, and the Nation of April 8. I commend them to your consideration:

"[From the Wilmington (Del.) Star of May 28, 1944]

"BRAND NEW TAX SAVING SCHEME

"EDITOR, SUNDAY STAR:

"The new tax bill which Congress sent to the President, said to be simplified for the

taxpayer, may be an improvement over the old tax measure, but we may well be suspicious of tax measures that are offered under a promise to make taxes easier.

"If they take the load off in one place they are most sure to put it on in another, and we may find it harder to meet, as in the final analysis the average taxable will pay more tax. There must be something slick about this one as it slipped through Congress in almost no time at all; consequently it must surely need watching.

"Now it seems there is another taxation scheme in the making, supported by a powerful lobby in Congress, with oodles of money backing it. It seems to be of the Gannett and Pettengill type. It is a foregone conclusion that anything sponsored by Frank Gannet and Samuel Pettengill has nothing to appeal to the average American. This scheme is a plan to change the Constitution, so as to limit the tax that may be placed against large incomes with the limit on those upper brackets at 35 percent. What this would do to the lower-income class need not be left to anyone's imagination. This scheme, as I understand it, has been aired before the Congress but the public pays little attention to what Congress does until it is sometimes too late.

"Sixteen States, it is said by Congressman PATMAN, of Texas, and SABATH, of Illinois, have passed resolutions to have Congress submit this proposed amendment to a constitutional convention. The campaign has been waged on the quiet but with considerable success as far as funds are concerned, as the very wealthy readily come across with a few thousands to speculate with some ready cash on a prospect of saving many thousands for themselves in income taxes, if this plan is successful, which, as a matter of course, they expect it to be.

"This time it is the Government that is being attacked through the Constitution of the United States and the people's interest is at stake, to be sacrificed for the benefit of a privileged class. It is possible that more than one powerful chain of newspapers as well as other powerful influences ready to be lined up with this sinister movement as they scheme in every possible way to fasten their treacherous tentacles on the United States Congress, and then on the lives and fortunes of the American people.

"L. G.

"MAY 24, 1944."

"[From the New Republic of May 1, 1944]

"A NEW TAX DODGE

"Would you believe that during a great war a modern democracy would sanction a strong movement to end income taxes?

"There is now an organization bent on this purpose called the American Taxpayers Association, supported by the Hearst press. Under its influence, 14 State legislatures have passed a resolution to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution (which grants the Congress the power to levy income taxes) and to restrict the taxing power of the Federal Government to a maximum of 25 percent not only on incomes but on gifts and inheritances as well. So has the New Jersey Senate and the proponents are hard at work in many other States.

"The association in its official bulletin deplores the fact that in the view of States that have turned the plan down 'practical and realistic methods' were not employed to obtain a favorable vote and believes the results would have been different 'if the program had been carried on as in the past in a quiet and effective way.'

"Enactment of the proposed measure would mean the virtual end of the progressive taxation of incomes or estates which adjusts the burden to the capacity to bear it. A man with a net income of $5,000, paying a 25 percent tax, would have $4,000 left, while a man with an income of $1,000,000, who could not be taxed at a higher rate, would have $750,000.

"Still worse, the measure would prevent any substantial curb on the accumulation of great wealth passed on from generation to generation. In view of the cost of war and the size of the national debt after it, the gentlemen who are trying to dodge their obligations in this way should be made to assume public responsibility by a congressional investigation of the financing and methods of the American Taxpayers Association."

"[From the Nation of April 8, 1944]

"A millionaire's lobby is quietly but successfully peddling to State legislatures a constitutional amendment designed to give upper-bracket taxpayers permanent relief from bearing their due share of national taxes. Already some 15 States have adopted a resolution asking Congress to summon a convention for the purpose of repealing the sixteenth amendment, which gave the Federal Government power to levy progressive income taxes. In its place, the resolution calls for a constitutional provision limiting income- and inheritance-tax rates to a maximum of 25 percent, save in a national emergency.

"This resolution was introduced in the New York Assembly in February and was narrowly defeated. Now it is before the New Jersey Legislature. Among its advocates one finds the New York Daily Mirror—the limitation would be a godsend to the Hearst family—which declares: 'There is no conceivable crisis in time of peace which would require taxing more than 25 percent of the people's income.'

"This is the choice example of the misleading propaganda being used to foster the new amendment which is concerned with limiting not the proportion of the national income taken in taxes but the amount taken from and one person's income. If the amendment were passed, a Henry Ford, who, on an income of $1,000,000 must now pay upwards of $800,000, would be charged at most $250,000. And, with the contribution of the Henry Fords limited, it would be necessary to jack up that of the John Does who would hardly be consoled by a constitutional limitation of the tax on $1,000 per year to $250.

