

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2008. A bill for the relief of Dr. Charles A. Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 2009. A bill for the relief of Michael Abarno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2010. A bill for the relief of Loucas Roussos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2011. A bill for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2012. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2013. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sirtart Arsenian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2014. A bill for the relief of Paul Rintrona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2015. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Garcia y Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 2016. A bill for the relief of Anton Waytashek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 2017. A bill to provide for the payment in a lump sum to Montana State College of national service life insurance granted the late Ralph Coldwater; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2018. A bill for the relief of Manuel Vaz Querido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 2019. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Dixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 2020. A bill to provide for the relief of Orlando DiTomasso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 2021. A bill for the relief of Archimidis Garbis; 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:

116. By Mr. MUNDT: Memorial of the State of South Dakota, recommending repeal of Federal taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

117. Also, memorial of the State of South Dakota, recommending maintenance of taxes and regulations affecting butter substitutes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

118. By Mr. NORBLAD: Joint memorial adopted by the House of Representatives and Senate of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to make on an annual and continuing basis the appropriations necessary for providing urgently needed additional Federal generating capacity in the Columbia Basin and not to require any increase in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration which would destroy the key of low-cost hydroelectric power needed to unlock other natural resources in Oregon and the great Pacific Northwest, per-

mitting the development of new opportunities and new jobs and the creation of new taxable wealth; to the Committee on Appropriations.

119. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution with respect to national legislation adopted by the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1947; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

120. Also, resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1947, concerning taxation of cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

121. Also, resolution passed by the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1947, concerning the wage-hour law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

122. Also, resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1947, concerning the amendment of the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

123. By the SPEAKER: Petition of board of directors, Northwest Public Power Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing appreciation for valuable assistance given in the entire northwest area in serving the public interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

124. Also, petition of Jessie E. Miller and various veterans of World War II, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request that the Redding office, at Redding, Shasta County, Calif., of the United States Employment Service be instructed to pay them their veterans' readjustment allowances, as required by the GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in whom we live, move, and have our being, so fill us with holy confidence that every shaft of temptation and evil shall be splintered on the shield of good upright living. When the sea of life is storm-wrought and tempestuous, we would see Thee coming through the conflict and hear Thy voice saying, "Peace, be still."

Blessed Lord, be with every household across our broad land; may every child be held as a gift from God and be brought up in the way of Thy commandments. O grant unto parents that they may never know the anguish which biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder. In these sadly disordered times, O God, so full of folly and irreverence, come and rule over our homes, and may understanding and wise discipline be the triumph of our victories. In the blessed Saviour's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1353. An act to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1030. An act to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. BARKLEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 568. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in one to include a radio address, in another a bill he introduced today, and in the third a further item.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials on the St. Lawrence seaway.

## WAR EXCISE TAX RATES

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KNUTSON, REED of New York, GEARHART, DOUGHTON, and DINGELL.

## SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire again to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the critical condition of the railroad transportation situation and particularly the need of boxcars in the Corn Belt.

My district in central Illinois is part of the so-called bread basket of the Nation, where millions of bushels of corn cannot be marketed because of the lack of cars—the corn is sorely needed by the processor for the manufacture of feeds and corn products, not only for this country but for commitments to the starving people abroad.

I am receiving many letters and telegrams from constituents.

The purpose of my remarks is to urge the Office of Defense Transportation to increase its efforts to correct this situation.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a set of resolutions adopted by the Ottumwa (Iowa) Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 5]

Andersen,	D'Ewart	McGarvey
H. Carl	Dirksen	Meade, Ky.
Anderson, Calif.	Donohue	Monroney
Andrews, Ala.	Drewry	Norblad
Andrews, N. Y.	Durham	Norrell
Barden	Elliott	Norton
Bates, Mass.	Elston	O'Hara
Blackney	Engle, Calif.	Peterson
Brooks	Fernandez	Pfeifer
Buckley	Fuller	Poulson
Buffett	Gerlach	Price, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Gorski	Priest
Busbey	Grant, Ala.	Rizley
Camp	Gwinn, N. Y.	Russell
Canfield	Hardy	Sanborn
Clason	Hays	Sasscer
Clements	Hébert	Scoblick
Clippinger	Hedrick	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Hendricks	Sikes
Cooley	Hess	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Jenison	Taylor
Coudert	Jenkins, Ohio	Towe
Crawford	Johnson, Calif.	Vinson
Cunningham	Kefauver	Winstedt
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	Wolcott
Dawson, Ill.	Kilday	Woodruff
Dawson, Utah	Lucas	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### SAFEGUARDING ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 105, Rept. No. 40), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2

hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### NEWSPRINT INVESTIGATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 58, Rept. No. 41), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized to conduct a study and investigation of all matters related to the need for adequate supplies, for use in the United States (including use in time of war), of newsprint, printing and wrapping paper, paper products, paper pulp and pulpwood, and of all matters related to means by which adequate supplies thereof may be produced or secured, with particular reference to—

(1) the short-range and long-range possibilities of increased production thereof in the continental United States (including Alaska);

(2) the short-range and long-range prospects of securing increased supplies thereof from Canada and other sources outside the United States; and

(3) the extent to which agencies or officers of the United States may be able to assist in furthering the objective of securing increased production and supplies thereof.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and as soon as practicable during the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the continental United States (including Alaska) or Canada, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

#### ESTABLISHING CEILING FOR EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 103, Rept. No. 42), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent res-

olution, House Concurrent Resolution 20, establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948, and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in said fiscal year, and all points of order against said concurrent resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] the concurrent resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said concurrent resolution. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

#### OCEAN TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO AND FROM ALASKA

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 122, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. That committee has directed me to make a recommendation for the passage of House Joint Resolution 122 since current legislation will expire on the 28th of February 1947.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to say I am heartily in favor of the proposed resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the pending bill, House Joint Resolution 122, is cosponsored by myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. The resolution authorizes the Maritime Commission to provide interim ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948. It represents a careful study by a special subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, commencing in May of last year. In order to give the Members of the House a better understanding of the urgent need for this legislation, I should like to discuss very briefly the history of this problem.

The people of the Territory of Alaska are completely dependent upon a life line of ships operating between the Pacific Northwest and the Territory, both to supply them with the necessities of life and to enable their products to be brought to market. Prior to the war this service was principally provided by three common carriers. During the war, however, all of their ships were requisitioned by the Government and all operations in the



Alaska trades were handled by the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission for the Government's account.

During these years of Government operation, costs have greatly risen. As a result of this rise in costs, Government operations have been conducted at a substantial loss. For example, I understand that the operating loss for the year 1946 will approximate \$4,000,000. Because of this rise in costs and because of the unfortunate recent financial experiences of the Government in this trade, private operators are loath to resume service to and from the Territory.

Conceivably, Government operation at a loss could be continued in order to insure the development of Alaska. But I think that most of us are convinced of the desirability of getting the Government out of the shipping business and returning ship operations to private hands. The Alaska situation, however, is complicated by the fact that private capital is unwilling to assume the necessary risks at this time because of their inability to foresee profitable operations. It is further complicated by the fact that the present authority of the Maritime Commission to operate ships in the Alaska trade expires on February 28, 1947. Even if the Maritime Commission's authority is extended as provided by House Joint Resolution 114, such authority will only continue until June 30, 1947. As a result, some action must now be taken by the Congress to provide a solution for this most difficult Alaska problem.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has had this problem under consideration for over 6 months. Despite this, we are unable to suggest a permanent long-range legislative policy at this time for the Alaska trades. The reason for this is that until we have had some operating experiences under present conditions, it is impossible to determine what service is required and what revenues are required to continue this service. Our committee, therefore, has submitted in House Joint Resolution 122 and House Joint Resolution 123 only an interim solution to the problem. But this solution is one which will perform the two necessary functions of, first, insuring the continuance of service to Alaska and, second, of providing a year's experience under present conditions to serve as a basis for permanent legislative policy.

The plan which has been developed in House Joint Resolution 122 is a simple one. That resolution authorizes the Maritime Commission to enter into contracts with the private operators experienced in this trade, whereby the latter agree to operate such service as the Commission may deem necessary. All possible losses of such operation are borne by the operators. In order to permit them to operate without fear of too great losses, however, the Commission is authorized to charter to them at nominal rates of hire the vessels to be used in this trade. In addition, the Commission is authorized to provide the necessary marine insurance. To protect the Government and the people of Alaska from

these operators' making any large profits, however, this resolution further provides that these operators shall receive, as their profit, a maximum of 10 percent of their capital necessarily employed in these trades. After all other expenses of operation have been met, the Maritime Commission would then recover a minimum of 75 percent of the excess, with a maximum additional 25 percent going to the operators.

It seems to me that this legislation is a highly workable solution of an extremely difficult problem. It solves the impasse resulting from the people of Alaska being unable to pay higher freight rates and the operators of vessels in the Alaska trades being unable to operate under the present rate structure. This solution will permit continued operation with a minimum increase in rates. The assistance which the Government furnishes to these operators will result in no out-of-pocket expenses, as the ships which are to be chartered at nominal rates are those already owned by the Government, and which would otherwise be placed in our laid-up fleet. Should the operation be a profitable one, the Government is assured of the recovery of the major portion of all such profits.

Coming from the Pacific Northwest I am well aware of the problems faced by our people of our great Territory to the north. I feel that by enacting this resolution Congress will not only be doing a great service to them, but a greater service to our Nation. It will be remembered that Alaska is our first line of defense. Only if it is adequately developed can it constitute a barrier against invasion from the north. And only if adequate water-borne commerce to and from that Territory is provided, can this development proceed. Accordingly, I strongly urge enactment of this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That in order to provide essential water transportation service for the Territory of Alaska pending the determination of long-range policy with respect to such transportation, the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to enter into appropriate contracts, charters, and other arrangements with American-citizen operators deemed by the Commission to be qualified to supply such service until July 1, 1948. Such contracts or arrangements shall include provisions for making available to such operators Government-owned vessels under the control or jurisdiction of the United States Maritime Commission for operation during the period ending June 30, 1948. Such provisions may include charter hire at a nominal rate or rates, with necessary marine insurance to be provided by the Commission as to ships made available by the Commission and other ships operated by such operators in the Alaska service under the contracts or arrangements with the Commission. Such provisions may likewise include requirements that the operators shall agree to operate such ships in a manner as determined by the Commission to secure the most economical transportation for the Alaska service. The contracts or other arrangements shall include appropriate provisions for allocation of receipts from the operations of such ships. Such contracts or arrangements shall in-

clude, among such other requirements as the Commission may deem appropriate, provision for the application of such receipts to meet the operating costs and overhead expenses of the operator as approved by the Commission and an amount equal to the charter hire paid by the Commission for the use of the privately owned vessels, and amounts in excess thereof to become the property of the operators in amounts not in excess of 10 percent (before taxes) on the value of the assets (other than vessels) contributed to the venture by the operator as determined by the Commission for the purposes hereof and not otherwise. Any amount in excess of such 10 percent shall be applied first to meet the insurance expenses of the Commission, and any balance shall be applied or distributed as may be provided by the terms of the contracts or arrangements, but in no event shall the Commission receive less than 75 percent of such balance, as additional charter hire.

Sec. 2. The Commission shall report to the Congress at intervals of not greater than 90 days all contracts, charters, and other arrangements entered into pursuant to this act and the details and course of all operations which have been conducted thereunder.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during the session of the House today.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROCEEDINGS AGAINST GERHART EISLER

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I present a privileged report, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Un-American Activities as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law No. 601, section 121, subsection Q (2), caused to be issued a subpoena to Gerhart Eisler, of 48-46 Forty-seventh Street, Borough of Queens, New York City, N. Y. The said subpoena directed Gerhart Eisler to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6, 1947, and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to the said committee; the subpoena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Sergeant at Arms, or his special messenger: You are hereby commanded to summon Gerhart Eisler, 48-46 Forty-seventh Street, Borough of Queens, New York, N. Y., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on February 6, 1947, in room 226, Old House Office Building, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons."

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 23d day of January 1947.

"J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman*.

"Attest:

"JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk*."

The said subpoena was duly served, as appears by the return made thereon by Louis J. Russell, investigator of the Committee on Un-American Activities, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpoena, the return of the service by the said Louis J. Russell being endorsed thereon, which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpoena for Gerhart Eisler, 48-46 Forty-seventh Street, Borough of Queens, New York City, N. Y., to appear before the committee on the 6th day of February 1947, at 10 a. m. Served the within named on January 24, 1947, at 8:30 a. m., at his residence by Louis J. Russell."

The said Gerhart Eisler, pursuant to said subpoena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law No. 601, section 121, subsection Q (2). The said Gerhart Eisler, after making his appearance in the chambers of the said committee, refused to be sworn by the chairman of the said committee; and as the result of the said Gerhart Eisler's refusal to be sworn as a witness before the committee, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter of inquiry committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpoena served upon the said Gerhart Eisler. The record of the proceedings before the committee on Thursday, February 6, 1947, during which the said Gerhart Eisler refused to be sworn as a witness and to give testimony is set forth as follows:

"The committee met on Thursday, February 6, 1947, at 10 a. m., the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, presiding. All members of the committee were present; and in addition thereto there was present Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator and examiner for the said committee, and Louis J. Russell, investigator.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. Mr. Stripling, do you have all of your witnesses here?

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, there are two witnesses who did not respond, Mr. Samuel Liptzin and Mr. Leon Josephson. Both have sent telegrams to the committee. I think that the telegrams should be read into the record and that the committee should take some action concerning the matter, for the reason that these are two very necessary witnesses.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Stripling, call your first witness.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Gerhart Eisler, take the stand.

"Mr. EISLER. I am not going to take the stand.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have counsel with you?

"Mr. EISLER. Yes.

"Mr. STRIPLING. I suggest that the witness be permitted counsel.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Eisler, will you raise your right hand?

"Mr. EISLER. No. Before I take the oath—

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman—

"Mr. EISLER. I have the floor now.

"Mr. STRIPLING. I think, Mr. Chairman, you should make your preliminary remarks at this time, before Mr. Eisler makes any statement.

"The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, Mr. Eisler.

"Mr. Eisler, you are here before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to a subpoena served on you January 25, 1947, which summoned you to appear before this committee this morning. This committee's

authority, which is derived from Public Law 601, is authorized to investigate:

"(1) The extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States;

"(2) The diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution; and

"(3) All other questions in relation thereto \* \* \*.

"The committee considers the Communist Party of the United States to be a subversive organization, and the testimony or activities of any individual connected with the Communist Party of the United States is considered to be the purview of this committee's authority.

"There has been considerable testimony before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and this committee, its successor, which links you with the activities of the Communist Party.

"The questions which will be asked you this morning will be aimed at determining the facts; and it is, therefore, requested that your answers be responsive and direct. It is not the policy of this committee to permit witnesses to make a statement. After you have completed your testimony, if you desire to make a statement, the committee will permit you to put it in the record at the conclusion of your testimony.

"Now, Mr. Eisler, you will be sworn in. Raise your right hand.

"Mr. EISLER. No.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Eisler, in the first place, you want to remember that you are a guest of this Nation.

"Mr. EISLER. I am not treated as a guest.

"The CHAIRMAN. This committee—

"Mr. EISLER. I am a political prisoner in the United States.

"The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Will you please be sworn in?

"Mr. EISLER. You will not swear me in before you hear a few remarks.

"The CHAIRMAN. No; there will be no remarks.

"Mr. EISLER. Then there will be no hearing from me.

"The CHAIRMAN. You refuse to be sworn in? Do you refuse to be sworn in Mr. Eisler?

"Mr. EISLER. I am ready to answer all questions, to tell my side.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is not the question. Do you refuse to be sworn in? All right.

"Mr. EISLER. I am ready to answer all questions.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, call the next witness. The committee will come to order, please. We have strived to put on a witness, Mr. Gerhart Eisler. Mr. Eisler refused to be sworn in.

"Mr. EISLER. I did not refuse to be sworn.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is the pleasure of the committee?

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I think that the witness should be silent, or take the stand or be removed from the room, one or the other, until this matter is determined.

"Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, suppose you ask him again whether he refuses to be sworn.

"Mr. RANKIN. Not 'sworn in,' but to be sworn.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Eisler, do you refuse again, to be sworn?

"Mr. EISLER. I have never refused to be sworn in. I came here as a political prisoner. I want to make a few remarks, only 3 minutes, before I be sworn in, and answer your questions, and make my statement. It is 3 minutes.

"The CHAIRMAN. I said that I would permit you to make your statement when the committee was through asking questions. After the committee is through asking questions, and your remarks are pertinent to the in-

vestigation, why, it will be agreeable to the committee. But first you have to be sworn.

"Mr. EISLER. That is where you are mistaken. I have to do nothing. A political prisoner has to do nothing.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then you refuse to be sworn?

"Mr. EISLER. I do not refuse to be sworn. I want only 3 minutes. Three minutes to make a statement.

"The CHAIRMAN. We will give you those 3 minutes when you are sworn.

"Mr. EISLER. I want to speak before I am sworn.

"Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that the witness be cited for contempt.

"Mr. RANKIN. I second the motion.

"The CHAIRMAN. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying 'aye.' Motion carried. The witness will be cited for contempt.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, before the witness leaves I would like to know in whose custody he leaves.

"The CHAIRMAN. Who brought the witness?

"Mr. STRIPLING. These gentlemen. Will you give your name?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Steve Grennman.

"Mr. STRIPLING. And what is your position?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Security officer, Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

"Mr. STRIPLING. And your name?

"Mr. BROSMAN. R. J. Brosman.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Your position?

"Mr. BROSMAN. Security officer, Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Did you bring Gerhart Eisler to the committee?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Is he now in your custody?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee where he will be taken?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. To the county jail in Washington.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know where he will go from the county jail?

"Mr. GRENNMAN. Back to Ellis Island, I believe.

Miss CAROL KING. May I be heard?

"The CHAIRMAN. Take the witness out.

"Mr. Stripling, put on your next witness."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities has been deprived of the right to receive the sworn testimony of the said Gerhart Eisler relative to the subject matter which under Public Law No. 601, section 121, subsection Q (2), the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the willful and deliberate refusal of the witness to be sworn and to testify as hereinbefore set forth is a violation of the subpoena under which the witness had previously appeared and his willful refusal to be sworn and to testify deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

#### "HOUSE RESOLUTION

"Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the willful and deliberate refusal of Gerhart Eisler to be sworn and to testify before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that the said Gerhart Eisler may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law."

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 104) and ask for its immediate consideration.



The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the willful and deliberate refusal of Gerhart Eisler to be sworn and to testify before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that the said Gerhart Eisler may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, when the Committee on Un-American Activities opened its session at 10 o'clock, it had by previous investigation, tied together the loose ends of one chapter of a foreign-directed conspiracy whose aim and purpose was to undermine and destroy the Government of the United States. The principal character of this conspiracy was Gerhart Eisler, alias Berger, alias Brown, alias Gerhart, alias Edwards, alias Liptzin, alias Eisman, a seasoned agent of the Communist International, who had been shuttling back and forth between Moscow and the United States from as early as 1933, to direct and master mind the political and espionage activities of the Communist Party in the United States.