"It is not surprising to find that the Committee for Constitutional Government, headed by Frank Gannett, the millionaire publisher, is the organization trying to slip over this measure while public attention is fixed on the fighting fronts."

THE RICH WOULD GROW RICHER—NO REDUCTION POSSIBLE IN LOWER-CLASS-TAX BRACKET

The Division of Tax Research of the Treasury Department has supplied me with an analysis of the effect that this proposed amendment would have on persons in the various income brackets.

Under the Gannett tax-limitation amendment, the 49,200,000 persons whose net annual incomes are now $5,000 or less—persons who now pay nearly 25 percent under the Individual Income Tax Act of 1944—would receive no benefits whatsoever. They would be obliged to pay at least their present tax bill, and probably more. Even if they did so, the over-all revenue from individual income-tax returns, not considering corporate returns, would be approximately $3,000,000,000 less than it is at present.

The greatest benefit, however, would accrue to the 38,000 persons whose annual net incomes are in excess of $50,000 a year, the millionaire class. This class of fortunate persons would find themselves only paying an average tax under this proposed amendment of approximately one-third of their present individual tax bill. Under present laws, these 38,000 persons will pay $2,618,000,000 this year in income taxes, whereas, if the 25-percent limitation is adopted, they will only pay $921,000,000, which would save them an average of almost $50,000.

According to the Treasury Department's experts, the 49,200,000 low-income taxpayers who now pay 54.15 percent of the present individual-income levy would have to assume liability for 65.8 percent of that levy under the Gannett plan.

Mr. Gannett and his fellow millionaires, however, who are even today only held liable for 23 percent of that levy, could only be held liable for 9 percent of the total individual-income levy under that plan. Small wonder that this scheme is characterized by some as the millionaires amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will in the near future be called upon to determine the advisability of extending for a future period some of the powers and authorities created and granted under the Defense Production Act of 1950. This responsibility has caused me grave concern in that the authority granted under that act is in fundamental contravention of the free economy and free enterprise system to which the free people of this Nation are indebted in the great strides that we have made in the progress of civilization. The exercise of the powers granted under that act constitutes a procedure contrary to the basic principles of supply and demand, and the result is a controlled economy rather than the free economy to which we have always subscribed. I make this predicate for the sole purpose of bringing to your attention that the problem posed is whether or not this country has reached the point in its progress when the system of free enterprise and free economy must be cast aside and a controlled economy resorted to for survival. If such is the case, the cause for which all the wars in our history were fought, beginning with the Revolutionary War and including the present conflict in Korea, is lost, and we, the Members of this Congress will be branded, and appropriately so, by historians as the officials who were derelict in their duty and who miserably failed in their responsibility to uphold and perpetuate the precepts of freedom and democracy. Much could be said on the subject from the general viewpoint, but suffice it to say at the present time that we have not reached a point in history when it is necessary to blind ourselves to the basic principles of free economy and free enterprise and permit ourselves to become the mere pawns of a regimented and controlled economy.

The subject as it affects the entire economy is so complex that time would not permit an all-encompassing treatment were I qualified to engage in such a discussion. Therefore, I shall today address myself to one phase of the problem with which I am somewhat familiar. It is that phase of our economy that has been affected by the regulations issued by the Office of Price Stabilization concerning the cattle business and the effect that these regulations will have. I say that I am somewhat familiar with this subject because the raising of cattle and the production of beef is one of the lead-

ing, if not the leading, businesses in my district. This district consists of 28 counties in the great Panhandle plains country of the State of Texas. In the early days of this country this section was inhabited by those great Americans of indomitable pioneering spirit who recognized no obstacle as being insurmountable. It is the blood of those great patriots that now courses through the veins of those presently engaged in the cattle business in that great section of this country—truly a race of people whose honesty and integrity is daily exemplified in their business dealings upon the maxim, "A man's word is as good as his bond," a people who have fairly appreciated the trials and tribulations of the pursuit in which they engage, and from whom, in the ordinary trend of events, there has never been a complaint. They have successfully fought the elements, the ravages of cattle disease, and have accepted, as part of the game, the market trends which have many times broken them financially, but which have failed to dim the pioneering spirit that is the moving force upon which they depend. Having won the battles against nature and man-made price fluctuations and at the same time producing better beef animals for the consumption of human beings—and mind you, without Government subsidies but solely on a free economy and free enterprise system—they rightfully felt that for these achievements they should be entitled to proper acclaim for a job well done. Little did they know that the battle had just begun and that the next onslaught to be directed at them would be a regimentation of their business that would do to them what the elements, the ravages of disease, and the questionable practices of market speculators had failed to do, namely, put them out of business. This is a fight for survival on the part of the small cattleman, the feeder, and the small packer, and unless it is won, these people who have meant so much to the economy of this country must seek other pursuits in order to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families.

The regulations that have been set up by the Office of Price Stabilization are fundamentally without logic in coping with the problem sought to be solved. One of the officials of this agency has stated publicly that if the cattle people are not satisfied with the regulations, they should "squawk" to him. I refer to Mr. Eric Johnston's statement in testifying before one of the Committees of this Congress. For the information of the Office of Price Stabilization and all of the officials of that agency, I would say that the great majority of the people of my district engaged in this business are not prepared financially to travel 1,800 miles to seek out officials of a Washington bureau and present their complaints in person. I represent many of those people of the Southwest, and I am squawking for them, and will continue to so do. In all fairness to all concerned, I do not base my case upon the complaints of a few from whom I have received communications. The problem was of sufficient concern to me that I returned to my district and sought out the people in this business and discussed their problems with them on the street corners, in the cafes, and at other points, in order to obtain the true facts. While there I had the opportunity to observe the beginning of what will develop into one of the greatest beef shortages that this country has ever faced, and I bring this information to this Congress in hopes that the duly elected representatives of the people will recognize the plight in which we find ourselves and lend their assistance to our salvation.

First, I want to correct the false impression that is so prevalent in many parts of the country to the effect that all people engaged in the cattle business are wealthy. Nothing could be further from the truth. These people are no different in this respect from the people engaged in any other business or pursuit, and for every one who is wealthy there are hundreds who live on credit from season to season. There seems to be another impression in the minds of many who are unfamiliar with the cattle business, and that is that the only problem involved in the production of beef is for a rancher to sit by and wait for calves to be born and to fatten on lush grass pastures and then sell these animals to the highest bidder. That this process is a continuing thing that goes on from year to year.

The Office of Price Stabilization seems to feel that because a rancher can make a few dollars per head on the animals that he raises that he is assured of a profit and cannot be hurt by this roll-back. This theory is as fallacious as the theory that all cattle people are rich. For instance, in my section of the country grassland sells today for approximately $35 per acre. A yearling steer requires 15 acres of grassland. This is an investment of $525. This same steer under present-day prices will cost the rancher approximately $200 to $210, making an over-all investment of approximately $735 per head. In order for the rancher to realize as much as 5 percent on this investment he must make a clear profit on each animal sold of approximately $36.75 per animal. This figure does not include items of expense such as fence building, treatment of the animals, interest on borrowed money, maintaining windmills and proper water supply, and does not include any additional feeding cost. Nor does it include any losses involved in connection with livestock raising. To go back for a minute to the cost of the animal, say $200, I want to show you what happens when one of these animals dies, and this they do in large numbers, especially in severe weather such as we have in the winter and early spring months in the Panhandle. Most of the cattle out there can stand a dry cold of below zero, but as is so many times the case, we will have a wet snow along with a severe drop in temperature and a high cold wind. There is relatively little shelter provided by nature in the Plains country, and when one of these animals becomes soaked from the wet snow, the accompanying drop in temperature kills them in great numbers. At an initial cost of $200 per head for these animals, you can readily see that if one dies, it will take a profit of $50 per head on four others to permit the rancher to break even. Now the severe weather is not the only cause of death to these animals, but is merely used as an example. There are many other types of losses that must be absorbed by the producer.

As an illustration of what is happening to the producer under the ceiling price regulations, we can take an average steer purchased this spring for spring and summer grazing and contracted for October delivery to feeders. The spring price of $42 per hundredweight on a 500-pound animal would make the original cost of the animal $210. Expenses in handling the animal, including pasture $20, interest $5, death loss and miscellaneous $5, increases the cost to $240. Under the regulations of the Office of Price Stabilization this animal will bring $27.30 per hundredweight on the delivery date somewhere between October 1 and the 15th. Assuming that the animal has gained 250 pounds during the summer, he will have attained a weight at delivery time of 750 pounds. By multiplying his weight by $0.2730 we arrive at the price the animal will bring, which is $204.75. Since the animal has cost the producer $240 and he can sell it for only $204.75, he has suffered a loss of $35.25 per animal. You can readily see that any rancher handling two or three hundred head of cattle can lose lots of money fast. In fact, he has lost more per animal than he is entitled to make as a fair return on his investment. The additional roll-back effective in October will increase this loss.