When Eisler appeared before the committee, he did not come as a grateful political refugee who had enjoyed a safe haven in this country from war-ravaged Europe during the period of World War II; he came instead as an arrogant, defiant enemy of that government and promptly manifested his disrespect by refusing even to be sworn before the committee. His manner and attitude was one of utter contempt.

Two other conspirators and comrades of Eisler, Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzin, who were subpoenaed to appear, did not appear; Josephson contended by telegram that 2 days was not sufficient notice for him to come from New York to Washington, and Samuel Liptzin informed the committee by telegram that he could not appear because he was at the bedside of one very dear to him. It is no wonder that Eisler refused to talk and Josephson and Liptzin did not respond to the subpoenas, because the committee, through its own investigators, had obtained documentary evidence which linked these three individuals with several very serious violations of Federal statute.

The committee also had present qualified witnesses who were prepared to unmask the subversive activities of Eisler and his coconspirators.

I think I am safe in announcing to the House that the committee will deal with Mr. Josephson and Mr. Liptzin at a very early date, and that subsequent hearings by the committee will reveal the detailed operations of Gerhart Eisler. There are a number of witnesses scheduled to be heard by the committee on this case.

I should like to read at this time from a report by J. Edgar Hoover on the activities of Gerhart Eisler:

It is of particular significance to note that through the investigation of Gerhart Eisler

it has been ascertained that he is identical with an individual previously known as Edwards, who, from approximately 1933 until approximately 1938, was the representative of the Communist International to the Communist Party, U. S. A., by virtue of which position he was responsible for and instrumental in the determination of American Communist policy and the control and the direction of American Communist operations. \* \* \*

Eisler's primary contacts since his arrival in the United States have been important Communist functionaries, many of whom are strongly suspected of involvement in Soviet espionage operations. \* \* \*

The entire pattern of Eisler's activities since his arrival in June 1941, as previously summarized, is one of apparent evasion and duplicity coupled with clandestine but no less important activity. He has been in constant contact with important Communist functionaries and has been frequently in touch with individuals identified as or strongly suspected as being Communist functionaries identified as or strongly suspected as being Soviet espionage agents. In addition, as noted in greater detail above, Eisler was for many years an important representative of the Comintern. During a recent interview, Gerhart Eisler unequivocally denied his activities as outlined above, which denials obviously were false and unfounded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the House some of the facts concerning Eisler. He was born in Leipzig, Germany, February 20, 1897. He started his Communist career in Austria when he helped organize the Communist Party in that country. He then transferred his activities to Germany and shortly thereafter was transferred to Moscow, where he was trained to be an agent of the Communist International, or a "C. I. Rep.," as they are referred to in Communist Party jargon. At the Lenin School in Moscow, he was schooled in revolutionary tactics, in espionage, sabotage, and other methods and tactics which serve the Communist revolutionary program. He was assigned to the American Commission of the Comintern to prepare himself for his future duties in America.

His first assignment as a Comintern agent was in China in 1928, and then in 1933 he was sent to the United States to take over. From 1933 until the late thirties, he was the mysterious but supreme authority on Communist activities in the United States. Because his activities were carried on secretly, it was necessary that he use many aliases. It was also necessary that he return to Moscow at regular intervals to get the latest party line and instructions, and so in 1934, when he needed a passport to return to Moscow, he obtained one through the application which I hold here in my hand. This application has been reproduced and is contained in the committee's hearings, and I suggest that every Member, at his convenience, study it, because it will give you an insight into the fraud and intrigue which is employed by the Communist agents to carry on their work.

Now the handwriting on this application, according to the questioned documents experts of the Treasury Department, is that of Leon Josephson; the name on this application is that of Samuel Liptzin; the picture on this application is that of Gerhart Eisler; the signature of the identifying witness, Ber-

nard A. Hirschfield, is also in the handwriting of Leon Josephson. In fact so far as the committee has been able to determine, there is no such person as Bernard A. Hirschfield. The passport was issued to Eisler in the name of Samuel Liptzin on August 31, 1934. He sailed on the *Berengaria* in 1935 for Moscow on passage which was paid for by the Communist Party of the United States.

He returned to the United States and used this passport again in 1936, when he again went to Moscow. Bear in mind, however, that the passport application made no reference to his going to Russia. Also bear in mind that while Eisler was the keyman on Communist affairs in the United States, he was known only to the top functionaries. The committee produced a number of other documents relating to Eisler's activities during the thirties, and heard considerable testimony to the effect that he was operating in the United States during the thirties. This becomes important when you learn that on June 14, 1941, when Eisler arrived at Ellis Island as a so-called political refugee from France, he swore before a special board of inquiry at Ellis Island that he had never been to the United States before. He swore that he had never been married, although the facts show him to have been married twice before he entered the United States.

When that board asked him the following question "Are you now or have you ever been a member of any Communist organization?" his answer was "No." When he was asked, "Were you ever sympathetic to the Communist cause?" his answer was "No." He even denied under oath that he had a sister, even though that sister was at that time residing in New York. Eisler has been in the United States since June 14, 1941. All during the war period Eisler was the commissar for Communist activities in the United States. When he wrote articles he was "Hanns Berger." When he sat in on secret Communist meetings he was "Edwards," and when he traveled he was "Brown." Under the name of Julius Eisman he was being paid regular sums by a Communist-front organization known as the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and from other Communist sources.

From the story I have related briefly today we can see the type of man we are dealing with. For those members who are interested in looking into the matter further, I recommend a reading of the full transcript of the testimony before the committee.

There is a tendency in some quarters to treat this case as one of a political prisoner, a harmless refugee whom this committee is persecuting because of his political belief, and who is guilty only of the fact that he happens to have a different political faith than the members of this committee. For that reason, I believe the story of his activities is important. It is a story replete with criminal acts against the United States, forged documents, perjury, failure to register as an alien agent. It is a story of a man described by his own sister as an arch terrorist of the worst type—a man who was clearly linked by the testimony with members of the Canadian

atom-bomb spy ring, a man whose only reason for being in the United States was to tear down and destroy the Government which furnished him refuge during the war years.

This is the man who showed such contempt for a committee of this House. Unfortunately, the statute of limitations has run on many of the criminal acts of Gerhart Eisler. It seems most pertinent to ask where were the agencies of our Government responsible for enforcing the immigration and naturalization laws when the statute was running on the Eislers, the Josephsons, and the Liptzins.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NIXON. I think that every Member of the House is in substantial agreement with the Attorney General in his recent statements on the necessity of rooting out Communist sympathizers from our American institutions. By the same token I believe that we must all agree that now is the time for action as well as words. The Members of this House have probably had experience in dealing with the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. The rules of that Service are extremely strict. For example, I have a specific case in my district, of a teacher of French at Pomona College, California, whose permit has been revoked because she did not report a change of employment to the Service; yet Gerhart Eisler was able to go freely in and out of the United States from 1933 until the present time with relatively no difficulty. It is significant to note that in 1943 the Immigration and Naturalization Service changed his status from that of alien in transit to alien for pleasure. In that status he had the complete run of the country. It would certainly seem that an investigation should be made of the procedures and the personnel responsible for granting such privileges to dangerous aliens of this type. Certainly no stronger case could be made for the proposition that there is no place in the Federal Service in positions so closely related to the security of the United States, for governmental employees who follow the Communist line or any other line which advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

It is essential as Members of this House that we defend vigilantly the fundamental rights of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. But we must bear in mind that the rights of free speech and free press do not carry with them the right to advocate the destruction of the very Government which protects the freedom of an individual to express his views.

The resolution before the House today proposes a very simple and direct question. By adopting the report of our committee concerning an obvious contempt, this House can put Mr. Eisler out of circulation for a sufficient period of time for the Department of Justice to proceed against him on more serious charges.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I recognize there is very little anyone can say here that will at this time dispel the hysteria which has been worked up over this case. However, there are certain fundamental truths which are inescapable and which time and events will bring to bear more and more forcibly on the minds of the American people. The first is that when you tear away all the innuendos, the opinions of personal enemies, as well as the propaganda in certain sections of the press, neither this record, nor any other record, will ever show that at any time has this defendant engaged in any activity aimed at the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States. You cannot get away from that. You can say he is a Communist—true. But you cannot say there is any concrete evidence anywhere that he has ever engaged in any activity supporting any action for the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States. His only activity has been that of a militant anti-Fascist. Ironically, the anti-Fascist is on trial while pro-Fascists are at liberty to applaud and demand his persecution. If he has violated any statutes with respect to the immigration laws, that is not a matter for us to decide. We are still living in a country of law and order. That is a matter for the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury to pass upon.

I would like to deal at this time with two phases of this question—the first is whether or not there is a willful contempt of the committee. That is a legalistic phase and one which I admit is relatively unimportant. I call to the attention of the Members of the House page 3 of the committee hearings, and I read as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Eisler, do you refuse again to be sworn?

Mr. EISLER. I have never refused to be sworn in.

I came here as a political prisoner. I want to make a few remarks, only 3 minutes, before I be sworn in, and answer your questions, and make my statement. It is 3 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My time is limited, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I want to add to the gentleman's remarks that that statement that Mr. Eisler wanted to make in 3 minutes consisted of 20 legal-size pages of paper.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Still and all, I do not think that he was guilty of contempt when he offered to answer all questions. The argument between Eisler and the committee was one of procedure. Of course, technically, the committee had the right to establish its own procedure and insist that the witness follow that procedure laid down by the committee. But we are dealing with contempt and we must consider the question of willfulness, to determine whether or not contempt was committed. This was not willful contempt when the witness states, "I want to answer questions but I ask you to permit me to make a statement first and

then I will be sworn in and then I will answer questions." Under the circumstances, the committee's insistence on its procedure was unreasonable and this is the decisive factor in this case.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In just a moment. I have only about two more minutes. I decline to yield, Mr. Speaker, I want to continue my argument.

So that here we do not have a case of willful withholding of information on the part of a witness. The witness was ready to answer questions. He so stated. He simply asked the right to read a statement. I do not think that witness should be blamed for it. Let us look at the circumstances under which he was brought before the committee. All of the evidence indicates conclusively that the witness was ready and willing to come before the committee and had made arrangements to come before the committee. All of a sudden, at the request of the gentleman from New Jersey, chairman of the committee, this man was picked up and brought before the committee as a prisoner.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes; but I want to suggest at that point that I did not request he be picked up. I have a copy of my letter to the Attorney General, dated January 31, asking that the man be placed under surveillance. It was the Attorney General who perhaps decided he ought to be picked up. I never requested that he be picked up, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] cannot possibly prove that I suggested he be picked up.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then the gentleman admits he requested of the Attorney General that this person who was going to willingly appear, be placed under surveillance.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. And I will tell you why I did it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now, Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. Then the Attorney General places this man in custody and brings him before this committee as a prisoner. Is it unnatural and unreasonable for such a witness to insist that he be permitted to make a statement for 3 minutes or perhaps a little longer? The world would not have been lost; nothing would have been lost, particularly when he said, "I want to answer the questions after I have made my statement," particularly in view of the circumstances under which he was dragged before the committee?

But, as far as the legalistic situation is concerned, I said that it is relatively unimportant, although I doubt whether you will ever get a conviction on this record in the courts. Of course, you will say I am wrong. The majority of the House is against me on the proposition. I was told I was wrong also on the Dodd, Lovett, and Watson cases in this House, but the Supreme Court took the position taken by me on this floor on those three propositions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.



Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is something much more important involved here than the strictly legalistic phase. I have taken the floor simply because I refuse to unlearn the lessons that history has taught us. This is the beginning of a Red scare, it is aimed at Eisler, the Communist, but it is aimed at all advocates of democracy. Yes, this is the beginning of a Red scare. History has taught us that behind a Red scare, behind Red-scare hysteria, there marches, slowly but surely, and often speedily, domestic fascism to destroy the democratic rights, not only of an Eisler, but the democratic rights of all people.

The Red scare is the prelude which is now being set forth for an offensive against the rights of American labor, today against the rights of the Communist, tomorrow against the rights of the progressives and liberals. The Red scare is the smoke screen behind which reaction advances to trample ruthlessly over the liberties of the American people in this instance, over the liberties of the Italian people when it was used effectively in Italy; over the liberties of the German people when it was used effectively in Germany. The only issue involved here is whether we shall unlearn the lessons of recent history.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the perfunctory arguments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in defense of Eisler, the notorious Communist, I was reminded of what Brann, the great iconoclast, once said, that you cannot "explain a dead cat out of a family cistern."

All this argument, and all this sophistry, absolutely fails to offset the fact that this man Eisler is not only a Communist but that he is one of the most dangerous men who ever set foot on American soil. Not only that, but he has been here for years aiding in the undermining of American institutions.

I had never seen this Gerhart Eisler until he appeared before our committee the other day. The gentleman from New York says that had he been allowed to make a statement then, we could have sworn him. No; what he wanted was to make his statement and walk out. He had already given it to the press. He knew if he swore to what was in it, he would commit perjury. His sister came in and testified against him. She said he was one of the most "dangerous terrorists" in the country, or in the world. We have shown that he committed perjury time and time again, and I submit that the statute of limitations does not run against a perjurer while he is out of the jurisdiction of the court. Now, if the Department of Justice will do its duty as far as this man is concerned, he will probably spend the next 10, 20, or 50 years in the penitentiary.

We had before that committee a witness that I had never seen. I am not so sure that I had ever heard his name.

He was a Negro by the name of Nowell. Now, you cannot accuse me of being in a race argument here, because this man Eisler and his sister are both Jews as well as his brother who is helping to poison the public mind through the motion-picture industry in California, but who referred to his sister, Mrs. Fischer, as "My former sister."

The other witness was a Negro. Now let us take these folks for what they are. I helped create this Committee on Un-American Activities because of these very dangers that I saw; and I want to say now that when I leave this Congress I will regard the creation of this committee as one of the greatest services I have ever rendered for the protection of my country.

It is the grand jury of America; it is doing more today to smoke out and expose these subversive elements that are trying to undermine and destroy America than any other influence in this country. The FBI is doing a wonderful job, but the FBI has its hands tied by the Department of Justice, which has not yet cleaned its own house.

During the last year or two when we were after these spies who were in here trying to get information on the atomic bomb, when the Committee on Un-American Activities was doing everything possible to run them down, we had this same nagging and the same opposition from the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. But we had the help of the Canadian Government, and I want to say again that America owes a great debt of gratitude to the Government of Canada for running those spies down, catching them, and breaking up that ring at least for the time being.

Now, let us turn back to this Negro witness. His name is Nowell. He lived in Detroit. He said he was born in Georgia. Now, I have lived all my life and practiced law for years in a State where we had many, many lawsuits between Negroes and whites and between Negroes themselves. I am used to cross-examining them. I know something of the way they testify, and have a fairly good way weighing testimony, and if I am any judge this Negro, Nowell, was sincere in every word he said.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. POWELL. Is it within the rules of this Congress to refer to any group of our Nation in disparaging terms?

Mr. RANKIN. It is not disparaging to call them Negroes, as all respectable Negroes know.

Mr. POWELL. I am addressing the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not aware of the disparaging term used.

Mr. POWELL. He used the term "nigger" in referring to a group.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman to say "Negro."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I said what I always say and what I am always going to say when referring to these people.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not a disgrace to be a real Negro. As I said on this floor before, if I were a Negro, I would want to be as black as the ace of spades. I would then go out with Negroes and have a real good time. These agitators are doing the Negroes of this country more harm than everything else put together.

Let us take this Negro, Nowell. He had been a Communist. They took him to Moscow to give him a course of communistic training. He testified that included in the course he was taught how to plan and carry out the overthrow of the Government of the United States—how to carry on subversive activities of all kinds. It finally got so bad that this Negro, Nowell, revolted, and I want to tell you now the American people owe him a debt of gratitude for exposing this infamous program.

When I asked him the question, he said that that race riot in Detroit a few years ago was caused by Communist agitation. They did not kill 30 Negroes, as was reported. They killed about 700. There was a Negro from my county who had organized a band up in Saginaw, Mich. He was down on Belle Isle playing when this riot occurred. They had 17 Negroes in this band. When the trouble started they got into a bus and started to leave. Their bus pulled up in front of a hotel in Detroit and a mob raided it and killed every single one of them. That is what these Communists are stirring up.

But let us see what this Negro said. We asked him if he was taught the tenets of revolution and he said:

Yes; on instructions, how to capture a city, we were told how to seize the most vital means of communications, transportation, lighting, water supply, and so on, food; and, of course, the army, the armed forces; any arms, if any arms were stored; then, code, of course, transmission of messages; street fighting.

We asked him if he knew this witness, the man who had just walked out of the room a moment before, who called himself Eisler. He said, "Yes," he was with him in Moscow when they were over there in this Communist school taking training as to how to overthrow the Government of the United States and other governments throughout the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not care whose toes this gets on. My country comes first, and I here and now ask the Department of Justice, and the State Department, to clean house and put only Americans on guard, as George Washington advocated, and I am not saying anything to you that I would not say to my friend Harry Truman, the President of the United States.

I say that every effort is being made now by these aliens who have flooded in upon our shores, bringing with them

atheism, communism, anarchy, and infidelity, and plotting to undermine and destroy the United States, the greatest Government the world has ever seen, and the greatest country on earth.

Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has placed in our hands the atomic bomb, the most powerful weapon of which humanity ever dreamed. Is it not strange that providence did not turn that weapon over to Japan or Italy or Germany? Is it not strange that divine providence did not turn that weapon over to some country that is now destroying human liberty and human freedom?

Talk about democracy. I want you to read some of this Communist stuff that has been coming out of New York. I see where we are going to broadcast to Russia. For God's sake, let us put Americans to doing the broadcasting, and not have some of the stuff that has been coming out of there sent to the Russian people.

You remember the Irishman who, having been asked what he found wrong in France, said that the French were so ignorant that he could hardly make them understand their own language.

Now, if we are going to tell Russia about America, let us get some real Americans to do the talking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, talk about this man not being in contempt of court. I am a lawyer. I practiced law for many years. There is not a court in America that would not have sent him to jail immediately. What I want is to appeal to the Department of Justice to prosecute him for these other crimes.

I hope the House passes this resolution and in that way backs up the Committee on Un-American Activities in its efforts to protect our country from these enemies within our gates.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the question before this House is simple: Has this man Eisler done something which deserves citation for contempt? In my mind there could be no clearer case. This man says he did not refuse to be sworn. But he did refuse to be sworn because he refused to be sworn except upon his own terms, and the moment you allow that privilege to any witness you have broken down the whole system of judicial and investigatory processes in these United States, because if he can specify his terms as a 3-minute speech, he could equally specify them as a 3-hour or 3-day speech or anything else that he desired to as a qualification upon whether or not he should be sworn. And thus the control of an investigation or trial would pass from the hands of the committee or court into the hands of the witness. This is a warning, I think, Mr. Speaker, of the insidious processes, the clever, ingenious processes by which these Communists attempt to break down the judicial proceedings of these United States.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have wrestled with my conscience on this question, and I have lost a good deal of sleep over how I should vote. I have

given a good deal of thought to it, as I am sure most of you have, and I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that I am going to vote to cite for contempt in this case. I say reluctantly, because I am not yet convinced that the present committee will not follow in the footsteps of its predecessor committee. I take my oath as a Member of the Congress very seriously, and I believe that committees of this House should be given the rights and privileges to which they are entitled as long as they are committees of this House.