To carry this example further, we must remember that the illustration dealt with the animal only as a grass-fed animal. It is now time for this animal to be sent to the feeder so that he can be finished out and made ready for slaughter. The animal will cost the feeder, under the OPS regulations, $204.75. The feeder places this animal in a dry feed lot and proceeds to fatten the animal further for subsequent delivery to the slaughterhouse. Under present-day market it will cost the feeder approximately 85 cents per day to feed the animal. Assuming that he feeds the animal for 120 days, as is usually customary in such cases, his feeding cost will be $102. To this will be added a freight cost of approximately $7.50, and interest charge of approximately $5, and a miscellaneous charge of incidental expenses in connection with the maintenance of the animal of $5. The over-all cost over a period of 120 days has now increased to $324.25. The animal will gain approximately 2 pounds per day while in the feed lot. If he is there 120 days, his total gain will be 240 pounds. Since its weight was 750 pounds in the beginning, he has now attained a weight of 990 pounds. This animal would probably dress out between 56 and 58 percent, which means that under the provisions of CPR 23, the feeder can expect to receive $31.50 per hundredweight for the animal. This would bring him a return for this animal of $306.90, which is $37.35 less than the animal cost him. No man could stay in business long operating at any such loss as that.

In connection with this feeding process, I want to call your especial attention to the per diem cost of feeding the animal as compared with the actual return under the OPS regulations. It will cost 85 cents per day to feed the animal, and the animal will put on 2 pounds per day. For these 2 pounds that are produced each day in weight gained the feeder can only expect to recover 63 cents. In other words, every time the feeder puts 2 pounds on the animal he loses 22 cents. The result of this unwarranted situation is going to be this: No feeder of cattle is going to put these animals in his feed lots and spend 85 cents per day to feed the animal when he can only recover 63 cents against this 85 cents cost. What will happen? The animals will be fed out on grass so far as possible and immediately shipped to the slaughterhouses and slaughtered. By doing this, there will be approximately 240 pounds of beef that will be lost to the consuming public of the United States and the world, simply because it was never produced. The additional question comes up concerning the use of the cattle feed that is never fed to the cattle. This Government will find in approximately 1 year to 18 months that we have a surplus of cattle feed that represents the beef that should have been on the backs of the animals that were slaughtered. In addition to this, the cattle population of this country is bound to decrease for the simple reason that the people in the cattle business are not going to continue in the cattle business unless they can make a living at it, and when the small operators in this business find out that they cannot maintain themselves and their families on what profits they can make from continuing in this business, they are going to slaughter the animals on hand and seek other means of making a living. This means that in the final analysis the program of the cattle people to increase the cattle population of this country by 1955 to 95,000,000 head will be absolutely sabotaged and that by 1955 our cattle population will be reduced as far below the present 84,000,000 head as these people contemplated increasing it.

And while we are on this subject, I want to call to your attention the paragraph in Ceiling Price Regulation No. 23, being the first full paragraph in column 3 on page 2, and I quote:

> The feed required to make Choice cattle into Prime, with the indicated change in yield, will be substantially greater than to change Good cattle to Choice, or to make Commercial cattle into Good. Hence, it is believed that the price relationships will not encourage producing undue numbers of Prime cattle which would be a wasteful use of feed resources. They will definitely encourage placing cattle that would produce Commercial and Good carcasses, but are suitable for further finish, into the feed lot to be carried to a higher grade, thus adding to the beef supply.

Mr. DiSalle is certainly correct in the first two sentences of that paragraph, but as definitely incorrect in the last. In order to make Prime beef, it is necessary to keep the animal in a dry feed lot on good cattle feed for not less than 6 months. Since I proved to you a moment ago that the animal would lose the feeder 22 cents every day that it stayed in the feed lot, certainly no feeder is going to leave the animal there for 6 months. The truth is, he is not going to put him there in the first place. Yes, Mr. DiSalle is certainly right; there will not be any Prime beef. But do not misunderstand me. I do not say that you will not be paying Prime prices for Commercial and Utility beef. As to the last sentence in this paragraph, which is to the effect that the producer would be encouraged to place Commercial and Good carcasses into the feed lot to finish them out into Choice, there is certainly no basis in reason. A true statement would have been that if any feeder was caught with cattle in the feed lot when this regulation was made effective, he would certainly get them out and sell them fast, which would, of course, create a temporary supply of beef, but at the same time reduce the over-all production of beef as it has been practiced in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking on this subject from a theoretical standpoint. As I stated before, I returned to my district for the purpose of getting the true facts. While there I had the opportunity to observe a number of feed lots that have always been full. I am sorry to say that these lots looked like ghost towns. There was not one head of cattle near them, whereas only a few weeks ago they had been full, and would have continued to be full had it not been for the regulations adopted by the Office of Price Stabilization. In addition to the damage that will be done to those engaged in the raising and producing of livestock, the entire economy of the Great Plains country is going to suffer. Only yesterday I received a call from a friend of mine in Memphis, Tex., calling to my attention another fault in these regulations. He called me because the people there are worried, and plenty worried, about what is happening to their businesses. Many cattle down there are sold at auction sales, and in the towns of around five to ten thousand population they have small slaughterhouses where these animals are slaughtered and prepared for market. These businesses each have several employees. The same is true of the small packing houses in that section of the country. These slaughterhouses and small packers find themselves in this dilemma: They undertake to stay in business by purchasing these animals, dressing them out and selling the product to the retailers. They now find that their strongest competition in obtaining the animals is coming from the larger packing houses in the larger cities, who have representatives at these auction sales to buy these animals and transport them to the larger cities where they are slaughtered.

The reason that these larger packers can buy these animals is that they can pay a higher price than the small packers and slaughterhouses in these towns. They can pay this higher price because they know that they have a Federal meat inspector available and that these animals will actually dress out as Good or Choice beef; whereas the small packing plants and slaughterhouses in the smaller towns do not have available the services of these Federal inspectors and are forced to grade the animals themselves. Under regulation 5–G of distribution regulation 2, they cannot grade the carcass better than Commercial. Therefore they cannot meet the price competition of the larger packers who have available these official graders. Most of these small businesses are operated on a month-to-month basis and do not have large capital reserves upon which to fall back; hence it will be impossible for them to stay in business until this Government can provide a sufficient number of official graders to place them on a parity with the large packing houses. The result will be that these boys will go out of business and their employees must find other means of livelihood, and the entire cattle business in this particular respect will be channeled into the larger cities and into big business. That is not America, and never has been America, and regardless of the motives of those advocating these controls, such practices will never be American.

Much has been said by the Office of Price Stabilization about protecting the ultimate consumer and what these price regulations are going to do for the ultimate consumer. I do not know what these controls will do for the ultimate consumer a year from now or 2 years from now, but I have a good idea, and I do not think it is going to be very satisfactory to the consumers. I do know what has happened so far under these regulations, and I have the right to base my opinion as to what will happen in the future on the evidence at hand. This evidence is factual and not theoretical, and if anyone doubts it, he has but to go out into the countryside and view the matter at first-hand. The first thing that happened in my section of the country was that the price to which the cattlemen were entitled was rolled back and the price the consumer was paying was increased. And the consumers are certainly not very happy about that because many of them in my section of the country depend at least in part on the cattle business for their livelihood. With these actual facts in mind and without resorting to these idealistic theories of city boys trying to run country boys' businesses, it seems to me only fair to conclude that in 1 year or 2 years from nor the consumer will probably have one of two choices. He can do without meat on his table or he will be forced to trade with a gray or black market at a price much in excess of what he has heretofore paid. If the cattle population drops, as it is bound to under these regulations, there will be no alternative but rationing, and let no one be fooled about that. If we have rationing, it will be because the beef to which we were entitled in this country was never produced. And the failure to produce that beef will be one of the greatest losses that this country has ever suffered, because we are going into a period immediately when we will need more production than we have ever heretofore required.

It is not too late to remedy this situation and to undo a grievous wrong. The cattle people have never engaged in a

strike, and never will, and for any official to insinuate that these price regulations are necessary because there is some contemplation that the cattle producers might strike is one of the greatest injustices that has ever been done this great segment of American life. If the cattle people do not produce the beef that this country needs it will be because Government regulation and Government regimentation has put them out of business without their consent or approval. The only answer to inflation is production, and if these cattle people are left alone and free of Government interference they will produce, and they will produce regardless of what happens to the cattle market so long as their operations are free and unshackled. The answer to the increased price of cattle is not Government control; it is the action of the consumer in the purchases. As recent as 1948 the housewives of this country decided that meat was too high and put on a campaign reducing the weekly consumption of meat in their homes. The effect of this was immediate, and the cattle market responded, just as the housewives knew it would. It dropped sharply and leveled off at a point where it should be. The same thing could be done again today without interference from Government officials. Controls can never be justified in a free economy unless there are three elements present: First, there must be a necessity created by an emergency; second, the controls must be temporary; third, the controls must be fair and equitable to all, and especially to those people in the particular field that is subjected to controls. The absence of any or all of these elements will defeat the very purpose upon which controls are predicated.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman has any idea where the Office of Price Stabilization is going to pick up 600 meat inspectors overnight.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I do not know, but I have my fears about where they are coming from.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Does the gentleman know where the program originated? I do not mean exactly where it originated, but does the gentleman know how this program originated in the OPS, and who recommended it?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Does the gentleman mean the origination of the program or the mechanics of working it out?

Mr. GROSS. I refer to the price fixing and the price roll-backs in feed cattle.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. As I am informed, and I do not know whether this is true or not, the advisory committees were set up concerning the different phases of American business. My information is that these advisers, or the members of these advisory committees, came to Washington at their own expense and paid their own hotel bills and were here in a patriotic attitude, at least, and that their advice was sought but was not listened to. I am sure that that happened with reference to the cattle roll-back.

I am advised further—and I have no reason to doubt it—that in the Construction Division of the NPA the same thing took place; that these people were brought in and were told that the committee was too large and too unwieldy because it had 28 members and the matter would have to be dispatched.