I believe they should be permitted to function to the fullest extent necessary, and I have confidence and pride enough in the House of Representatives to believe that when a committee has not performed, and will not perform, the functions for which it has been established it will be abolished. But as long as we have this committee, I believe it should be supported. I do not want anybody to get up and remind me that I have not supported this committee at times in the past, and I am proud of that fact because I felt that in most instances the committee was wrong. I believe—and I have said many times—that we need in this country a real Committee on Un-American Activities. Let me say to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, that there are many other activities which are equally un-American with the types of activities which the committee has delved into. I agree with my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] when he talks about the Red scare. There is a Red scare here. There is much hysteria being created throughout the country about the Communist menace. While such menace may exist, I abhor the committee's practice of branding all those with whom it disagreed as Communists. But I say to you gentlemen—and specifically to the committee—that there are many other groups whose existence threatens the security of this country and the preservation of its democratic processes. How about the Columbians, Inc.? How about the Ku Klux Klan? Do you not agree with me that they are equally subversive, that they are equally dangerous to the welfare of this country, and that they bode no good to this country whatsoever? They are as harmful and as dangerous as the Communists are, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will consider that phase of subversive un-American activities in the future.

I want to serve notice that I and many who feel as I do in this House will not vote to sustain this committee in the future unless it demonstrates clearly that it will investigate and stamp out all types of subversion, and not proceed, in the same manner as its predecessor, against only those whom it calls Communists.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, at all times here and elsewhere, I will always refer to the members of this Nation, whether they are black or white, Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, in the highest terms. It is unbelievable that any practice contrary to this can be

allowed in this the highest body of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the Committee on Un-American Activities. I do not agree with it because of the way it was formed. I do not agree with it because of the way it has functioned. I do think there is need for a committee on Un-American activities. I think such a committee properly conceived could do a tremendous job for good. But this present committee has consistently aimed at only one phase of so-called un-American activities—that of communism. I make no brief for communism. It has plenty who can and do speak for it. I am not a Communist and I am not in favor of communism. However, I must defend the right of any individual to maintain whatever particular view he holds until such a view is declared illegal by act of Congress. It is not illegal now to be a Communist. Those of you who are so afraid of Red scares should have the guts to make communism illegal. Until then it is legal.

I am not in favor of this citation or any other, because, first, I have faith in our Department of Justice and our Federal Bureau of Investigation to do the job our laws have set them up for. Second, I have faith in the United States, which we all love, faith in the right, the moral right and the moral power of this Nation to triumph over any form of ism which may be against us. Third, I would vote against Mr. Eisler or any one else if the evidence was properly presented and it was indisputably proven that he was an enemy of our country. Fourth, I am against the Committee on Un-American Activities because of its methods. It follows an un-American pattern of prejudice. And fifth, the Committee on Un-American Activities is not impartial in its investigations. It is one-sided. It creates a terror of communism while it ignores the deeds of strife and violence. If the Committee on Un-American Activities would go into such things as the Columbians, Inc., the lynchings of Georgia and elsewhere, the anti-Negro and anti-Jewish groups, and the Ku Klux Klan, then I would support it. As it is now constituted and functioning, I cannot support this or any other citation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I became a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities when it was created as a standing committee of the House. At that time I was not thoroughly convinced as to the value of the Dies committee. I had read many statements with respect to the drawing of red herrings across the trail and witch hunting, so I went on the committee with my mind wide open. If you will notice the hearings, you will see that I asked very few questions. I took a very small part in the activities of the committee and in bringing people before the committee. However, it gradually dawned on me that this is one of the most important com-



mittees that has ever been created, and I shall ever remember the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN, as its creator, and the part he has played by the creation of this committee in bringing about one of the strongest forces for the defense of this country that we have today.

Certainly no one can ever accuse me of not being friendly with colored people, with Negroes. I was raised with them. I have played with them. I like them and they like me. I admire the colored man who came before the committee recently. He was like a fellow standing up in a revival meeting, after he had been a Communist sinner, who wanted to confess his sins and return to the righteous way. My heart went out to him because surely he is a real American, and I wish he were here to hear me say that. But when I stand there and watch the defiant and contemptible manner in which these people who are cited to come before this committee appear, it puts a fear in my heart. I saw one man come before the committee. He was the son of a distinguished and old American family, and he so misled me that after his first appearance he said, "Well, now, we have caught the committee wrong." He went away promising to do everything. When he came back he was most contemptible, or equally as contemptible as any witness who was ever called before the committee. These witnesses who are asked to appear before this committee seem to be schooled. They all come in alike and they all have the same tactics and all have the same approach. As red-blooded Americans, on the basis of the evidence that has been brought to light here, whether you are a lawyer or a layman, we are asking you to support this committee in the work they are doing in trying to clean up, bore in, and bring to the surface this group that is being permitted to run in and out of America on forged passports and practice their damnable trick of deception and preparation for the overthrow of our form of government. I think it is the greatest reflection on our Department of State and the Department of Justice when we read and hear the facts that have been produced here about this man under question. If I were a layman or businessman sitting on a jury, after I had witnessed his action and his approach to this committee, I would have sat there until the hair on my head grew to my knees before I would ever acquit him of the charge that has been brought here against him today.

Mr. Speaker, I hold here an advertisement which appeared in several North Carolina papers. It purports to be political advertising. That is not its purpose, and any intelligent person in North Carolina or elsewhere will agree. The purpose is to stir up trouble. It is purely communistic propaganda. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

[Paid political advertisement]

**A PROGRAM TO WIN A BETTER LIFE FOR THE PEOPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA**

The people of North Carolina are uneasy about the future. They have a right to be uneasy. Even the experts of big business admit that a recession is on the way. Un-

less we people of North Carolina unite and fight for a people's program, terrible misery is in store for us.

North Carolina is one of the Southern States in which super profits are wrung from the white and colored peoples by keeping their standard of living below that of the country as a whole. The great corporations, dominated in the State by the Reynolds, the Dukes, and the Cannons, and linked with the billionaire trusts of Wall Street, have a field day at the expense of the people.

They can do so because the dead hand of the slave past still clutches at the people of this State and prevents North Carolina from being the great and prosperous State that it can and will be. One of the biggest lies ever foisted on a people was the one told the white workers and farmers of this State 70 years ago. They were told by the ex-slave-holding plantation owners that the path of progress for North Carolina was to keep the Negro people down and prevent them from winning equal rights as citizens.

Today it is easy to see what that course has meant not only for the Negro people of this State but for the white people as well. United States Department of Commerce figures show that in 1945 the average per person income in North Carolina was only \$732 compared to \$1,290 for all States outside the South.

In other words, this Jim Crow system robs every white worker in this State of more than \$10 a week—money that his children need. In their own interest the white workers of North Carolina must join in the fight to end the Jim Crow system which forces the Negro people to serve as a source of cheap labor and allows the Dukes, the Reynolds, the Cannons, and their Wall Street buddies to wring extra profits from all the people of North Carolina.

Jim Crow also fosters hostility and distrust among our people, therefore its elimination will not only open up a new era of prosperity for North Carolina, but it will also usher in greater unity between the white and Negro peoples of this State, a unity based on mutual respect and trust.

The winning of equal rights for all is a key to winning a better life for the people of North Carolina. Below the Carolina district of the Communist Party lists the main demands in an immediate program for a better North Carolina. The Communist Party, as the political party of all militant working people, regardless of race, creed, or color, raises the goal of socialism for America, but it also leads in the day-to-day struggles of the people.

This immediate program, along with the national progressive demands, such as FEPC, full employment, defense of labor's rights, big three unity for peace, etc., can defend and advance the interests of the people. But only if around these issues is developed the maximum unity of labor, the farming population, the Negro people, professionals, and small businessmen. This is a program that must be fought for through united political action by the people—by all who put the interest of the many above the selfish super profits of the few.

**RAISE LIVING STANDARDS**

We advocate that the general assembly—Establish a State minimum wage of 75 cents an hour with overtime after 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week for all workers, including agricultural, domestic, and State employees.

Amend the North Carolina unemployment act to provide benefits of \$25 a week for 26 weeks. End exemptions for seasonal workers. Allow benefits for strikers. End delays. Liberalize base-period policy. Guarantee against discrimination.

Petition Congress to extend social security to cover all workers, including agricultural, domestic, and marine.

Require by law that all industries employing women provide a free State-inspected nursery for children of working mothers. Defeat all antilabor bills.

**MEET THE SCHOOL CRISIS**

We advocate that the general assembly—Establish a minimum salary of \$2,400 a year for beginning teachers with college certificates, with regular raises for experience and training. Grant full sick leave with pay.

Abolish segregation in education. Open all State schools to all students, regardless of race, creed, or color. This democratic act will end much duplication and our school dollars will buy more education.

Petition Congress to enact the Federal aid-to-education bill.

**FULL CITIZENSHIP FOR ALL**

We advocate that the general assembly—Repeal all segregation and Jim Crow laws in North Carolina.

Establish a State fair employment practices act to provide equal job opportunity in industry and government, with equal pay for equal work.

Guarantee the right to vote for all by halting illegal action of registrars that prevents thousands of Negroes from voting, particularly in eastern North Carolina.

**MEET NEEDS OF VETERANS**

We advocate—A State bonus of \$300 for overseas veterans and \$200 for others.

Low cost State-financed, self-liquidating housing projects with priority for veterans, without discrimination.

**LAND FOR THE WORKING FARMERS**

The plantation system must end. Sharecroppers and tenant farmers must become owners of family-sized farms.

We advocate—Government loans at low interest rate to guarantee land for the dirt farmer.

Petition Congress to guarantee full parity prices to the family-sized farm.

Help break the monopolistic control of markets by the big tobacco corporations. Establish cooperative control by committees of working farmers.

**REPEAL SALES TAX**

We advocate—A tax program based on ability to pay. End the State sales tax which puts heaviest proportionate burden on lowest income group. Tax money should come from large property owners, public-utility monopolies, from income taxes on the higher income bracket, and from capital gain and excess-profits taxes on corporations. Drastic steps must be taken to stop the tax leak resulting from scandalously low assessments by big corporations in North Carolina.

**USE BOTH HANDS**

*United Labor Action—or Else*

Big business has captured control of Congress. As the opening gun in their assault against the people's standard of living and democratic rights—they are out to cripple and crush the trade unions.

Workers—AFL, CIO, railroad brotherhoods—unite in action to fight for your unions! Meet together and send joint demands that North Carolina Congressmen oppose all antilabor bills in Congress and that the general assembly at Raleigh defeat all antilabor bills. Send delegations to Congressmen and assemblymen.

Farmers, professionals, all Negro people, small businessmen—join with labor in this fight. It's a struggle between the millions of people on one side and the handful of billionaire trusts on the other. Labor's side is your side!

These demands are only the main ones of our North Carolina program. Write us for more details on any point. Ask us for our program of socialism—when the people, led

by the workers, will own the factories, the mines, the banks, etc., and produce for the use of all, instead of the profit of a few.

SAM HALL,

Chairman,

Winston-Salem, N. C.:

Send me the Worker, the people's fighting weekly paper.

6 months, \$1.50.

1 year, \$2.50.

Send me more information about the Communist Party.

Enclosed find a donation to help publish more advertisements like this one.

Name.....

Street.....

City..... Zone..... State.....

CAROLINA DISTRICT,

COMMUNIST PARTY, U. S. A.,

SAM HALL, Chairman,

Winston-Salem, N. C.

I also hold here news clippings condemning this brazen attempt to stir up trouble between the good people of all races in North Carolina and a direct attack on the pioneers of industry in the State. I ask that these clippings be inserted at this point:

[From Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer]

LABOR, NEGROES ANGERED BY COMMUNISTS' PROGRAM—STATE LEADERS REPUDIATE PARTY'S BID FOR FAVOR IN LEGISLATIVE PLANS

(By Jim Chaney)

Angry North Carolina labor leaders yesterday unanimously repudiated a Communist Party attempt to affiliate itself with their program and roundly denounced a Communist-sponsored advertisement endorsing labor unions.

The advertisement, carried in the News and Observer Friday, purported to outline a program to win a better life for the people of North Carolina, by way of the Communist Party and the labor-union movement.

"It was a Judas kiss, a kiss of death," union spokesmen charged.

Negro leaders were equally irate.

The North Carolina Elks Association, in a resolution adopted at its midwinter meeting at Washington, N. C., called the advertisement an attempt to promote civil strife and array class against class.

#### OUT OF REACH

Meanwhile, the creator of the confusion, Chairman Sam Hall, of Carolina district Communist Party, United States of America, remained out of reach of potential interviewers. Hall could not be contacted at his Winston-Salem rooming house by telephone. Nor did his landlord know his whereabouts.

"The Communists would do well to keep their — noses out of the labor unions," R. R. Lawrence, southern director of the Textile Workers' Union of America (CIO), exploded. "We deny any connection with the Communist Party, and we object to their attempt to affiliate themselves with us."

Denouncing the advertisement by telephone from Salisbury, C. A. Fink, president of the State Federation of Labor (AFL) claimed, "It has always been our position to stand against the Communist Party."

"We have no common ground to stand on," he said. "I am sorry the advertisement appeared."

"I didn't know a thing about it (the advertisement) until it came out in the paper. I am certain that no responsible labor group would have been a party to it."

Condemned by unions and capital alike, the Communists have been working throughout the Nation largely on the subsistence provided with funds raised among radical groups. Labor spokesmen interviewed yesterday suggested that the Communists may have used the newspaper advertisement as a

subtle means of "knifing the unions for ignoring them."

No real friend of labor would have publicly smeared the labor movement with red paint, Fink, Lawrence, and other union officials pointed out.

Even the Communists must realize that their endorsement in this State of a measure or plan or individual means the death of the thing they support, the labor leaders declared.

#### PROBABLE REACTION

Appearing at a time when the State legislature is considering at least one bill to curb labor unions, the advertisement could cause the passage of the severest type of anti-labor legislation.

State Labor Commissioner Forrest Shufford pointed out that the general assembly might be influenced to throw its weight against a proposed State minimum wage-hour law and to hold out on other labor requests.

Virtually the only persons pleased by the development were reactionary elements in the legislature and in State politics, who acknowledged that the Communists had supplied them with the political equivalent of an atom bomb. Unless liberal elements and labor can correct the damage, some observers felt, attempts may be made to paste the Communist label on any one who advocates betterment of the Negro race or improvement of working conditions.

If the references to the "Jim Crow system" in the advertisement was aimed at gaining favor with North Carolina Negroes, the committee failed as badly as they did with labor.

F. J. Carnegie, Raleigh Negro attorney; Dr. O. S. Bullock, pastor of the Negro First Baptist Church, and other Raleigh Negro leaders described the advertisement as a "blow" to the social program of the Negro race.

"The Communists have been taking advantage of every little incident to stir up trouble among our people," Dr. Bullock said. "We do not need the help of the Communist Party nor of any other such group."

Carnegie claimed "the Communists would do the Negro race a favor if they ceased associating themselves with Negro affairs."

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer]

ELKS' IRE DRAWN BY COMMUNIST AD—OFFICIAL PROTEST ENTERED AT STATE MIDWINTER MEETING; REPORTS PRESENTED

(By Ed W. Davis)

WASHINGTON, N. C., February 15.—The North Carolina Elks Association in midwinter session here this afternoon "went up in arms" in protest against a Communist advertisement which appeared in the News and Observer Friday morning and unanimously adopted a resolution denouncing and condemning an attempt to promote civil strife and array class against class in North Carolina. The advertisement was waved before the meeting by Dr. W. A. Sams, of Marshall, past State president of Elks and present district deputy grand exalted ruler, who shouted "this is the greatest challenge Elksdom in North Carolina has ever had." He read the advertisement and urged the session to consider an action against it.

#### RESOLUTION DRAWN

President Boyce A. Whitmire of Hendersonville appointed the following committee, Staton Insoe of Raleigh, J. C. Pittman of Sanford, and Edgar Woolard of Washington, who retired and after due deliberation returned with the following resolution which was unanimously endorsed by the gathering: "Whereas there appeared in the Raleigh News and Observer on February 14, 1947, a paid political advertisement by the Communist Party, U. S. A., Carolina district, Sam Hall, Winston-Salem, N. C.; and

"Whereas the program of the Communist Party is un-American and threatens the security of our people and our Government and aims to promote revolution, discord, and civil strife and would seek to overthrow our Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the North Carolina Elks Association in meeting assembled at Washington, N. C., February 15, 1947, do denounce and condemn the attempt to promote civil strife and array class against class as shown by the aforesaid advertisement and call on all Elks in North Carolina to use their effort and influence against this and any other false doctrines that threaten our Government or security of the people of North Carolina."

Mr. Speaker, the above is sufficient answer to any communistic movement in North Carolina. It will never thrive there. I ask here and now that every Member of Congress rise up and support the pending resolution and show the country that we are determined to bring this evil in the open and run them out of our country.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I think first of all we should clear up any misapprehension which might exist concerning whether or not this man Eisler is in contempt of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and of Congress. I think we should clear up any misapprehension which might exist in the mind of some Member of the House who has not had an opportunity to read all these hearings as to whether or not Gerhart Eisler was actually in contempt of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

You heard the impassioned, although not overly persuasive, argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARC-ANTONIO] who, laboring somewhat under a handicap, found a sentence or two in the hearings and on that tried to build a case that Gerhart Eisler was not in contempt. But he entirely overlooked the first two pages of the hearings of the committee. In fact, Mr. Gerhart Eisler's first statement was clearly in contempt of the committee. Remember, he was brought here under a subpoena under which he was instructed to answer questions, and a subpoena pursuant to which he was expected to be put under oath so that his testimony could be classified as accurate or as perjurious, as the case might be.

Let me quote from page 26 of these hearings, which, incidentally, are so important and informative. Every Member of Congress and every well-informed American should read them from cover to cover.

Mr. Stripling first said:

Mr. Gerhart Eisler, take the stand.

Mr. Eisler said:

I am not going to take the stand.

If that is not contempt of Congress, then it seems strange indeed to what extremes men must go these days to show their contempt for our legislative body.

A little later the chairman said:

Now, Mr. Eisler, you will be sworn in. Raise your right hand.

Mr. Eisler said:

No.



If that is not in contempt of Congress I would like to know what kind of language one has to use to register his contempt.

A little later the chairman said:

Just a minute. Will you please be sworn in?

Mr. Eisler said:

You will not swear me in before you hear a few remarks.

The chairman said:

No; there will be no remarks.

Then Mr. Eisler said:

Then there will be no hearing from me.

I cannot understand what kind of judiciary must prevail in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] if it cannot find a man in contempt who uses language of that type and that nature when responding to a subpoena.

After that had transpired I made a motion, saying:

Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that the witness be cited for contempt.

Mr. RANKIN said:

I second the motion.

The chairman:

Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying "aye."

And the chairman declared the motion carried. It was carried by unanimous vote of the committee, with all members of the committee present, accounted for, and participating in the vote. So on that first point there is no question at all but what Mr. Eisler registered his contempt of Congress and the committee and the American system of government here prevailing. The question is whether you want to take it lying down and let this foreign Communist come over here and show his contempt, or whether, on a roll-call vote which is soon to follow, you care to stand up and be counted among those who desire to uphold the dignity and the honor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I think I have heard enough to enable me to render my own judgment on the matter, but I would like to have the gentleman indicate to the House, if he will, the nature of the testimony that the committee hoped to elicit from this witness, in a general way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made a very important contribution to the record when he showed that the chairman of the committee put the vote with all members present voting unanimously in favor of the motion. That is why he declared the motion to be carried. There was no necessity for putting the vote as far as the opposition was concerned. I am asking the gentleman specifically for the record on that point, when the gentleman's motion was put by the chairman, whether or not the vote of the members present on that occasion was unanimous.

Mr. MUNDT. The vote was unanimous and all members of the committee were present. Of course, that is the reason the record shows that the chairman did not ask for a negative vote, because in such a small committee as ours, with all the members close together, he could tell that all members had voted and that all had voted in the affirmative. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his helpful contribution in making the record crystal clear on this point.

Pursuing the interrogatory of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I think it might be proper to review a little what we expected to bring out of Mr. Eisler and what we expected to show, because, after all, we expect the Department of Justice not only to act expeditiously from the standpoint of trying this man for contempt of Congress, but also to make certain that he does not leave the country until that trial takes place. We also expect the Department of Justice to move forward with equal expedition on the five other charges that were made against Mr. Eisler, which indicate his great hazard to this country.

May I say in passing that when the trial takes place on the citation for contempt, I offer the faint but vigorous hope that it be tried before a judge of the United States who values the Congress of the United States more than \$250 worth, as that was the fine that was last levied against a man who showed his contempt for Congress. I hope that we can find a judge who will value the reputation and dignity of the greatest legislative body in the world higher than \$250.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Eisler refused to take the oath because he knew that some questions that the chairman, counsel for the committee, and investigators would ask him would either subject him to perjury or else convict him of subversive activities throughout the United States for the last several years.

Mr. SHORT. And income-tax evasion.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; income-tax evasion, and perjury that he had already committed.

Mr. MUNDT. Furthermore, the reason he refused to take the oath before he made his own prepared statement which he said he could make in 3 minutes but which consisted of 20 pages of legal-sized stationery—the reason he did not want to make his own statement under oath was because it was full of falsifications. Had he taken the oath first he could have been held under perjury charges. Consequently he wanted to put those falsifications into the record with immunity to himself.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If he had been sworn first and then read that statement which he gave to the press there were enough false statements in it to have sent him to the penitentiary for the rest of his life; and he knew it.

Mr. MUNDT. That would not have been long enough to suit me, but, anyway, that is the truth.

Let us go a little bit into the background of this fellow Eisler. I think it is important that we bear in mind the extent of the maneuvers of these people who constantly defend those folks who are being tested and examined by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I think it is interesting to note the interlocking communications and cooperation and the interlocking activities of the various groups we have brought before you. This is part and parcel of one big fabric of un-American activities in this country. It has quite truthfully been said that it is a long trail which does not have a turning; and it is indeed a longer trail which does not lead ultimately to some destination. The trail of Gerhart Eisler leads directly to the doorstep of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee which this House in its good judgment cited for contempt in April of 1946—nearly a year ago.

In response to the question of the gentleman from North Carolina, I wish to show you some of the things we expected to bring out from Mr. Eisler in that connection but which instead of bringing them out by questioning him as we planned we placed in the record from the reports of the FBI, from the report which J. Edgar Hoover made on this fellow Eisler. Let me read a portion of it. Mr. Hoover's report reads:

For the past several years Eisler has made regular daily visits to the offices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, a well-known Communist-front organization in New York City, and it is indicated that Eisler may have been regularly employed by this organization although he has frequently described himself as unemployed. Contacts with Eisler have been made by numerous individuals, including important Communist Party functionaries through officials of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and on many occasions at the offices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. In this connection, it appears that Eisler has been extremely careful about any visits to Communist Party headquarters.

Through the investigation of Eisler, the possibility was developed that Eisler is identical with one Julius Eisman who is known to have been receiving for a considerable period of time regular monthly checks from the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee in New York City in the amount of \$150.

Subsequent investigation has identified Julius Eisman as Gerhart Eisler. It is known that the following checks were issued to Julius Eisman by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee:

All of these checks which were from the funds of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and were made payable to Julius Eisman were endorsed by Gerhart Eisler.

So there we have the direct tie-up between this man Eisler and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee which refused to disclose its books to our committee a year ago and which we were compelled to cite for contempt of Congress because all of its directors and officers, 14 in number, consistently refused to let us look at the books.

Why would they not let us look at their books? Because if they had let us look at their books then we would have known a year ago that Gerhart Eisler was being financed by this group to conduct

Communist activity in this country and that he was the mouthpiece and the spokesman and the transmission belt of Moscow directing the Communist activities here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask at this time unanimous consent to place in the RECORD extracts of the debate which took place on April 16, 1946, when we had before us for contempt citation the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the following quotations are from my remarks found on pages 3843 and 3845 of the bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, during the debate leading to our vote to cite for contempt the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which masks its underhand Communist work under that seductive and deceptive title:

The New York World Telegram as long ago as 1941 published a series of articles accusing Dr. Basky, executive director of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and many of his present associates of communistic activities. Among the directors we are today asking you to cite for contempt are several self-admitted Communists and at least one who has been a candidate for public office in this country on the Communist ticket.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of the House to read the printed hearings which report the testimony of these directors of the so-called Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee when we had them before our committee on April 4 of this year. They were completely non-cooperative. They were consistently insolent, arrogant, and secretive. All had been carefully coached by the same attorney and all evaded questions with the same practiced patter. Of more than passing significance is the fact that most of the directors specifically declined to deny that they were Communists when given an opportunity to do so by our committee. None of them availed themselves of the opportunity to go on record in support of American institutions and ideals.

The issue is clear-cut. Will you vote to uphold the dignity of Congress or will you vote to uphold those who defy and denounce Congress? Will you vote to maintain and preserve and emphasize the authority of Congress to conduct an effective investigation or will you vote to establish a precedent whereby Congress would become impotent in its investigatory tasks upon the refusal of a group or individual voluntarily to cooperate?

Today's vote will long be used as tomorrow's index to the attitudes of those of us who now sit as Members of this House. Unless we are to turn America over to those who depreciate it and to those who would destroy its established institutions it is imperative that we today face up to our responsibilities and vote to uphold the dignity and the authority of Congress. Once the powers of a congressional committee to function effectively in an investigatory capacity have been reasserted as I am convinced they will be in today's roll-call vote, the great job of exposing and eradicating the subversive influences now at work in this Republic can be resumed with vigor and authority.

In the meantime, I would like to suggest to the many fine and patriotic Americans who have been induced to make contributions to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee because of its attractive title and its announced objectives that they refrain from

further contributions until we discover the true record of the facts. Before contributing further, Americans generally have the right to know whether the money they subscribe is being used to give relief to the victims and refugees of fascism abroad or whether it is being used to reinforce the ramblings of those attempting to expand the sinister influence of American Communists here at home.

Mr. Speaker, that debate occurred on April 16, 1946. We had the same speakers then defending the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee who have defended Gerhart Eisler today. There were more of them then by a great many voices. The reason fewer spoke today in his favor is because of the 56 people who voted against the contempt citation of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, the people of America in their good judgment retired from office well over half of those 56 on last November 5. I think that is likely to influence today's vote when it comes. The April 26 roll call can be checked for your information. It is found on page 3849 of the bound RECORD. It discloses one compelling reason why so few people spoke here today in condemnation of this committee whereas we had a whole string of them speaking on April 16, 1946. It is my guess today's vote will be a demonstration of confidence in and of approval for the House Committee on Un-American Activities such as is unprecedented in the long history of this committee.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman tell the House what became of that citation proceeding?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I will be happy to do that. Let me quote from the RECORD. The House of Representatives considers itself a coordinate branch of the Government. The House of Representatives sometimes prides itself on the fact that it controls the purse strings of the Government and exercises a lot of influence, that it can get cooperation and some kind of consideration from the executive agencies because it has control of the purse.

Yet, on April 16 last year it passed by a vote of 292 to 56 a contempt citation of this Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. Now, the question has been asked by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], What happened to it? That question, in fact, also appears in the hearings on page 13. I asked the question there. I said, "Mr. Chairman, before we get away from the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee I suggest that this afternoon you address a letter to Attorney General Tom Clark urging him to expedite trial of the contempt proceeding which has been dragging painfully ever since the Congress cited this group for contempt last July." I was in error. It was last April 16 rather than last July. Just exactly nothing has been done, Mr. Speaker, by the Attorney General, to move in on this Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee which we cited for contempt almost a year ago. If you wonder why the Communists are given a

free hand in America, one emphatic reason is because after you cite them for contempt nothing happens out of the Attorney General's office. What we need from the Attorney General is less lip service against communism and at least a little specific action to curtail communism where it is known to exist.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MUNDT. That is one reason we feel that after we cite, as we are going to do today, this Gerhart Eisler for contempt of Congress, probably he will be here at least a year while the Attorney General's Department gets ready to act. So, in all events, that will keep him in America and prevent his carrying information back to his bosses in Moscow. However, we sincerely hope the Attorney General's office will really go to work and get action on this Eisler case.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of our committee.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I think it is important that we also put in the RECORD that in the case of the old Dies committee we sent over six cases to the Attorney General and it took 6 years before they even brought up the first case.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is very important and it is very relevant to the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to one other item in passing, and this is also in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina. I refer to Mr. Gerhart Eisler's relationship to the secrets of the atom bomb. That is the big reason we do not want him deported. You will find this evidence clearly set forth on pages 41 and 42 of our hearings, which are obtainable in the offices of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. That is one additional reason we want him cited for contempt and brought before a judge who we hope is American enough to do something about it, including putting this man behind iron bars, not merely fining him \$25 or \$250 or maybe 25 cents if a Red New Deal judge should hold court in this case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL].

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, the case against Gerhart Eisler has been ably presented with a transcript of the evidence and the statements made here today, and I do not believe that further detailed elaboration is required.

In general summation I would like to say that it is our sworn duty to uphold, protect, and defend the Government of the United States—to guard it against its enemies.



One such enemy of our Government and the peace and security of our Nation is Gerhart Eisler, whose subversive activities as a guest of our country have been proven beyond possibility of doubt—not an enemy met in combat on the field of battle but of the type that pursues its activities surreptitiously through propaganda—the type that stealthily creeps from behind to plunge a dagger in the back. Eisler refused to testify before a hearing of the Un-American Activities Committee, thus flouting the authority of the Congress of the United States.

The Un-American Activities Committee asks you to endorse the major accomplishment of the committee in securing unimpeachable evidence, apprehending and prosecuting this agent, whose subversive operations have caused untold misery and suffering in various parts of the world.

By your unanimous approval of the action of the committee in citing Eisler for contempt and on other serious charges you will serve notice upon other similarly minded that the United States of America refuses to submit itself as a breeding place for the festering sores that afflict so many other nations of the world and that violators of the sanctity of its government shall receive merited punishment, swift, just, and sure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I think there is little question about the fact that, as a matter of law, the witness, in refusing to be sworn, was prima facie guilty of contempt. It is an occasion, however, for the Members to indicate to the Committee on Un-American Activities their views with regard to the conduct of its investigations. This is due the country and the gentlemen who give their time and energies to this work.

An unfortunate impression got abroad with regard to the Dies committee that it was engaged primarily in a Communist hunt and that it quite neglected the Fascists, Nazis, and their associates in our midst. The Un-American Activities Committee can now render a great service by proceeding even-handedly to unearth the subversives on the extreme right as readily as those on the extreme left, for the committee knows that they both have the same design on our freedoms—to extinguish them.

Let us hope, therefore, that the committee will—and soon—strike this twin blow for freedom against the Fascists, Nazis, and those like-minded in our midst.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 370, nays 1, answered "present" 1, not voting 60, as follows:

XCVIII—72

[Roll No. 6]  
YEAS—370

Abernethy	Elston	Knutson
Albert	Engel, Mich.	Kunkel
Allen, Calif.	Evins	Landis
Allen, Ill.	Fallon	Lane
Allen, La.	Feighan	Lanham
Almond	Fellows	Larcade
Anderson, Calif.	Fenton	Latham
Andresen,	Fisher	Lea
August H.	Fiannagan	LeCompte
Angell	Fletcher	LeFevre
Arends	Fogarty	Lemke
Arnold	Folger	Lesinski
Auchincloss	Footo	Lewis
Bakewell	Forand	Lodge
Banta	Fulton	Love
Barrett	Gallagher	Lusk
Bates, Ky.	Gamble	Lyle
Bates, Mass.	Gary	Lynch
Battle	Gathings	McConnell
Beall	Gavin	McCormack
Beckworth	Gearhart	McCowan
Bell	Gifford	McDonough
Bender	Gillette	McDowell
Bennett, Mich.	Gillie	McGregor
Bennett, Mo.	Goff	McMahon
Bishop	Goodwin	McMillan, S. C.
Blackney	Gordon	McMillen, Ill.
Blad	Gore	MacKinnon
Blatnik	Gossett	Macy
Bloom	Graham	Madden
Boggs, Del.	Granger	Mahon
Boggs, La.	Grant, Ind.	Maloney
Bonner	Gregory	Manasco
Boykin	Griffiths	Mansfield,
Bradley, Calif.	Gross	Mont.
Bradley, Mich.	Gwynne, Iowa	Mansfield, Tex.
Bramblett	Hagen	Martin, Iowa
Brehm	Hale	Mason
Brooks	Hall,	Mathews
Brophy	Edwin Arthur	Meade, Md.
Brown, Ga.	Hall,	Merrow
Brown, Ohio	Leonard W.	Meyer
Bryson	Halleck	Michener
Buchanan	Hand	Miller, Calif.
Buck	Hardy	Miller, Conn.
Burke	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Md.
Burleson	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.
Butler	Harris	Mills
Byrne, N. Y.	Harrison	Mitchell
Byrnes, Wis.	Hart	Morgan
Canfield	Hartley	Morris
Cannon	Havener	Morrison
Carroll	Hébert	Morton
Carson	Heffernan	Muhlenberg
Case, N. J.	Herter	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Heselton	Murdock
Celler	Hess	Murray, Tenn.
Chadwick	Hill	Murray, Wis.
Chapman	Hinshaw	Nixon
Chelf	Hobbs	Nodar
Chenoweth	Hoeven	Norblad
Chiperfield	Holfield	Norman
Church	Holmes	Norton
Clark	Hope	O'Brien
Clason	Horan	O'Konski
Clevenger	Howell	O'Toole
Coffin	Huber	Owens
Cole, Kans.	Hull	Pace
Cole, Mo.	Jackson, Calif.	Passman
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Patman
Colmer	Jarman	Patterson
Combs	Javits	Peden
Cooley	Jenkins, Pa.	Philbin
Corbett	Jennings	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Jensen	Phillips, Tenn.
Courtney	Johnson, Calif.	Pickett
Cox	Johnson, Ill.	Ploeser
Cravens	Johnson, Ind.	Plumley
Crosser	Johnson, Okla.	Poage
Crow	Johnson, Tex.	Potts
Curtis	Jones, Ala.	Preston
Dague	Jones, N. C.	Price, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Jones, Ohio	Rabin
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Wash.	Rains
Deane	Jonkman	Ramey
Delaney	Judd	Rankin
Devitt	Karsten, Mo.	Rayburn
Dingell	Kearney	Rayhel
Dirksen	Kearns	Redden
Dolliver	Keating	Reed, Ill.
Domengeaux	Kee	Reed, N. Y.
Dondero	Keefe	Rees
Dorn	Kelley	Reeves
Doughton	Keogh	Rich
Douglas	Kerr	Richards
Drewry	Kersten, Wis.	Riehlman
Durham	Kilburn	Riley
Eaton	Kilday	Rivers
Eberharter	King	Robertson
Ellis	Kirwan	Robson
Ellsworth	Klein	Rockwell
Elsaesser		Rogers, Fla.

Rogers, Mass.	Smith, Va.	Vail
Rohrbough	Smith, Wis.	Van Zandt
Rooney	Snyder	Vinson
Ross	Somers	Vorys
Sadlak	Spence	Vursell
St. George	Springer	Wadsworth
Sarbacher	Stanley	Walter
Sasser	Stefan	Weichel
Schwabe, Mo.	Stevenson	Welch
Schwabe, Okla.	Stigler	West
Scott, Hardie	Stockman	Wheeler
Scott,	Stratton	Whitten
Hugh D., Jr.	Sundstrom	Whittington
Scrivner	Taber	Wigglesworth
Seely-Brown	Talie	Williams
Shafer	Teague	Wilson, Ind.
Short	Thomas, N. J.	Wilson, Tex.
Simpson, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.	Winstead
Simpson, Pa.	Thomason	Wolverton
Smathers	Tibbott	Wood
Smith, Kans.	Tollefson	Worley
Smith, Maine	Trimble	Youngblood
Smith, Ohio	Twyman	Zimmerman

NAYS—1

Marcantonio

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Powell

NOT VOTING—60

Andersen,	Donohue	Norrell
H. Carl	Elliott	O'Hara
Andrews, Ala.	Engle, Calif.	Peterson
Andrews, N. Y.	Fernandez	Pfeifer
Barden	Fuller	Poulson
Bolton	Gerlach	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Gorski	Priest
Buffett	Grant, Ala.	Rizley
Bulwinkle	Gwinn, N. Y.	Russell
Busbey	Hays	Sabath
Camp	Hedrick	Sadowski
Clements	Hendricks	Sanborn
Clippinger	Hoffman	Scoblick
Cooper	Jenison	Sheppard
Coudert	Jenkins, Ohio	Sikes
Crawford	Kefauver	Taylor
Cunningham	Kennedy	Towe
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Wolcott
Dawson, Ill.	McGarvey	Woodruff
Dawson, Utah	Meade, Ky.	
D'Ewart	Monroney	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Engle of California.  
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Donohue.  
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Monroney.  
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Pfeifer.  
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Sikes.  
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Kefauver.  
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.  
Mr. Buffett with Mr. Barden.  
Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Camp.  
Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Peterson.  
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Sheppard.  
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Gorski.  
Mr. Sanborn with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.  
Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Buckley.  
Mr. Towe with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.  
Mr. Rizley with Mr. Priest.  
Mr. Russell with Mr. Cooper.  
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Price of Florida.  
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Sadowski.  
Mr. Jenison with Mr. Hedrick.  
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Kennedy.  
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Hendricks.  
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Elliott.  
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Fernandez.  
Mr. Crawford with Mr. Grant of Alabama.  
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Clements.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks and include therein an advertisement signed by the Communist Party that was published in the North Carolina papers recently and the reply thereto made by the leading colored citizens of the State condemning the advertisement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent radio address.

Mr. SASSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Lithuanian Society of Baltimore.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered on January 20.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter addressed to him dated February 11, 1947.

Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REES (at the request of Mr. KILBURN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article and letter on the subject American Veterans Who Were Prisoners in World War II.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rent control in Louisville, Ky.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Society of Maryland.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1968) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that contains the cuts of appropriations for OPA?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The House may go into the Committee of the Whole and later, after debate has occurred, rise, and then a motion would be in order to close debate; but otherwise a motion would not be in order at this time to close?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York states the situation accurately. The House must first go into Committee and have general debate, and then rise and fix the time of debate by vote.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I take it that the chairman of the committee will see that the minority is allotted time.