Mr. GROSS. Then the people who know cattle raising and the cattle feeding business did not support this program and did not advise that this kind of program be put into effect? That is a true statement, is it not?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. As far as I know, no one from my section of the country is for this program or knew what was in the making when the program was being formed.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of an actual farmer, or a person who knows the grass-roots operation of farming, in the OPS? Does he know of a single individual like that?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No, sir; I do not. I do know some of these fellows who were called in as advisers on this Advisory Committee were qualified, and their advice should have been taken.

Mr. GROSS. As a matter of fact, they are conspicuous by their absence throughout the entire defense mobilization set-up, sof ar as farmers are concerned, is that not true?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That appears to be the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOYLE). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill H. R. 4141.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOYLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the Leninist line, or more often referred to as the Communist Party line, is a zigzag line of advance and retreat and is the theoretical basis for the many shifts of Communist strategy that have prevailed throughout the years since the Russian revolution.

Immediately after the revolution came 3 years of progress toward communism when the party in Russia drove toward the left, nationalizing industries, requisitioning goods, and drafting manpower.

Next came the 6 years of the new economic policy when free enterprise was encouraged in order to revive production and trade from the terrible breakdown left after the civil wars.

Next came the 5-year plan. The drive to the left in this period brought the socialization of agriculture and the famine in the Ukraine in 1931.

Hitler's rise to power in 1933 brought another transition, a swing to the right in foreign relations.

In 1935 the new Soviet constitution was adopted in a form that apparently accepted the familiar standards of western democracy. The popular front became the announced policy and the allegiance of communism was made the basis of political tactics in France and other countries. Communism in the United States became "twentieth century Americanism," the real "friend" of democracy, and the "guardian" of every tradition of freedom and civil liberty. The Communist Party in the United States went to great lengths to advertise Soviet Russia in this new "democratic" light. Anti-Nazi leagues flourished in the United States and the Communist Party was in the forefront as opponents of Hitler. The ruthless and barbarous persecution of the Jews by Hitler stirred up a righteous indignation in the hearts of every liberty-loving American citizen. Testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities has brought out that it was during this period the Communist Party in the United States was able to recruit many persons who were definitely anti-Nazi but not necessarily pro-Communist.

On August 23, 1939, the Communists in the United States received what was probably the greatest shock of their lives. Without advance notice of any kind, they were amazed and stunned to learn that the Soviet Union had signed a nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany.

Many of those who had joined the Communist Party because of its opposition to fascism simply could not swallow this new move and left the party in disgust. Collective security went out the window. Communists became isolationists and the war in Europe was belabored as an imperialist war. American Communists, once more straightened out as to the party line, took up the hue and cry that President Roosevelt was a warmonger and coined the phrase "The Yanks are not coming." On Labor Day of 1940 the American Peace Mobilization was created. They opposed every move the United States made in preparation for a war that was eventually to involve this country.

Once again the American Communists were caught flat-footed. While the American Peace Mobilization was picketing the White House on June 22, 1941, word flashed that Hitler and his hordes had attacked the Soviet Union. The American Peace Mobilization, after a weak attempt to change their name to American Peoples Mobilization, vanished into thin air. Communist-inspired strikes in war industries ceased. Overnight President Roosevelt's status changed from that of a warmonger to hero and it was quickly decided that the Yanks are not coming too late. Unity leagues for this and victory committees for that mushroomed overnight.

Earl Browder, who earlier had been convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary for passport fraud, was released from prison by President Roosevelt on May 16, 1942, by commuting the 4-year sentence to 1 year and 2 months. The reason given was to promote national

unity. It is to be remembered that the Communist Party of the United States, in their 1940 convention, passed a resolution "to combat the imperialistic policies and acts of the President, the State Department, and Congress to spread the war and involve the United States in it—oppose all war loans and credits—not a cent, not a gun, not a man for war preparations."

But with the head of their party out of jail and the Soviet fatherland being overrun by Hitler, the Communist Party, at its convention in May 1944 decided not to put candidates for office in the coming election. This question was solved by the dissolution of the Communist Party and the creation of the Communist Political Association. In other words, the very existence of the Soviet Union was at stake and the Communists could and should work with the capitalists to win the war.

With the successful conclusion of the war, Browder emerged more or less as a hero to the American Communists. But the true meaning of communism—violent opposition to capitalism—would not permit Browder's policy of friendliness toward the Government of the United States to continue.