Mr. TABER. Unless there is more demand than the first recognition of 1 hour, it will be my purpose to allot out of the hour that I am being recognized for half of the time to the gentleman from Missouri, and see how we get along.

Mr. CANNON. That will be satisfactory, Mr. Speaker, and we will require no further time on this side.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1968, with Mr. HERTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent (on motion of Mr. TABER), the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been reported for the purpose of supplying certain urgent deficiencies in appropriations and for the purpose of rescinding certain other appropriations which are no longer needed and which the Committee believes is in the interest of the Government that they be rescinded. I will briefly describe what is contained in the bill.

There was in the first place a recommendation on the part of the Budget of a deficiency appropriation of \$5,950,000 for the Office of Price Administration, which we have refused. There was an appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation of \$143,000, which we have reduced to \$130,000. There was an estimate of \$135,000,000 for additional funds for administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, to which we were unable to give a satisfactory hearing, and which we allowed on the basis of what the Veterans' Administration said would carry them to the 31st of March, so that we would be able to have a satisfactory hearing. That is not intended or presented as a cut in the appropriation, but as a postponement of the hearings. The same thing applies to an item for military and naval insurance, where we have provided \$1,000,000 out of an estimate of \$4,125,000 for the

purpose of carrying them likewise until we can have a satisfactory hearing. There is likewise an estimate for the vocational rehabilitation revolving fund—no year—of \$500,000, and we have provided \$200,000 to carry them until we can have a satisfactory hearing.

There is an estimate for the Division of Disbursement, the check-writing outfit in the Treasury Department, of \$3,520,000. The committee reduced that to \$3,000,000.

As to the rescissions, we have recommended a rescission of \$9,000,000 in OPA funds. We have also recommended a rescission of \$2,400,000 in the funds for the Civilian Production Administration. The estimate there was \$1,200,000. We have raised a suggested rescission of Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion funds from \$46,000 to \$60,000, believing they can get along very well on that with the contraction of activities that they present.

I think I have described the major items which were subject to hearings. In addition to that, the committee has included in the bill which is before you rescissions amounting to practically \$700,000,000—to be exact, it is \$692,688,579 which the President recommended in House Document 65 in his budget estimate of rescissions.

There are many other items of rescission, some of which will come before the committee upon budget estimates that will hereafter be considered and some will come as the result of the initiative of the committee, so that we may go into the picture to see just what is needed for the operations of the Government. I might say in addition there is one estimate that is pending for the rescission of a very large amount of lend-lease funds, if I remember correctly, approximately \$900,000,000, which we have not been able to hold hearings on and are not prepared to report on at this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have been informed that there is a very substantial sum of money that is being held by these various agencies that could be recovered running into several billion dollars. Is there anything to that?

Mr. TABER. There is no question but what there is a very large amount of money, the rescission of appropriations of which should be considered by the committee, and it is the intention of the committee to go ahead just as rapidly as possible to hold hearings upon these items and recommend to the House rescissions insofar as it is possible to make them.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman mentioned lend-lease funds. In the past few days the papers carried the story that Lend-Lease officials are seeking to have a change in the law preventing the use of such funds after December 31, 1946, for shipments to Europe. Is there anything in this present bill that would affect that situation?



Mr. TABER. There is not. I might say to the gentleman that our committee held hearings on that situation. We have not taken it up in the Deficiency Committee, and we have not acted upon it. There is one item in connection with that which I think the Congress should act on and should provide for. That is an item of about \$100,000 worth of merchandise that the Australian Government purchased from us and for which they have paid in cash. I would think that that presented an entirely different picture from anything else that is in the offing in connection with that situation. I can see no reason why, frankly, any country presently in default of payment, such as the Union of the Soviet Republics is, for the use of ships and which ships have not been turned back as was agreed upon, and where they have failed to get together and make an agreement accepting their obligations, should be handed any more merchandise or should be entitled to the fulfillment of any contract which it is supposed to have made. Frankly, I do not have a ruling on whether or not that alleged contract was of any validity, as yet. But in all transactions there is the right, as I understand it, under any kind of procedure, of stoppage in transit, or of the refusal to deliver things to a proposed debtor who is in default. That is the picture from a business standpoint.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is this not the proposition: The question is whether anyone has the right to make a moral commitment for the United States Government in face of a statute that would forbid the carrying out of that commitment?

Mr. TABER. That is true. On the other hand, with reference to that particular item of \$100,000 that Australia has paid for, I think they were in a different category from any of the rest of the outfits.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is this an appropriate place to ask a question with regard to the denial of a deficiency appropriation for the OPA?

Mr. TABER. I would think so. I intended to discuss that at a little greater length, and I will do so now.

Those of you who have the hearings before you I suggest turn to pages 80 and 81. The OPA has not done an honest job in connection with its operations. At the time the hearings were held, a week of two ago, they had 914 employees in the office in Washington drawing \$4,000 and more each. They had 851 employees drawing less than \$4,000 each. In other words, they had more generals than they had privates, and that picture with reference to their whole operation extends throughout the country except that it is not quite so bad. The only place where they have as high as three privates to one general is the State of New York. Other places it is hard work to figure out how they have two privates to one general. In Washington they have 122

economists. They have no possible need for any at the present time. They have 31 personnel officers and personnel assistants at a time when they should be reducing the force and should not have any to speak of. They have 147 accountants in the Washington office at a time when three or four should be able to do all the work they have to do. They have 37 investigators in the Washington office, absolutely unnecessary.

They have 14 price executives, with nothing to fix prices on except rents. They have 187 analysts who can perform no useful function whatever. They have 21 administrative officers when they need but one or two. They have six labor relations advisers when the time for that sort of activity has passed. They have 168 lawyers and there is no legal activity for any except possibly six or seven in the rent set-up. They have 25 directors. What they have to do is beyond the imagination of the most gullible. They have 14 administrative assistants, 13 information specialists, 4 archivists, 7 engineers, 22 field representatives, 10 statisticians; and on down the line—business specialists, graphic analysts, executive officers, special advisers, deputy administrators, general counsel—four general counsel. What anybody can imagine they would do is beyond my ability to figure out. Rationing executives, two. That is the first item I have struck where they have any excuse whatever for the set-up. They have: Rationing analysts, 2—probably they need them; stenographic reporter, 1; printing and publications specialists, 4; training specialists, 8; commodity standards specialists, 2—absolutely no use for them; auditor-supervisors, 6; administrators, 1; historians, 6. What do they need them for? Procurement assistant, 1.

That is in the Washington office alone.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. I see there are 914 employees in the Washington office.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION. One of them seems to be a stenographic reporter.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION. I am just wondering how that one stenographic reporter handles the business of the other 913 generals.

Mr. TABER. I suppose the fact that there is one stenographic reporter indicates the real volume of work that is being done.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that OPA has transferred a lot of employees to the Division of Rent Control.

Mr. TABER. They have increased the number in the Rent Control Division by 1,500 to 2,000. They have put on people in places where it was absolutely unnecessary. They have extended rent control, according to my information, where it was unnecessary, and they have in general a very incompetent staff and a very incompetent set-up.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. As an example, the regional office in my territory is at Dallas, Tex. Recently they sent 11 inspectors to St. Joseph, Mo., which is the largest city in my district, to investigate the property owners there.

Mr. TABER. Probably not over a thousand miles of travel each way.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. It is about a thousand miles, possibly a little more, from Dallas to St. Joseph.

Mr. TABER. Each way.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Each way. They are there at a per diem, as the gentleman knows, of \$6 per day, plus all expenses. They have been there for the past 3 or 4 weeks. They are asking the property owners to furnish them with their records from 1938 to the present time. They travel in pairs. One cannot go alone and do the job. They must have two or three who call on the property owners. I call this to the attention of the House so that the Members will know how they are padding the pay rolls and how they are making work for themselves and how they are squandering the appropriations granted to them by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. TABER. I think probably they have a justification for about 50 out of the 914. That would be my judgment from the whole picture.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. We are in no position obviously, in looking over this set-up, not having been in the hearings, to know what these people are doing. I happen to be one who is convinced that we have to have rent control and I do not feel we can have rent control by hobbling the OPA so that it does a bad job of administration. Therefore, I ask the gentleman this question: Is the gentleman convinced, as a result of the hearings, that the OPA will be able to carry on its rent-control functions until June 30, 1947, yet give landlords who have true hardship cases adequate and rapid enough satisfaction so that we will not have the unnecessary pressure from them to do away with the OPA and rent control, which the people in my district are about 95 percent for?

Mr. TABER. My own idea was, after very careful and extensive hearings on this subject, that we could rescind about \$12,500,000. The judgment of the committee is \$9,000,000. My own idea was to allow every dollar that I could legitimately allow for an honest administration of this rent activity. I cannot see any sense in allowing a great lot of money for them to carry on their pay roll a lot of generals and other personnel that they do not need and that they have no useful function for.

I will give you an illustration of some of the highfalutin activities. They had an employment committee set up composed of 64 people whose average salary from the OPA was \$7,500 to \$8,000. The job that these people had to do was to go out and get jobs for the employees of the OPA. Perhaps the thing to do is to try to supersede the employment offices

that are set up all over the United States by grants to the States and the District of Columbia under the Labor and Federal Security bill, but, frankly, the idea does not appeal to me. I think it is an utter and absolute waste of money, as well as a violation of the trust and duty imposed upon the managers of the OPA when they were given their appropriation. As I remember the figure, they have two-hundred-and-sixty-odd people involved in getting up a history of the OPA and, in my opinion, the only value that I can see in that would be for guiding future generations in what not to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman that he has consumed 25 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. How much does this leave the OPA after rescission of the \$9,000,000?

Mr. TABER. About \$18,000,000, as I remember it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is that not about three times more than it needs?

Mr. TABER. I think it is more than they need; yes, I will give you the exact figure a little later on.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. How much do they have for this year?

Mr. TABER. They had \$101,000,000, as I remember the figure, and the amount of expenditures was somewhere around seventy-odd-million dollars.

Mr. ROBSION. That was allowed for a full year.

Mr. TABER. It was allowed for a full year; that is right.

Mr. ROBSION. And for full activities.

Mr. TABER. But their activities have dropped off and they have not reduced their force as they should. For instance, it came along about the middle of November when they cut off a lot of their pricing activities, but they did not serve any notices upon their employees of termination of employment so that their terminal leave could begin to run. They let them hang around the place until the first of December before they got their notices, and they managed everything else in just the same way. They want to carry on, according to the statement that came out in the paper, with 13,500 personnel to the end of the year. They show no disposition to try and put the set-up on a business basis, which is absolutely necessary if it is going to succeed, and if your rent control is not going to be destroyed by bad administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, do I understand the gentleman then to assure us—and the gentleman knows that I have very high regard for his assurance—that he is convinced that OPA can do the rent control job with the funds which will be available to it after the passage of this bill?

Mr. TABER. I believe they can, if they do it honestly.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is in some respects a very satisfactory bill; in other respects not so satisfactory.

It is satisfactory in that the larger part of the bill is devoted to rescissions recommended by the President. There is a vast number of these rescission items and in all save three the bill before us follows the President's recommendations, word for word and dollar for dollar without deviation. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations is continuing the program of retrenchment and rescission so auspiciously begun by the President and the committee in the last Congress. Following the close of the war, this program was consistently adhered to and funds sequestered as rapidly as the liquidations of war agencies and war activities advanced and as surpluses developed and rescissions became possible and practicable and it is gratifying to see it continued in the pending bill.

There are, however, a few items in the bill, some minor and some which merit more than passing attention.

The first item discussed in the report, the provision for Defense Transportation, is a case in point.

Everybody is familiar with the war record made by Colonel Johnson as head of the Office of Defense Transportation. He accomplished the impossible. He provided cars. He kept the trunk lines open. He kept traffic moving. He kept the trains running. He provided transportation during the critical period of the war when collapse was imminent any day.

Incredible as it may seem the traffic load is heavier today than at any time during the war. To complicate the situation the rolling stock is wearing out. Boxcars are being switched off to the junk yard daily and there are no replacements.

Production and consumption are dependent on transportation. It is useless to produce goods when they cannot be delivered; and consumers are helpless if goods are not available. Transportation is the indispensable link.

We must have cars. Labor is short and materials are lacking. ODT is needed to mobilize construction, allocate material, mobilize labor, and expedite construction.

To meet this new and unexpected situation it is necessary to continue ODT beyond the period originally set for liquidation. The estimate for the purpose is \$143,000, but the committee arbitrarily cuts the amount to \$130,000. It offers no explanation, no basis of computation on which to predicate such a cut. Throughout its war service ODT has returned at the end of the fiscal year every dollar not needed for the economical administration of its activities. Any surplus of the pending estimate will be returned. So why cut it? If not needed it will not be spent. If required any money cut from the estimate will have to be returned as a deficiency. So the only result of the cut will be to leave the im-

pression that economy is being practiced when actually no economy is being effected.

In the same way, an arbitrary cut is made in the estimate for the Division of Disbursements in the Treasury Department. This agency has no control over the volume of its work. It must accept the allocations of the various agencies of the Government which themselves have no choice but to forward to the Division of Disbursements the volume of work assigned to them, whether large or small. The work must be done and money must be provided to do it. The money cannot be expended unless needed. So again, the cut here is merely to leave the impression of saving money when as a matter of fact not a dollar is saved by the cut.

The item for the Office of Price Administration is not retrenchment. It is extinction. The provision for OPA amounts to liquidation.

Here is the analysis of the situation as submitted to the committee:

MY DEAR MR. TABER: We have just completed an analysis of the report of the subcommittee in charge of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1947.

From the determinations made by the committee as indicated by this report, we feel sure there has been a misunderstanding of the information submitted by the Office of Price Administration and the Civilian Production Administration of the Office of Temporary Controls.

We feel that we should immediately call your attention to the following facts and the situations that would result if action is taken on the basis of the committee report:

With regard to the Office of Price Administration, there was available on January 1, 1946, as stated in the committee report, \$27,649,222; obligations incurred between January 1 and February 15, 1947, amount to \$10,213,534, which leaves a balance available from February 15 to June 30 of \$17,435,688. If the recommendation of the committee to rescind \$9,000,000 is carried out, there will be left a balance of only \$8,435,688. The present dollar value of accrued annual leave is \$7,555,974. This would leave only \$879,714 for liquidation and program activities—sufficient for only a few days' operation.

If the rescission is made effective and the Office of Price Administration meets its present financial obligations, it must immediately—

1. Stop rent control.
2. Stop all sugar rationing.
3. Stop all price control on sugar, rice, and sirups.
4. Stop all audits in connection with subsidy payments.
5. Eliminate all enforcement and compliance activities.
6. Eliminate all activities in connection with the veterans' housing program.

With regard to the proposal to increase the rescission for the Civilian Production Administration from \$1,200,000 to \$2,400,000, I should like to call your attention to the statement of Mr. Houston, Commissioner of Civilian Production Administration, as recorded on page 154 of the hearings.

"On the basis of complete termination of all Civilian Production Administration functions by March 31, 1947, \* \* \* the financial requirements would be \$15,800,000 as compared to \$16,800,000."

This statement makes it clear that the million-dollar reduction is definitely predicated on stopping Civilian Production Administration work March 31, and not June 30, which may not have been understood by the committee.



If the action of the committee is approved, the Civilian Production Administration will have to discontinue all program activities on March 31, which means they must:

Cease all functions performed in connection with the Veterans' Emergency Housing Program, including those provided for by the Patman Act.

Dismiss employees now engaged in allocation and priority operations in connection with tin, rubber, antimony, cinchona, streptomycin, tractors, automobiles, and other imports and exports. In respect to these items, this would mean that even if positive legislation is enacted to implement the recommendations made by the President in his message of January 31, there would be no personnel available to implement the continuing work required by the legislation.

Suspend all functions on premium-payment plans for the housing program, including the audit of accounts for payments already made.

Halt all compliance activities, including the completion of cases now pending in the courts or about to be brought before the courts, whether in connection with housing or earlier programs of the Civilian Production Administration and the War Production Board.

Drop defense of Government claims to which the Civilian Production Administration or the War Production Board was a party. These claims are filed against the Government under section 17-A, Contract Settlement Act, Renegotiation Act, Requisitioning Act, Tax Amortization Act, and other statutes.

Abandon the partially completed program of the agency to analyze and make available for future use the records and details of actions taken by the War Production Board and other predecessor agencies.

Stop informal assistance in support of the freight-car program.

We appreciate the seriousness of the proposal of the committee which, if made into law, would in effect stop all Office of Price Administration program activities immediately and all Civilian Production Administration activities by March 31. In carrying out our administrative duties, we do not feel that we can properly stop these programs based on the committee report but must wait until there is final action by the Congress. This means, of course, that obligations continue to accrue and the situation with regard to available balances will become progressively more serious.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FOLLIN,  
Acting Administrator.

To summarize the statement in tabular form, here is the proposition reduced to its simplest terms:

1947 appropriation.....	\$101,000,000
Less transfer to FTC.....	125,000
Available appropriation.....	100,875,000
Obligations to Feb. 15.....	83,439,312
Unobligated balance of original appropriation as of Feb. 15.....	17,435,688
Less proposed rescission of.....	9,000,000
	8,435,688
Employees' accumulated annual leave.....	\$7,555,974
This sum available for purposes other than payment of accumulated annual leave, as of Feb. 15 provided \$9,000,000 rescission should become effective.....	879,714

In other words, with only \$879,714 remaining, liquidation is the only alternative. What does that involve?

All rent control stops. The law is still in effect but there is no money with which to implement it. Without funds there can be no enforcement. And without enforcement the law is a dead letter.

Rationing of sugar ceases. Without money to maintain the agency, rationing is at an end. Price control on sugar, rice, and sirups stops. Audits on subsidy payments must be abandoned. And all activities in connection with the veterans' housing program must be discontinued.

It may be that this is the committee program. I am not taking issue with it. I am merely calling attention to the effect the agency says will follow enactment of the provisions of the pending bill.

Similarly, the provision for the Civilian Production Administration will force immediate liquidation. According to the figures submitted to the committee by CPA the fiscal program laid down in the bill would have required post liquidation commencing 2 weeks ago in order to comply with the provisions of the act.

Mr. Chairman, while the principal provisions of the bill are in keeping with the program of the President, the Bureau of the Budget and the last Congress, I recommend to the committee and the House a careful and factual study of these individual items which affect so directly the national economy during this critical period of reconversion. Unquestionably they merit deliberate consideration in this or another body.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed to hear the statement by the gentleman from Missouri that the action of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the Office of Price Administration means that the ability to control rents and the control of the rationing of sugar will disappear very shortly. There are two ways to kill an agency—that is, by direct attack through legislation, or by failure to appropriate money. I hope that the price of sugar is not going to increase to 30, 40, and 50 cents. Certainly, if we do not have some kind of sugar rationing, the American public, the consumers, are going to feel it very keenly. If we have a rent situation that is uncontrolled, there is bound to be an increase in rents, and the responsibility will rest upon the Republican Party.