The Tehran pact of November 1943 was an agreement between Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt that there would be generations of peace. But Hitler, the enemy of Soviet Russia, was defeated in May 1945 and the Tehran pact became only a diplomatic gesture. The need of the American Communist Party to return to their program of revolution was stressed by Jacques Duclos, general secretary of the Communist Party of France in April 1945. Recognizing this as notice that the party line in America was to change again, a convention of the Communist Political Association was called in May 1945. Again the American Communists bowed to the dictates of the leader of world communism. The Communist Political Association faded out of the picture and the Communist Party of the United States was resurrected. Earl Browder was deposed as the titular head by the simple procedure of branding him as a revisionist and selecting William Z. Foster as head of the party. Sacrificing himself as a well disciplined party member, Browder, the hero of one day became a bum the next.

Witnesses before the House Committee on Un-American Activities who admitted their membership in the Communist Party at the time of Browder's deposal, stated they were unable to follow the reasoning offered by the party leaders for such a move. These witnesses stated that it had been drilled into them by party functionaries that Browder was the leader and as the leader he could do no wrong. Yet these same party functionaries hurriedly climbed aboard the party bandwagon and belabored Browder because he had not continued to follow the party line and failed to anticipate another of the many changes.

The Communist Party line changes with conditions in the Soviet Union. During the period of the Soviet-Nazi pact, a time when Russia was not fully prepared for war, peace movements and antiwar propaganda was the order of the day.

The party line of today is being advanced by a hard core of well-trained and thoroughly disciplined Communists whose adherence to the dictates of Moscow is and has been unfailing. More underground than in the open, they follow the divide and rule tactics laid down by Lenin. They hope and patiently wait for a time when the United States may be extended by foreign engagements, when the United States is divided in counsel, when the United States may become involved in industrial or financial straits, to achieve the overthrow by force and violence of our Government.

The Communist Party of America is constantly seeking converts by the extensive use of indoctrination courses and schools.

We have listened to the testimony of a number of witnesses who testified that their admittance to the Communist Party was preceded by attending a Marxist study group or indoctrination course.

Witnesses appearing before the Un-American Activities Committee recently in the Hollywood hearings have testified concerning the Communist Party line at the present time. It seems to follow this pattern:

First. Communists who feel that their affiliation with the party is known to the FBI and other intelligence agencies and who still remain loyal to the Soviet, claim immunity under the self-incrimination clause under the Constitution and exhibit a false interest in preserving world peace and freedom of speech, thought, and other liberties guaranteed by the Constitution, which they use as a shield.

Second. Communist Party members who have never carried cards or attended Communist Party meetings and feel that they are not known publicly as Communist Party members, apparently have been instructed to vociferously deny Communist Party membership and claim now to be anti-Soviet and pro-American.

Third. Pinkos and Communist sympathizers still follow the Communist Party line by claiming they are liberal Democrats and are interested only in preserving peace and national unity.

Fourth. American Communists apparently have been instructed to continue the use of new front groups with high sounding names whose purpose shall be to encourage financial chaos in America under the guise of social progress.

The real hard core of American communism still exists and is flourishing. Adherents to this hard core continue to flaunt the efforts of all sincere anti-Communist groups. They have but one purpose in mind: To overthrow our form of government and eventually become czars under the regime of Communist dictatorship.

GENERAL MacARTHUR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I have respect for the integrity of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE]. I think he is perfectly honest in his statement that he did not hear the discussion with General MacArthur as he was sitting at the other end of the long table in the Embassy at Tokyo. He was engaged in conversation with the charming Mrs. MacArthur. I very carefully prepared my former statement so that it would present the facts. I made notes as usual after the meeting and so did the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE. My statement stands as presented.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a speech of Mr. William Boyle, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and in the other an editorial by the Lions Club of Denver, Colo.

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. MARSHALL) was given permission to extend his remarks and include newspaper editorial material.

Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain statements.

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

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include appropriate material.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a Territorial resident's proposal.

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

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

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

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. SCHWABE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in

three instances and include extraneous matter.

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

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

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Louisville Times.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Hoosier Farmer.

Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by him on Memorial Day in Grand Rapids, Mich.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 29, 1951, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3842. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 4, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

474. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

475. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

476. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of Displaced Persons, who upon arrival in possession of appropriate immigration visas, are found to be excludable as persons within the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

477. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of the order of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subject of such order, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

478. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

479. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the names of two educational institutions that have requested donations from the Navy Department under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 649 (79th Cong., 2d sess.) approved August 7, 1946, namely, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla., and East Carolina Teachers College, Greenville, N. C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

480. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $700,580 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 151); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 534. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. S. 1. An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 535). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4106. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" by adding a new section thereto known as section 1732b to permit the photographic reproduction of business records and the introduction of the same in evidence; with amendment (Rept. No. 536). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER: Committee of conference. H. R. 1612. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 537). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4141. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4297. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4298. A bill to confer upon Hawaii the status of a State for purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 4299. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4300. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of Defense to transport passengers and cargo in vessels of the Military Sea Transportation Service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4301. A bill to extend to certain individuals serving on active duty in the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4302. A bill to amend the War Contractors Relief Act so as to extend relief thereunder in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 4303. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4304. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 4305. A bill to authorize the use of the Sackets Harbor Military Cemetery for the burial of war and peacetime veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4306. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 4307. A bill to provide that members of the bar of the United States district courts shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4308. A bill to repeal limitations contained in other laws on federally assisted low-rent housing projects authorized by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4309. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating

to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the completion of the San Diego Aqueduct; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, transmitting a copy of an act appproving the act of the Governor in signing the interstate compact for civil defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the Congress to defer taking any action to discontinue or modify the pay differentials granted to Federal employees in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, respectfully urging the Congress of the United States to support House Concurrent Resolution 64; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4310. A bill for the relief of Walter Samuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4311. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Caraccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4312. A bill for the relief of Antonio Vitiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 4313. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Wan Hsien Wu, Dorothea Wan Lien Wu, Ray Kiu Wu, Christine Wan Ming Wu, and Ying Victor Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 4314. A bill for the relief of Satsuko Uchida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4315. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Lechner and Ingrid Lechner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4316. A bill for the relief of Leonid Zankowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4317. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 4318. A bill for the relief of Allen W. Spangler and The Great American Indemnity Co. of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

300. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of Mrs. Morris E. Lile and 131 others protesting high food prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

301. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles F. Strohson, clerk, Board of Supervisors, Mineola, Nassau County, N. Y., requesting the Congress to enact legislation in aid of the financing of the safety program of the Long Island Railroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

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

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

Our Father God, always Thou art near us. In Thee we live, move, and have our being; but often our cold and spiritually insensitive hearts keep Thee on the outside of the locked doors of our lives. Enmeshed as we are in a multiplicity of things, slaves to the tyranny of the tangible, weighted down with the pressing concerns of the Nation, with all other voices hushed at noontide we come bowing in reverence, lifting from this daily altar of prayer but one petition: "Nearer, my God, to Thee, nearer to Thee."

In all the perplexities and confusions of these days, with clouds and darkness even around Thy throne, we would steel our resolution to do what these times demand of us by the assurance that Thou art behind the shadows and in the shadows, keeping watch above Thine own. Quicken our hearts that they may become responsive to Thy touch. Save us from all national and international attitudes and actions which have not Thee in awe. Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet lest we forget to use our liberties and privileges, bought with so crimson a cost, to promote the common good of this stricken earth. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 31, 1951, was dispensed with.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor and Management of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

CONTINUATION OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION FOR VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions I have commented on the Senate floor regarding the deep interest of the people of Wisconsin in continued adequate appropriations under the George-Deen and George-Barden Acts. We have always found that vocational training very definitely pays off in both an economic sense and in many other respects.

I have in my hand a resolution sent to me by C. D. Rejahl, secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin Association for Vocational and Adult Education, located at 211 North Carroll Street, Madison, Wis.

I believe that this resolution urging the restoration of funds for continuation of distributive education will be of interest to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, to be followed thereafter by a list of the names of the officers of the executive committee of the association, and I request that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the names of the officers of the executive committee of the association, as follows:

Whereas the program of distributive education—merchandising and service occupations—has been effectively initiated through Federal aid appropriated under the provisions of the George-Deen and George-Barden Acts; and

Whereas this program is still in the process of development in the meeting of the needs of small business in this country; and

Whereas the problem of effective and economical distribution of materials and products to our civilian population will become more acute as the demands of increased mobilization restrict full civilian production; and

Whereas the House of Representatives in the passage of H. R. 3709 has eliminated all Federal aid for distributive education—merchandising and service occupations—authorized under the George-Barden Act: Wherefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Association for Vocational and Adult Education meeting in Milwaukee, Saturday, May 5, 1951, call to the attention of Members of Congress from Wisconsin, the importance of the program of distributive education to our present economy and urge that Federal aid for this activity be restored for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION FOR VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

John E. Te Poortan, president, Madison; C. D. Rejahl, secretary-treasury, Madison; Marie H. Peterson, commercial, La Crosse; Frank J. Woerdehoff, teacher training, Madison; Arthur Larsen, guidance, Sheboygan; Lawrence B. Hoyt, coordination, Wausau; Ted D. Sather, past president, Kenosha; C. J. Haase, rehabilitation, La Crosse; John Perkins, agriculture, Neillsville; Emil J. Schaefer, distributive, Madison; Raymond W. Henke, trades and industry, Marinette; Calvin Evans, general subjects, Milwaukee; Monica M. Diebold, homemaking, Green Bay; H. L. Sherman, directors, Menasha.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1580. A bill for the relief of Alevtina Olson and Tatiana Snejina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1581. A bill to provide for recognition of the Cathedral-of-the-Pines, Rindge, N. H., as a national shrine; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.