In connection with the appropriations we make for our armed forces, such appropriations are the price or premium that we pay for national security. In connection with this important duty, we should give the benefit of any reasonable doubt to that determination which will assure security rather than insecurity. We cannot let the conditions that existed after World War I be a guide for meeting the conditions that now exist following World War II; that is, unless we are going to follow, as we did then, the road of isolationism. That was the road which the country was committed to by the Republican Party in the Congresses of the years following World War I. I wonder if history is going to repeat itself, and I wonder if the dreadful ex-

periences of World War II are going to be ignored.

After World War I, America failed to assume its dominant role in world affairs. To follow the road of isolationism now, as has been done in the past, will be inconsistent with our present and future national interests. Due to the policy of isolationism that we followed after World War I, and the disarmament conference in 1922, as a result of which we scrapped a mighty fine navy, which, by the way, also was during a Republican administration, appropriations for defense purposes were sharply reduced. In the light of world conditions today and so far as we can see into the immediate future, it would be dangerous to do that now.

An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. If any Member thinks he can justify himself or lull himself into slumber by voting for this reduction, \$9,000,000,000, and that it is only a gesture, or a meaningless or pious hope, and when specific appropriation bills come up vote the other way, I call his attention to the frank admission made to me only yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that he will consider the resolution agreed upon as instructions to the Committee on Appropriations to keep within that limit. Do not underestimate the ability or the courage of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], nor his tenacity. Also, do not underestimate the same qualities in the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

If my friend from Minnesota had not spoken too soon in favor of a 20-percent income-tax cut across the board, which practically every big taxpayer is favoring, the "quickie" tax, so called, and if it goes through will be a "wickie" tax, meaning wicked, I am strongly inclined to the belief that the situation would be different today.

This reduction is not based on reason. Its basis is the 20-percent "wickie" tax cut. In order for the Knutson bill to have any chance of passing, a large reduction in the budget, even if not justified, must take place to comply with the campaign promises made by a few men in pivotal positions, even if it means our country again taking the dangerous road of pacifism and isolationism.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know whether my memory serves me completely or not, but it runs in my mind that shortly after I came to Congress the administration of the gentleman then being in power proposed what was known as the Neutrality Act. Some of the provisions of that act were to bar our vessels from dangerous waters, and such other provisions as to prevent the sale of war goods to belligerent countries.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the question?

Mr. HALLECK. The question is simply this, if there was any isolationism in the country, was that not a definite move in the direction of isolationism, and

was it not presented by the gentleman's party?

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to that is emphatically "No." Oh, you Republican gentlemen may laugh and smile, but the reason for that answer is that we passed a Neutrality Act in those years so that we would not be permitting the powers of America to be used in the conflict going on in Spain by the so-called Loyalist government. We passed the Neutrality Act in those years so that the foreign policy of America would not be such as to lend assistance, directly or indirectly, to the destructive forces that were engaged in the Spanish conflict. We amended the Neutrality Act in later years because the continuance of it was helping Hitler, and we were helping the destructive forces engaged in the war before we were forced into it. So that the basic proposition is that our country passed the Neutrality Act in the Spanish conflict so that we would not be helping the Loyalist cause which was the only side of that conflict that had freedom of the seas, and could send vessels to America to get arms to transport over there to use against the other forces. We amended that law in later years so that we would not again be helping the destructive influence that was engaged in the World War, represented by Hitler.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield for a question only, because I have some other observations to make. I yield because the gentleman is majority leader and I respect him, but the gentleman knows I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly do not want to monopolize the gentleman's time.

Mr. McCORMACK. By the way, the gentleman forgot to answer a question of mine yesterday. How did the gentleman vote on the extension of the Selective Service Act in 1941?

Mr. HALLECK. I voted "no" on the extension.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it passed by a 1-vote margin. If that bill had not become law we might not be sitting here today.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to answer the question he asked me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I said to the gentleman, as the RECORD discloses, that I voted "no." If the gentleman's administration had told the Congress and the country the true state of affairs in the world, of course I would not have voted "no."

Mr. McCORMACK. What an alibi that is. What an alibi. What a poor alibi.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Wait awhile; I have the floor. I will yield, of course, but let me answer. The gentleman's alibi cannot stand up in the light of history. I now yield.

Mr. HALLECK. It certainly will stand up much better than the gentleman's alibi about how the Neutrality Act was passed to meet a situation existing in

Spain. I never heard a more ridiculous assertion in my life.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is losing control of himself. The gentleman voted against every bill before Pearl Harbor necessary for the preservation of the United States of America.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am going to continue my observations.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield; yes.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman refers to the fact that as he suggested—

Mr. McCORMACK. It is rather pleasing to know that I get under the gentleman's skin.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly the gentleman does not mean to say what he just said, because no later than yesterday he said: "Why, the gentleman from Indiana voted against all the appropriations for the prosecution of the war."

Mr. McCORMACK. I said before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman said "prior to Pearl Harbor" and I said I voted for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman vote to lift certain restrictions of the Neutrality Act?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course I did.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is exactly correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope the gentleman will let me have a portion of my 3 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly will; and I shall be short.

Mr. McCORMACK. There seems to be something about the gentleman from Massachusetts that makes the gentleman from Indiana feel compelled to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to yield whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts takes the floor.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I always get along.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are warm friends.

Mr. HALLECK. We are warm friends. The gentleman in his speech apparently is complaining about our cutting the cost of government and our action to reduce taxes. I infer from what the gentleman has said that he is against cutting the expenses of government and against reducing the personal income taxes of the people of the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, of course, again jumps to an erroneous conclusion. The gentleman has not been following what I have said. I am talking about a \$6,000,000,000 cut as proposed and its effect upon our Army and Navy, our national defense, and the national interests of our country. Witness the Republican promise to lift wartime excise taxes even before June 30. Witness the failure to keep that promise and the

extension of these excise taxes permanently, the reason being—now mark this—the reason being the necessity for this additional revenue, \$1,200,000,000 to put through the Knutson bill. Also further in support of this fact that the legislative pattern is being cut by the Republicans for this "quickie-wickie" tax reduction, our national defense, and our national interest to the contrary notwithstanding.

I call attention to a statement appearing in the Washington Post only this morning purporting to come from my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] in announcing the postponement of hearings on his bill which were scheduled to open tomorrow, saying that the failure of the Congress to slash the President's budget by \$6,000,000,000 would materially cut the idea of a 20-percent tax reduction. The evidence clearly supports the finding that a primary purpose of the arbitrary cut is tax reduction as proposed by the Knutson bill—and the national interest of our country be damned.

At this time, with our civilization, our way of life, and our concept of government being challenged by another concept of life, it is my belief that our national interest is more directly linked up with the necessary power of our armed forces than if such a challenge did not exist.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, according to the Legislative Calendar, on Thursday, February 20, the Congress will consider and vote on the proposed cut to the Federal Budget. In my humble opinion the vote on that subject will be the most important that will come before us while Members of the Eightieth Congress. I know how I am going to vote, yet I do not consider it sufficient to merely cast a vote, for the importance of this question requires a statement of reasons as to why one votes as he does.

I hasten to say that I am far from being an expert on budgetary matters.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have seen at firsthand and do know something about the tragedy, the pain, and the devastation of war. Thousands of pages have been written of the destruction, the waste, and the havoc of World War II, and hundreds of thousands of pages have already been written of how vastly more terrible will be the results of World War III. While nobody can accurately state just what the results of World War III would be, certainly all of us agree that insofar as our country—its people, its system of government—are concerned, the results would be catastrophic. Certainly therefore we all can agree that the problem of working out a lasting peace is the No. 1 problem facing this Congress and the world.

Economy is important. Both Democrats and Republicans alike want an economically operated government. There may be some difference in the approach to the question of economy, but in substance I think that everyone wants



economy in government because everyone knows that practical economy usually goes hand in hand with efficiency. Tax reductions are important. Everyone wants less taxes. I have yet to see the man who enjoys paying taxes. Certainly all of us want to lower them at the first real opportunity.

Those two problems are important ones that are facing this Congress; but can anyone successfully claim that the problems of economy and lower taxes are more important to this country than is the problem of peace? No answer is needed. Yet, gentlemen, tomorrow in considering the question of the proposed cut in the budget, we should keep reminding ourselves that peace is vastly more important than taxes.

According to the reports as I read them, the proposed budget cut of \$6,000,000,000 would reduce the money allocated to the United States Army by \$1,000,000,000. It would reduce the money now allocated to the United States Navy by \$750,000,000. It would reduce the money now allocated for the functioning of civilian affairs in foreign countries by \$500,000,000.

On February 15 the New York Times quoted Secretary Marshall as saying to reporters following the closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I quote:

If the Army is deprived of the necessary funds, or adequate funds, to provide food for those people who are so sorely in need of it, a practically impossible situation will be created for our troops and for our Government in its international commitments. We cannot expect to maintain the occupation with our troops if the people are starving. That would be an intolerable condition, and under that condition the present procedure would be impractical.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain we are all aware that upon Secretary Marshall's shoulders has been placed the greatest and gravest responsibility that it is possible for man to carry—that of working out a world peace—yet are we going to make his already difficult and dangerous task onerous by depriving him of the funds that he needs?

Senator VANDENBERG, who has played a large and important part in working out the manifold problems of peace, is reported in the Evening Star to have said that he was opposed to any budget cuts that would require the United States to "disarm alone." He further declared that he feared "a cut of \$1,750,000,000 in Army and Navy funds might upset American prestige in troubled international affairs." Senator CONNALLY, the great Texan, who has been a part of this great American team for peace, has voiced strenuous objection to the proposed cut.

Now, Mr. Chairman, is there anyone better qualified to pass judgment on the requirements and needs of the peace problem than Secretary of State Marshall and Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY? I do not know of any Congressman who claims that he is better qualified. Marshall, Vandenberg, and Connally know that, while we have made some steps toward a peace program,

world peace is not yet a reality. It is still a hope. They know that another world conflagration could overwhelm us in the space of a few months. They know the necessity for us to have adequate armed forces, not only to protect us during this period of uncertainty and unrest but to give us bargaining power at the conference table.

Someone may wonder what constitutes an adequate armed force sufficient to protect this country in event of an emergency. No doubt we have some military and naval experts in the Congress; no doubt some of them are sitting on this Budget Committee, but do they or anyone else claim that they know more about what the Army needs to maintain adequate standards than does General Eisenhower? Does anyone in this Budget Committee claim he knows as much about the Air Force as General Spaatz, or about the Navy as Secretary Forrestal or Admiral Nimitz? These are the best qualified men in the country to advise us on our armed forces, and they all urge us not to cut the armed-forces allocation, because, and I quote Secretary of War Patterson, "the President's War Department estimate was down to the minimum our leaders believed necessary for support of our occupation forces overseas and for reasonable guaranties for national security."

Most of us have agreed that Secretary Byrnes' policy of "friendly but firm" in dealing with foreign countries was a sensible and wise one. We can be friendly, but how can we be firm if we have reduced our strength to below the standard of adequacy. It takes strength and power to be firm.

Mr. Chairman, if we vote for the proposed \$6,000,000,000 cut in the President's Budget, we are grossly ignoring the advice and counsel of those men who, in all fairness, we must admit, know more about the armed forces, the practical problems of peace, and what is needed to protect our country, than does anyone else in these United States. If we vote for the proposed cut, we are closing our eyes to the fact and entrusting our fate to chance. No one can be certain just what lies ahead. Certainly we are inviting trouble by weakening ourselves at this time—yet no one knows—we are gambling. We are gambling the biggest stake in the world—peace—against less than \$2,000,000,000. The stakes are all out of proportion.

Money is important. Lower taxes are important. But certainly they are not important when the choice could easily lie between money or bloodshed—less taxes or peace.

I would think that those veterans who had seen their friends, their brothers, their buddies, give their lives in order that the world might have peace, I should think that those fellows who had seen that sacrifice would think a long time before making that sacrifice a mockery by giving it away for \$2,000,000,000 and lower taxes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that some of the figures that were given by the gentleman from Mis-

souri came in a letter which was delivered after I took the floor, I feel obliged to take the well of the House at this time and call attention to the serious discrepancies in the stories that have been told by the OPA.

First off, in the President's budget estimate he reports expenditures to the 30th of November of \$56,971,000, leaving a balance of \$44,000,000. The OPA told us that they had spent \$80,000,000 to the 1st of February, or at a rate double what they had been spending in the previous months. Based on the President's budget statement we would be able to cut at least \$12,000,000 back and let them go on and operate with the force that they now have, allowing plenty of money for terminal leave and everything else.

Now they come in here with a statement indicating not only that they have spent twice as much money in December, but that they have spent in January and the first half of February \$10,000,000, which is just twice as much as they could possibly spend on the same ratio that they have been operating on before.

Frankly, I am in this position: I do not believe a word of the testimony that they have given us or a word that is in the letter, and I shall stick to my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATIONS

Amounts available to the departments and agencies from appropriations and other funds are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office for Emergency Management:  
Office of Scientific Research and Development:

Working fund, Executive, Emergency Management (Office of Scientific Research and Development), 1942-46, \$2,044,477.

Working fund, Executive, Emergency Management (Office of Scientific Research and Development), 1940-46, \$160,744.

Working fund, Executive, Emergency Management (Office of Scientific Research and Development), 1945, \$6,688,979.

Office of Temporary Controls:  
Salaries and expenses, Civilian Production Administration functions, Office of Temporary Controls, 1947, \$2,400,000: *Provided*, That the Civilian Production Administration shall be discontinued and its affairs placed in liquidation not later than June 30, 1947.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Price Administration functions, Office of Temporary Controls, 1947, \$9,000,000.

Salaries and expenses, Office of War Mobilization functions, Office of Temporary Controls, 1947, \$60,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say for the benefit of those who have come in since general debate started that the action taken here with respect to the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Price Administration functions means that we are definitely on

our way toward redeeming the pledges made to the people that we are going to save some money out of the Budget, money that has previously been appropriated.

The mandate given in lines 10 to 13 on page 4 provides that the Civilian Production Administration shall be discontinued and its affairs placed in liquidation not later than June 30, 1947. I recognize that it has been said, probably, a little during the debate here, and more will be said in the press, that that interferes with the CPA's continuing to allocate materials, and the red herring will be drawn that that will affect the veterans' housing program.

At a meeting of the committee on veterans' housing conducted by the South Dakota Department of the American Legion, in my own State, along in November, members of the Legion, representing the building trades, the construction industry, and just rank-and-file veterans, came to the conclusion that continued channeling of materials was defeating the purpose of veterans' housing, defeating jobs for the veterans, and retarding the welfare of the veterans generally. It is my own belief that the CPA program has reached its maximum usefulness, and that the provision here for discontinuing its functions by the 30th of June 1947 will have a salutary effect upon the economy of the country and the welfare of the veterans and their housing program.

With respect to the Office of Price Administration, it must be borne in mind that many controls were discontinued last fall. When the statement was made that the people who lost their jobs by reason of the decontrol then would be added to the other functions of the OPA the country heard it with a horse-laugh. The people just did not believe that kind of thing was possible or would actually be attempted. Actually, that is what happened. In the field of rent control, on the 1st of July last year the OPA had 5,700 people. That was the 1st of July last year, a year after VE-day. Under the figures given the committee in these hearings, on the 1st of February of this year, many months later, that number had increased from 5,700 to 6,554. They had increased the number of rent-control areas in the country from 535 to 649. That is after the war had been over for a year. They increased by almost 1,000 the number of employees of the O. P. A. Rent Control Division between July 1 last year and February 1 of this year. They did increase by over a thousand in the field offices.

The only way we are going to redeem the promises which have been made to the country with respect to getting rid of controls and reducing expenditures is to have the courage to do it. What the committee is here doing is proposing that not only shall we refuse the increase in money this agency has requested but we shall take back some of the money they have had appropriated for the balance of this year, in order that they may move in the other direction, that of reducing the number of em-

ployees rather than increasing them the farther we get away from the war.

When this bill passes, as it will today, you can send out the word: "Congress is in action. We are on the way. We are reducing expenditures. We are reducing the Federal pay roll."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the remainder of the bill involves rescissions which were recommended by the Budget and since the committee is in complete agreement upon it, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

After hearing the distinguished minority leader attacking cuts in the appropriation for the OPA and mentioning that sugar may go up 30 or 40 cents a pound, I thought it might be appropriate to talk a little bit about sugar. Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday of this week, the International Emergency Food Council consisting of representatives from more than 30 countries, will meet in secret session to split up or divide amongst themselves American-owned sugar supplies. We are not unwilling to share a portion of our sugar with other countries where they are in short supply, but the question that I want to raise is by what authority the Secretary of Agriculture or any other representative of the United States Government has the right to enter into an agreement with other nations to keep the division of American-owned sugar secret from the people of the country? There is no law authorizing such secrecy. The American people are entitled to learn all of the facts as to what is being done with the sugar owned by the United States Government. In addition, the people are entitled to find out as to sugar supplies in all countries that now seek to secure a substantial portion of American-owned sugar.

The special food committee to investigate the sugar situation insists that the direct sugar allotment for consumers in the United States be increased from 35 to 40 pounds for 1947 as against 25 pounds last year. The committee also recommends an increase for industrial users of approximately 30 percent. These are minimum recommendations of the committee. If the Secretary of Agriculture or any member of the Cabinet consents to any smaller amount of sugar than recommended by the committee, American consumers should know where the responsibility belongs.

To fill the minimum quotas of sugar recommended by the committee for American consumers for use in 1947, we will need approximately 3,300,000 tons of American-owned Cuban sugar. This amount from Cuban supplies plus 3,808,000 tons produced in American areas shows a minimum requirement of approximately 7,200,000 tons of sugar for the use of domestic consumers in 1947.

I insist that the Secretary of Agriculture stand by the recommendations of the committee and that all proceedings of the International Emergency Food Council, including information on stocks and supplies of sugar in other countries, be made available to Congress and the country.

I again invite the Members of the House to secure copies of the report of the committee on the sugar situation, and I also urge my colleagues to contact the Secretary of Agriculture today with a demand that he retain a minimum of 3,300,000 short tons of American-owned Cuban sugar for use in 1947 by the American people.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HERTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1968) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 26, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—319

Abernethy	Bennett, Mich.	Canfield
Albert	Bennett, Mo.	Cannon
Allen, Calif.	Bishop	Carroll
Allen, La.	Blackney	Carson
Almond	Boggs, Del.	Case, N. J.
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs, La.	Case, S. Dak.
Andresen,	Bolton	Chadwick
August H.	Bonner	Chapman
Angell	Bradley, Calif.	Chief
Arends	Bradley, Mich.	Chenoweth
Arnold	Bramblett	Chipherfield
Auchincloss	Brehm	Church
Bakewell	Brooks	Clark
Banta	Brophy	Clason
Barrett	Brown, Ga.	Clevenger
Bates, Ky.	Bryson	Cole, Kans.
Bates, Mass.	Buck	Cole, Mo.
Battle	Burke	Colmer
Beall	Burleson	Combs
Beckworth	Butler	Cooley
Bender	Eyrnes, Wis.	Cooper



Corbett	Jarman	Phillips, Calif.	Bloom	Fulton	Monroney
Cotton	Javits	Phillips, Tenn.	Boykin	Gerlach	Norman
Courtney	Jenkins, Pa.	Pickett	Brown, Ohio	Goff	Norrell
Cox	Jennings	Ploeser	Buckley	Gorski	O'Hara
Cravens	Jensen	Poage	Buffett	Gross	Peterson
Crosser	Johnson, Calif.	Potts	Bulwinkle	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pfeifer
Crow	Johnson, Ill.	Preston	Busbey	Hardy	Plumley
Curtis	Johnson, Ind.	Rains	Byrne, N. Y.	Hartley	Poulson
Dague	Johnson, Tex.	Ramey	Camp	Hays	Price, Fla.
D'Alessandro	Jones, Ala.	Rankin	Clements	Hedrick	Priest
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N. C.	Rayburn	Clippinger	Hendricks	Rees
Deane	Jones, Ohio	Redden	Coffin	Hollfield	Rich
Devitt	Jonkman	Reed, Ill.	Cole, N. Y.	Jenlon	Rizley
Dingell	Judd	Reed, N. Y.	Coudert	Jenkins, Ohio	Russell
Dirksen	Kean	Reeves	Crawford	Johnson, Okla.	Sanborn
Dolliver	Kearney	Richards	Cunningham	Jones, Wash.	Scoblick
Domenegeaux	Kearns	Riehlman	Davis, Tenn.	Kefauver	Sikes
Dondero	Keating	Riley	Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Dorn	Kee	Rivers	Dawson, Utah	Kersten, Wis.	Taylor
Doughton	Keefe	Robertson	D'Ewart	Lucas	Thomas, N. J.
Drewry	Keogh	Robison	Donohue	McGarvey	Towe
Durham	Kerr	Rockwell	Eberharter	Mansfield,	Vinson
Eaton	Kilburn	Rogers, Fla.	Elliott	Mont.	West
Ellis	Kilday	Rogers, Mass.	Engle, Calif.	Mason	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Rohrbough	Fernandez	Meade, Ky.	Woodruff
Elsaesser	Knutson	Ross	Folger	Meyer	Zimmerman
Elston	Kunkel	Sadlak	Fuller	Mitchell	
Engel, Mich.	Landis	St. George			
Evins	Lane	Sarbacher			
Fallon	Lanham	Sasscer			
Feighan	Larcade	Schwabe, Mo.			
Fellows	Latham	Schwabe, Okla.			
Fenton	Lea	Scott, Hardie			
Fisher	LeCompte	Scott,			
Flannagan	LeFevre	Hugh D., Jr.			
Fletcher	Lemke	Scrivner			
Fogarty	Lesinski	Seely-Brown			
Foote	Lewis	Shafer			
Forand	Lodge	Sheppard			
Gallagher	Love	Short			
Gamble	Lusk	Simpson, Ill.			
Gary	Lyle	Smathers			
Gathings	McConnell	Smith, Kans.			
Gavin	McCormack	Smith, Maine			
Gearhart	McCowan	Smith, Ohio			
Gifford	McDonough	Smith, Va.			
Gillette	McDowell	Smith, Wis.			
Gillie	McGregor	Snyder			
Goodwin	McMahon	Spence			
Gore	McMillan, S. C.	Springer			
Gossett	McMillan, Ill.	Stanley			
Graham	MacKinnon	Stefan			
Granger	Macy	Stevenson			
Grant, Ala.	Mahon	Stigler			
Grant, Ind.	Maloney	Stockman			
Gregory	Manasco	Stratton			
Griffiths	Mansfield, Tex.	Sundstrom			
Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa	Taber			
Hagen	Mathews	Talle			
Hale	Meade, Md.	Teague			
Hall,	Merrow	Thomas, Tex.			
Edwin Arthur	Michener	Thomason			
Hall,	Miller, Conn.	Tibbott			
Leonard W.	Miller, Md.	Tollefson			
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Trimble			
Hand	Mills	Twyman			
Harless, Ariz.	Morgan	Vail			
Harness, Ind.	Morris	Van Zandt			
Harris	Morrison	Vorys			
Harrison	Morton	Vursell			
Havener	Muhlenberg	Wadsworth			
Hébert	Mundt	Walter			
Herter	Murdock	Weichel			
Heselton	Murray, Tenn.	Welch			
Hess	Murray, Wis.	Wheeler			
Hill	Nixon	Whitten			
Hinshaw	Nodar	Whittington			
Hobbs	Norblad	Wigglesworth			
Hoeven	O'Brien	Williams			
Hoffman	O'Konski	Wilson, Ind.			
Holmes	Owens	Wilson, Tex.			
Hope	Pace	Winstead			
Horan	Passman	Wolverton			
Howell	Patman	Wood			
Hull	Patterson	Worley			
Jackson, Calif.	Peden	Youngblood			
Jackson, Wash.	Philbin				

## NAYS—26

Buchanan	Kelley	Powell
Celler	King	Price, Ill.
Delaney	Klein	Rabin
Douglas	Lynch	Rayfiel
Gordon	Madden	Rooney
Hart	Marcantonio	Sabath
Heffernan	Miller, Calif.	Sadowski
Huber	Norton	Somers
Karsten, Mo.	O'Toole	

## NOT VOTING—87

Allen, Ill.	Andrews, Ala.	Bell
Andersen,	Andrews, N. Y.	Bland
H. Carl	Barden	Blatnik

CONFEREES ON EXCISE-TAX  
LEGISLATION

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the number of conferees on the bill which was sent to conference this morning be enlarged to seven.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to act as conferees.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may be privileged to address the House for 35 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

## THE LATE COLONEL EARLE L. JOHNSON

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation sustained a great loss yesterday in the death of Col. Earle L. Johnson, national commander of the Civil Air Patrol, when the plane he was flying crashed only half a mile from its take-off at Cleveland Airport.

Colonel Johnson was my friend for many years. Of gigantic stature, well over 6 feet, with the genial simplicity of a big boy, he naturally had the nickname of "Tiny" Johnson. He was a lineman on Ohio State University first Western Conference football team in 1916. He was active in farming, real estate, and business and served three terms as a representative in the Ohio General Assembly. He became interested in aviation during this period through his friendship with his colleague David S. Ingalls. In 1929 Mr. Ingalls was author of the law creating a bureau of aeronautics for the State of Ohio. I had the honor of being appointed as Ohio's first director of aeronautics. In 1931 various amendments and improvements to the law, which experience had shown were necessary, were drafted in a bill which Colonel Johnson sponsored in the Ohio Legislature. Although this bill was vetoed by the Governor, such a protest arose from friends of aviation that it was immediately repassed with slight changes and is still the law in Ohio. In 1939 Colonel Johnson was drafted from private life by Governor Bricker to act as Ohio's director of aeronautics. In 1941 he helped organize the Civil Air Patrol and in April 1942 he became its national commander. Under his guiding genius the Civil Air Patrol performed vitally important war services while retaining its character as an organization of amateur volunteers. In

So the bill was passed.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

## General pairs:

Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Pfeifer.  
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Eberharter.  
Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Donohue.  
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Sikes.  
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Hedrick.  
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.  
Mr. Norman with Mr. Clements.  
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Mansfield of Montana.  
Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Priest.  
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Camp.  
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Vinson.  
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Fernandez.  
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Byrne of New York.  
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Bland.  
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.  
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Engle of California.  
Mr. Buffett with Mr. Gorski.  
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.  
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Monroney.  
Mr. Crawford with Mr. Buckley.  
Mr. Sanborn with Mr. Folger.  
Mr. Towe with Mr. Bell.  
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Peterson.  
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Hendricks.  
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Kefauver.  
Mr. Plumley with Mr. Boykin.  
Mr. Rich with Mr. West.  
Mr. Russell with Mr. Bulwinkle.  
Mr. Mason with Mr. Hollfield.  
Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Lucas.  
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Barden.  
Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Price of Florida.  
Mr. Gross with Mr. Bloom.  
Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. CELLER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MADDEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H. R. 1968 for the following reasons:

First. The bill reduces veterans' appropriations from the requested \$307,258,000 to \$135,000,000.

Second. It eliminates appropriations for OPA. This withholding of funds endangers rent control.

1942 when the submarines were sinking ships all along our coast the CAP carried on antisubmarine reconnaissance along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts which was extremely effective in keeping our shipping lanes open. Since the war the CAP has performed many different missions and services, as well as furnishing preflight training for air cadets.

Only a man with the energy and resourcefulness and tact and ingenuity and force of Earle Johnson could have organized and directed the vast volunteer organization of the CAP in war and peace. He loved and understood flying, and people, young and old, and his country. He was only 52 when he died. His experience and his ability would have been invaluable to our Nation in the next few years. His death is a great loss to his family and friends and to his country. Our deep sympathy goes to his widow and his mother who survive him. His memory will be an inspiration to those who served with him and under him and to all who learn of his great character and his great work.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I desire to say that I knew Colonel Johnson very well. I considered him as one of the men who had performed outstanding service for his country during the war as head of the Civil Air Patrol. With the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and others, I want to say how much I sympathize with those of his loved ones who are sad today in the loss of this great man.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Col. Earle Johnson. I was greatly shocked when I learned of his tragic death. Aviation in this country suffered a heavy loss in his passing. For many years he had been recognized as one of the outstanding leaders in matters pertaining to aviation. He was an expert flyer himself, and was tireless in his leadership of the Civil Air Patrol. I first met Colonel Johnson several years ago and was immediately attracted by his charming personality. A visit with him was always a delightful and profitable experience. All who knew him have lost a true friend.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague from Ohio in expressing my sympathy on the tragic death of Col. Earle L. Johnson, National Commander of the Civil Air Patrol. It has been my privilege to know him down through the years, and he was one of the air pioneers who carried on during this war. He was a leader in the early days and gathered together those who wanted to serve for the air protection of our country.

The colonel was always gracious and held the affection and confidence of his men. He will long be remembered for his distinguished service to our country. My sympathy goes to his family and I know that they will be comforted by the affection and love of his many friends.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last, Col. Earle L. Johnson lost his life in a yet unexplained plane crash. Those of us who knew him are certain that if he had time to think it would have been for the two who were with him, not for himself.

For a quarter of a century or more, Colonel Johnson has been a leader in aviation in Ohio and in the Nation, serving as Ohio State Director of Aeronautics, and as director of the National Aeronautics Association. Upon the creation of the Civil Air Patrol he was made Ohio wing commander. At the time of his death he was head of the national patrol organization. His work won him the Legion of Merit.

Colonel Johnson had been recommended for the Distinguished Service Medal and his nomination as brigadier general had been sent to the Senate by the President, all of which attests to the fine service he has rendered his country.

Colonel Johnson was a man who took his responsibilities of citizenship seriously. He has been active in his community of Painesville, Ohio, and Lake County, having represented the county in the State legislature for 6 years, prior to serving the State of Ohio in several capacities.

To his family we extend our deepest sympathy. The Nation can ill afford to lose such a man.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to extend their remarks on the life and character of Colonel Johnson may be permitted to do so at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a certain editorial comment.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain tables and extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMERICAN HEALTH

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, during the next few minutes I would that we counsel together on the Nation's health.

Are you interested in the health of your family, your constituents, your State, and our great Nation? If you answer these questions in the affirmative, then the observations I make today should command your attention, inspire

you to make a careful and serious study into the health of the people in your own State, and thereafter join in an American crusade to restore health to the people of our great Nation.

SELECTIVE SERVICE REJECTS AS UNFIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE 5,000,000 PROUD YOUNG AMERICANS

On January 8, 1947, the distinguished and able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] spoke briefly before the House and inserted in the RECORD certain findings released by the Selective Service System which revealed the sad, yet true, fact that the health of the American youth had reached a new low. The details are so tragic that this Congress will stand indicted by this and succeeding generations if we fail to offer some remedies.

#### BASIC MATERIAL

The basic material used in presenting my opinions include medical statistics from the Selective Service System, hearings before the Committee on Education of the United States Senate in respect to the Hospital Construction Act, the Nation's Business of August 1946, releases from the American Hospital Association, findings of the North Carolina Medical Care Commission, not to mention the able counsel and advice of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

#### OVER-ALL DATA

During the war 5,000,000 young Americans were rejected as being physically unfit for military service. The record shows that of the 22,000,000 men between 18 and 32 registered for military service in World War II, 5,000,000 were deferred on essential occupational grounds. Of the 17,000,000 remaining, examination showed 5,000,000 physically unfit for armed service, this being a rejection percentage of 30.2 percent.

#### REJECTION PERCENTAGE RACIALLY

A break-down nationally between the races reveals that the ratio of rejection to those examined for Negroes was 53.4 percent and that of the whites 39.2 percent.

#### HEALTH BY STATES

Every Member of Congress is proud of his State and it is not my desire to embarrass my people of North Carolina or my colleagues from other States as I go a little further than did the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DIRKSEN, and spread upon the record some rather damaging testimony concerning the health of this Nation.

#### BIPARTISAN APPROACH

My observations today are indeed bipartisan and there must be no aisle separating our joint efforts in this common undertaking to restore good health to the people of our Nation. Since the health of those folks in my home State is of great concern to me, I shall begin by citing the North Carolina record.

In North Carolina out of 530,800 examined for military service—ages 17 through 18—by August 1, 1945, 227,600 were rejected. This is a rejection percentage of 42.9 per 100 men examined. Racially the percentage in North Caro-



lina ran higher than the national average. The only figures available for this State are for the period August 1944 to August 1945, and the rejects to number examined were 57.9 percent for the Negroes and 46.7 for the whites.

At this point Mr. Speaker, I insert along with my remarks three tables compiled by Selective Service showing the rejection percentages for each State.

The first table is limited to inductions. A careful study will reveal one other State with a higher rejection ratio than North Carolina, yet many States with records almost equal that should shock us out of our complacency.

TABLE 1.—Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted and rejected<sup>1</sup>

Table with 4 columns: Age group, Estimated total physically examined, Total acceptable, Total rejected, Ratio of rejected to physically examined.

<sup>1</sup> Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants. <sup>2</sup> Includes registrant enlistees and inductees and non-registrant enlistees 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date.

TABLE 1A.—Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted or rejected, by State<sup>1</sup>

Table with 5 columns: State, Estimated total examined, Total acceptable, Total rejected, Ratio of rejected to examined.

TABLE 1A.—Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted or rejected by State—Continued

Table with 5 columns: State, Estimated total examined, Total acceptable, Total rejected, Ratio of rejected to examined.

<sup>1</sup> Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants. <sup>2</sup> Includes registrant enlistees, inductees and non-registrant enlistees 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date.

The second table covers Negro registrants, who were inducted as well as those who enlisted. It is interesting to note that 20 States did not have a single Negro registrant:

TABLE 2.—Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted or rejected, by State<sup>1</sup>—Negro registrants

Table with 5 columns: State, Estimated total examined, Total acceptable, Total rejected, Ratio of rejected to examined.

<sup>1</sup> Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants. <sup>2</sup> Includes registrant enlistees, inductees and non-registrant enlistees 18-37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date. <sup>3</sup> Small number of Negro registrants examined.

The third table covers all races other than Negro, who were inducted as well as those who enlisted:

TABLE 3.—Estimated number of men 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been physically examined for induction or enlistment and number accepted or rejected, by State<sup>1</sup>—white registrants<sup>2</sup>

Table with 5 columns: State, Estimated total examined, Total acceptable, Total rejected, Ratio of rejected to examined.

<sup>1</sup> Based on RS 110A, a monthly report on the classification of registrants. <sup>2</sup> Includes all races other than Negro. <sup>3</sup> Includes registrant enlistees, inductees, and non-registrant enlistees 18 to 37 years of age on Aug. 1, 1945, who had been discharged by that date.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENT RECORDS

I point out to the Members that the voluntary enlistments from each State are over and above the total number of selectees accepted for the armed services. This should be taken into consideration as we study the rejection records by States. To the credit of North Carolina and several other States where the rejection record looks bad, it is interesting to discover that these States have an excellent percentage record of voluntary enlistments. In World War II in North Carolina over and above the 303,200 who were accepted for induction, 66,651 volunteered. If the North Carolina enlistment record was compared with certain States which did not have as favorable voluntary enlistment but did have a lower percentage in rejections, we would not be next to the cellar in the number of rejections.

ACCEPTANCE RECORDS BY STATES

For the information of the Members I insert at this point in the RECORD the acceptance record of the various States showing the percentage of men and women in the service in comparison with the number of citizens 21 years and over in the United States.

According to War and Navy records, North Carolina averaged 19.2 in the service, compared with the national average of 18.9.

Percentage of service personnel, male and female, who served in World War II in comparison with the number of citizens 21 years and over

State	Number of service personnel <sup>2</sup>		Percent- age
	I	II	
Alabama	1,555,309	302,566	19.5
Arizona	283,346	63,495	24.1
Arkansas	1,098,986	190,289	18.1
California	4,455,677	952,255	21.3
Colorado	688,410	124,747	18.1
Connecticut	1,159,601	227,465	19.6
Delaware	471,856	32,253	18.7
District of Columbia	174,793	73,209	15.4
Florida	1,187,827	232,805	19.5
Georgia	1,768,969	315,953	17.8
Idaho	305,311	60,933	19.9
Illinois	5,119,854	940,158	18.3
Indiana	2,198,935	396,638	18.0
Iowa	1,608,926	265,969	16.4
Kansas	1,144,823	101,819	8.8
Kentucky	1,630,772	295,166	18.0
Louisiana	1,364,933	262,450	19.2
Maine	493,596	87,725	19.8
Maryland	1,153,510	117,958	10.2
Massachusetts	2,575,477	539,597	20.9
Michigan	3,131,722	627,730	20.0
Minnesota	1,730,547	236,116	13.6
Mississippi	1,195,679	163,358	13.6
Missouri	2,463,726	402,893	16.3
Montana	343,180	62,608	18.2
Nebraska	817,280	132,795	16.2
Nevada	70,327	17,375	24.7
New Hampshire	295,859	55,814	18.8
New Jersey	2,592,978	534,506	20.6
New Mexico	275,227	63,551	23.0
New York	8,327,563	1,613,910	19.3
North Carolina	1,925,483	369,851	19.2
North Dakota	358,090	60,303	16.8
Ohio	4,404,423	856,314	19.4
Oklahoma	1,362,438	246,691	18.1
Oregon	717,121	140,750	19.5
Pennsylvania	6,031,192	1,253,812	20.7
Rhode Island	424,876	90,128	21.2
South Carolina	989,841	194,364	19.6
South Dakota	378,405	60,944	16.1
Tennessee	1,703,391	317,561	18.6
Texas	3,710,374	777,380	20.9
Utah	298,160	73,968	24.8
Vermont	214,248	36,869	17.2
Virginia	1,567,517	319,632	20.3
Washington	1,123,725	211,918	18.8
West Virginia	1,046,107	221,679	21.1
Wisconsin	1,941,603	319,895	16.4
Wyoming	150,031	34,100	22.7
Total	79,863,451	15,132,525	18.9

<sup>1</sup> Sixteenth Census of the United States, population vol. 1, U. S. Bureau of the Census, Washington 1941. 1236 pp.

<sup>2</sup> Army Personnel by State of Residence as of Dec. 31, 1945, Showing Accessions and Separations From Nov. 1, 1940. War Department press release, Aug. 21, 1946, 5 pp. Estimated Number of Naval, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard Personnel Serving During World War II, December 1941 Through May 1946. Navy Department press release, Jan. 14, 1947. 2 pp.

BREAK-DOWN OF DEFECTS

Because of my limited time I cannot give comparative data on the five most frequently recorded defects for all the States. However, at this point I will insert in the RECORD the rates per 1,000 examined in the continental United States, Kansas, and North Carolina. Kansas has been chosen for comparative purposes because its rejection rate was the lowest of any of the States. I should point out, however, that Kansas had the lowest percentage of service personnel

serving in World War II, the percentage to total population being 8.8, whereas the national average was 18.9; this low average, I would assume, being due to essential occupational deferment.

Continental United States

	Rates per 1,000 examined
Total defects	1,105.7
Eyes	119.6
Teeth	116.1
Feet	90.1
Musculoskeletal	87.5
Cardiovascular	57.5
Ratio rejected to examined (all defects)	30.2

KANSAS

Total defects	729.8
Musculoskeletal	73.7
Feet	70.7
Eyes	68.9
Mouth and gums	56.6
Cardiovascular	46.7
Ratio rejected to examined (all defects)	23.9

NORTH CAROLINA

Total defects	1,157.3
Musculoskeletal	126.5
Feet	123.1
Mental and educational deficiency	116.5
Eyes	78.6
Cardiovascular	63.9
Ratio rejected to examined (all defects)	42.9

FREQUENTLY RECORDED DEFECT

The studies show that a State may have a large number of most frequently recorded defects that do not appear as a chief cause for rejection. This is due to the great variance in the political, social, and economic conditions in the various regions of the country, and it explains the omission of mental deficiency as one of the five causes of rejection in most of the Northern and Western States.

In the South the rejection rates were above the national average for educational deficiency and syphilis.

In the eastern region, cardiovascular defects were above the national average.

In the Midwest, rejections for hernia were above the national average, and also in the Midwest mental deficiency, dental defects and defects of the abdominal viscera were important causes for rejections.

In the far West rejections were above the national average for musculoskeletal defects, hernia, eye defects, and syphilis.

GREAT RECORD OF OUR ORPHANAGES

Before I suggest one remedy for what I have tried to reveal, you would be interested in the excellent acceptance record of the young men called by selective service from our orphanages, and at this point I wish to make a plug for every orphanage in this land.

The figures I give to you for North Carolina are comparable to those for the continental United States. Of 1,154 former students of North Carolina orphanages listed for the Army, only 16 were turned back—and this in spite of the fact that the Army was pretty choosy in the early days of the war.

The orphanage boys had good bodies and good eyes. The rejection rate was 1.4, against a rejection ratio of 42.9 to the number examined for North Carolina as a whole. The orphanage boys came from the same blood lines, pre-

sumably, same social and in the main perhaps worse economic background.

The only reason for this great record in our orphanages must be due to adequate hospital and medical care at an age when it was most needed.

WAC'S REJECTED

My approach today is limited to the male rejects, but the same serious health conditions existed among the young women called for service; for example, one-third of the applicants for the WAC in the Nation were rejected for physical or mental reasons.

WHAT IS THE PARTIAL ANSWER?

In the Seventy-ninth Congress the Hill-Burton bill was enacted into law. It was brought before the Congress under the bipartisan sponsorship of Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senator (now Justice) Harold Burton, of Ohio. It was passed by a unanimous voice vote in the Senate and by a vote of 136 to 28 in the House.

Examination of the testimony of expert and professional witnesses at the hearings on this bill disclosed many convincing facts in support of a program to increase the availability of medical care and hospitals. Dr. Frederick D. Mott, then chief medical officer, Farm Security Administration, testified that less than one-third of all the counties in the United States, with 69 percent of the population, have 89 percent of the total number of hospital beds. He further stated that 1,785 counties having no cities of more than 10,000 population but including 21 percent of the total population had only 8.8 percent of the total number of general hospital beds. In plain language this means that most of the hospitals have been built close to urban areas and are not uniformly distributed so as to be equally available to all segments of the population.

HOW—THE DESCRIPTION OF THE ACT, ITS SCOPE, ADMINISTRATION AND ENABLING STATE LEGISLATION

I will not presume upon the time of the House to discuss the details of the Hill-Burton Act, its scope and administration and the required enabling State legislation, but for the benefit of the new Members of this House as well as the old, I insert in the RECORD at this point a brief résumé of the act and its broad objectives:

THE ACT

Within the next 5 years the Nation's communities—small and large—will construct \$1,125,000,000 worth of hospitals and related facilities under a Federal grant-in-aid program. These are to be built on the basis of need under programs which will be drawn up within the States, and the Federal Government will pay for one-third of the cost of constructing and equipping them. The other two-thirds of the cost will come from sources within the State.

This construction program was made possible by Public Law 725 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, signed by President Truman August 13, 1946. The law is better known by its earlier title, S. 191, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, or the Hill-Burton bill. The American, Catholic, and Protestant Hospital Associations have endorsed and actively supported the bill because of the direct benefit to the Nation's health through increased hospital facilities. Additional support has come from leaders in the public health field and labor, farm, civic, and welfare groups.



There will be hospital construction outside of this program; but the money provided by this law will be used for assistance in building hospitals in those areas which are shown by State-wide surveys to be in greatest need of additional facilities.

#### ITS SCOPE

Public Law 725 provides grants-in-aid to States for the purposes of (sec. 601<sup>1</sup>):

1. Conducting State-wide surveys and planning for construction of needed hospitals, health centers and related facilities;
2. Constructing hospitals, health centers and related facilities which are part of over-all State plans developed from surveys.

For both surveys and construction the Federal Government is authorized to contribute one-third of the cost with the remaining two-thirds to be provided from sources within the States.

#### ITS ADMINISTRATION

Administration of the Nation-wide program is under the direction of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service through the newly created Division of Hospital Facilities. The Federal Hospital Council, with members drawn from various interested groups, will assist and guide the Surgeon General in formulation of policies and standards for the program.

Administration at State levels will be through a single State agency and an advisory council. The State agency may be an existing agency or one established for the purpose of administering the new law.

#### STATE LEGISLATION

Each State, in order to participate, will be required to enact an enabling law and a hospital licensing law.

The enabling law must provide for the proper organization and administration of the State's program (sec. 623 (a)). The American Hospital Association is working with governmental agencies and the Council of State Governments in preparing a model enabling act. As soon as an enabling act is developed which the association can recommend, it will be distributed to officers of State hospital associations and will be available from the Washington Service Bureau.

Public Law 725 does not authorize Federal control over the operation of hospitals after construction is complete; it does specifically require that each State must enact legislation before July 1, 1948, establishing minimum standards of operation of hospitals constructed with Federal assistance under this law (sec. 623 (d)). A model hospital licensing law has been prepared by a special committee of the council on Government relations of the association and is now available from the Washington Service Bureau.

#### ITS FINANCING

Three million dollars are authorized to assist in surveys and planning. Of this, \$2,350,000 have been appropriated. A later Congress may appropriate additional funds as required.

Survey and planning funds are allotted on the basis of State population. For each dollar put up by the Federal Government, \$2 must be furnished by the State (sec. 613).

Seventy-five million dollars annually for 5 years are authorized for construction grants. No appropriation for construction has yet been made by the Congress. Construction funds will be allotted according to population and the per capita income of the States, weighted so that States with lower per capita incomes are allotted higher amounts per capita. Each dollar of Federal funds must be matched by \$2 from the project applicant (sec. 625 (b)).

<sup>1</sup> Section numbers refer to sections of the act.

Church and other nonprofit organizations in many States will find that constitutional or statutory provisions prohibit their receiving funds through the State's disbursing agency. Public Law 725 provides that under such conditions the Federal funds can be paid directly and the State agency need only certify for compliance (sec. 625 (b)).

#### THE SURVEY AND PLANNING PROGRAM

In order that a State may participate, it must set up a single State agency and an advisory council to consult with the State agency in surveys and planning. This, in most States, will require enabling legislation, but in some States survey programs have been started under executive order of the governor.

The designated State agency then applies to the Surgeon General for funds to cover one-third of the cost of its survey program.

The groundwork for surveys has been completed in many of the States where groups working with the Commission on Hospital Care have outlined and begun State-wide surveys. These will usually be carried forward by the designated State agency.

From the inventories, plans for a State-wide construction program will be made. The State agency will submit the State plan to the Surgeon General. If the plan complies fully with the regulations drawn up by the Surgeon General and the Federal Hospital Council it will be approved. If the Surgeon General rejects a plan the State agency may appeal to the Federal Hospital Council and that Council may uphold or veto the original ruling. (Sec. 623 (b).)

#### THE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

As a first step for this phase of the program a State must again designate a single State agency—to administer the construction program. The agency may be the same as the survey agency or a new agency may be selected. This, also, will require State enabling legislation.

Applicants for individual projects may apply for Federal assistance for construction of any project, provided it is part of the approved State-wide construction program (State plan). (Sec. 625.)

Application forms for construction funds may be received from the State agency after construction funds are appropriated by Congress. (It is expected that Congress will make the appropriations by early spring and such action as well as other events significant to the program will be reported in hospitals.) The application will be submitted to the State agency for approval and will then be recommended to the Surgeon General. Should the Surgeon General refuse approval of any project which is part of a State plan, the State agency may appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Upon final approval of the project, Federal funds for one-third of the cost of construction will be allotted, and will be paid in installments as work progresses.

#### IN SUMMATION

The Office of the Surgeon General will:

1. With the approval of the Federal Hospital Council, draw up complete regulations for administering the law (sec. 622 and sec. 633).
2. Approve State plans and applications for funds for surveys and planning (sec. 623).
3. Approve individual applications for construction projects (sec. 625).

The States will:

1. Pass enabling legislation to set up:
  - (a) A single State agency to conduct the surveys and planning.
  - (b) A single State agency (or the same) to administer the construction program (sec. 612 and sec. 623).
  - (c) An advisory council to consult with the State agency (sec. 612 and sec. 623).

2. Pass a hospital licensing law by July 1, 1948, providing for minimum standards of operation for hospitals and related facilities constructed as part of the Federal grant-in-aid program (sec. 623).

The State agency will:

1. Administer the program with the assistance of the State advisory council in accordance with Federal regulations (sec. 612 and sec. 623).
2. Complete survey work and develop a State plan for construction (sec. 623).
3. Accept applications for construction and forward these to the Surgeon General if they are approved as part of the State plan (sec. 625).
4. Inspect projects and certify payment of installments from Federal funds (sec. 625).

The individual project applicant should:

1. Consult with the State agency to plan its project so that it is in accord with a State-wide plan (sec. 622).
2. Submit application for construction funds, in accord with the State plan and the Federal regulations, to the State agency for approval and recommendation to the Surgeon General. The application should contain:
  - (a) A description of the site for the project;
  - (b) Reasonable assurance that the title to the site is or will be vested solely in the applicant;
  - (c) Plans and specifications which comply with Federal regulations;
  - (d) Reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available for two-thirds of the cost of constructing the project and for its maintenance and operation when completed;
  - (e) Reasonable assurance of the payment of prevailing wages for construction work; and
  - (f) Assurance of compliance with requirements of the State plan and regulations concerning the availability of hospital services without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, and for persons unable to pay, as well as assurance of compliance with State minimum requirements for operation and maintenance (sec. 625).

#### STATE SURVEY DIRECTORS

- Alabama: Preliminary survey completed.
- Arizona: State Department of Health, Phoenix, Ariz.; Hilda H. Kroeger, M. D., director, Maternal and Child Health Division.
- Arkansas: Hospital and Health Survey, 421½ West Capitol Avenue., Little Rock, Ark.; Miss Helen Robinson.
- California: Department of Public Health, 423 Phelan Building, 760 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.; P. K. Gilman, M. D.
- Colorado: State Division of Public Health, Denver, Colo.; Dr. Florence Sabin.
- Connecticut: State Department of Health, Hartford, Conn.; James A. Dolce, M. D.
- Delaware: Survey officially authorized but not begun.
- District of Columbia: Washington Metropolitan Health Council, St. Luke's Hospital, Amsterdam Avenue and One Hundred and Thirteenth Street, New York, N. Y.; Claude W. Munger, M. D.
- Florida: Survey officially authorized but not begun.
- Georgia: Department of Public Health, Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. John E. Ransom.
- Idaho: Department of Public Health, Boise, Idaho; Ruth Raattama, M. D., Division of Maternal and Child Health.
- Illinois: State Department of Public Health, Springfield, Ill.; Henrietta Herbolshelmer, M. D., chief, Division of Maternal and Child Hygiene.
- Indiana: State Board of Health, Indianapolis, Ind.; Dr. Martha O'Malley, Division of Hospital and Institutional Services.

Iowa: State Hospital Survey Committee, State Department of Health, Des Moines, Iowa; Verne A. Pangborn, director.

Kansas: State Board of Health, Topeka, Kans.; Miss Selma A. Czarnowsky.

Kentucky: State Department of Health, 620 South Third Street, Louisville, Ky.; W. B. Atkinson, M. D., Division of Medical and Related Services.

Louisiana: Survey Study Group, Office of the Governor, Health and Hospital Division, Baton Rouge, La.; J. W. Holloway.

Maine: Department of Health and Welfare, Augusta, Maine; Mr. Boyd L. Bailey, Department of Health and Welfare.

Maryland: Hospital Survey Committee, 15 East Fayette Street, Baltimore, Md.; Mr. Herbert G. Fritz.

Massachusetts: State Department of Public Health, 8 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.; Donald A. Martin, M. D.

Michigan: Michigan Planning Committee, 422 West Michigan, Lansing, Mich.; Don C. Weeks.

Minnesota: State Board of Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Viktor O. Wilson, M. D.

Mississippi: Mississippi Commission on Hospital Care, 207 Tower Building, Jackson, Miss.; Dr. D. V. Galloway.

Missouri: Survey being considered.

Montana: Hospital Survey Committee, Agricultural Experiment Station, Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.; Carl F. Kraenzel, associate agricultural economist.

Nebraska: Committee for Hospital Survey, Room 1004, Capitol Building, Lincoln, Nebr.; Dr. W. S. Petty, chairman.

Nevada: State Department of Health, Reno, Nev.; Mrs. Christie T. Corbett.

New Hampshire: New Hampshire State Hospital Study, 201 State Office Building, Concord, N. H.; Thorsten V. Kaljarvi.

New Jersey: Survey of Hospital and Health Center Facilities, Department of Institutions and Agencies, State Office Building, Trenton, N. J.; Dr. Emil Frankel.

New Mexico: New Mexico State Hospital Survey, 300 East Second Avenue, Hot Springs, N. Mex.; Mr. Leo P. Schwartz.

New York: State Postwar Public Works Planning Commission, State Office Building, Albany, N. Y.; John J. Bourke, M. D., Joint Hospital Board.

North Carolina: North Carolina Medical Care Commission, Box 1880, Raleigh, N. C.; John A. Ferrell, M. D., executive secretary.

North Dakota: State Department of Health, Farm Foundation, State College Station, Fargo, N. Dak.; Marguerite L. Ingram, specialist, medical care and health studies.

Ohio: Department of Health, Columbus, Ohio; Dr. Ed V. Turner.

Oklahoma: State Department of Health, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Paul A. Snelson, Director, Hospital Division.

Oregon: Oregon State Board of Health, Portland, Ore.; Forrest E. Rieke, M. D.

Pennsylvania: Department of Welfare, Board of Education Building, Twenty-first and Parkway, Philadelphia; Hublely R. Owen, M. D.

Rhode Island: Survey Commission for Hospitals, State Department of Health, State Office Building, Providence, R. I.; James P. Deery, M. D., medical director of industrial hygiene.

South Carolina: Box 927, Columbia, S. C.; Mr. W. N. Walters.

South Dakota: State Board of Health, Pierre, S. Dak.; Gilbert Cottam, M. D.

Tennessee: Department of Public Health, Nashville, Tenn.; Dr. R. H. Hutcheson.

Texas: State Board of Health, Austin, Tex.; Mr. Norman Roberts.

Utah: Preliminary survey completed.

Vermont: State Hospital Survey Commission, 50 Nelson Street, Barre, Vt.; Mr. Lawrence C. Campbell.

Virginia: Survey officially authorized but not begun.

Washington: Department of Health, Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. Ralph L. Nielson.

West Virginia: Survey officially authorized but not begun.

Wisconsin: State Board of Health, 400 State Office Building, Madison, Wis.; Vincent F. Otis.

Wyoming: Wyoming State Department of Health, Cheyenne, Wyo.; G. M. Anderson, M. D., State health officer.

#### HILL-BURTON BILL NOT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The Hill-Burton bill is not socialized medicine, nor is it considered a step in that direction. It does not provide that the Federal Government shall build hospitals or control them. It does provide that the hospital construction in each State shall be under State control. It provides that in each State an advisory council, composed of citizens who represent a cross section of the community, including doctors and hospital administrators, will advise with the State agency in developing a program that will put new hospitals in the areas where they are most needed in the State. Federal money is not distributed on the basis of political patronage.

#### NECESSARY APPROPRIATIONS

The Hill-Burton bill authorizes five annual appropriations of \$75,000,000 each, to assist the States in developing a medical-care program. The first fiscal year of this program will end June 30, 1947. No funds have been appropriated for the first fiscal year. Perhaps it is not necessary that they should be, since most of the States are surveying their needs as provided and required under the bill.

But at the end of the second fiscal year the Hill-Burton bill authorizes \$150,000,000 to be appropriated. Yet the President's Budget requests only \$50,000,000 as an appropriation to include the first and second years.

Perhaps the program will not get under way any faster. The \$50,000,000 recommended may be all that is needed at this stage. However, it would seem that this question should be carefully examined and a definite reason set forth as to why \$50,000,000 is sufficient to meet a \$150,000,000 planned program. My opinion is that each Member of the House should determine what progress is being made in his own State and when his State will need the full annual allotment.

#### SEVERAL STATES HAVE COMPLETED PLANS

My closing remarks are not selfish, as you recall my honest efforts to present an over-all picture; but North Carolina, like several other States, is at the crossroads on this hospital and medical-care program. These States have provided from their own funds plus Federal grants and have completed the planning program as will be revealed by convincing data which I have and will insert in the RECORD.

The legislatures in various States are at this very time beginning to set in motion appropriations from the States to qualify under the hospital construction part of the bill.

#### STATE PROGRAMS IN JEOPARDY

Yet, if this Congress refuses to support the recommendation of the President, or even go beyond, the program in

the various States, including countless small towns and communities throughout this land where the citizenship has raised thousands and millions of dollars to take advantage of the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, will be placed in jeopardy.

#### NORTH CAROLINA 5-YEAR HEALTH PLAN

If North Carolina was not taking steps to protect and improve the health of her people by providing an adequate health program, frankly I would be ashamed to open up the record and address the House today.

At this time the North Carolina Legislature is in session and is being asked to provide for a \$48,000,000 medical-care program, within \$2,000,000 of the Federal recommendation for all States, and I believe the greater part, if not all, of the program will be enacted into law.

Your attention is directed to my remarks which follow, which I will not describe in detail, outlining a 5-year health plan, 1947-51, sponsored by the North Carolina Medical Care Commission; this survey and suggested plans having been made possible by the cooperative efforts between the State and the Federal Government.

#### FIVE-YEAR PLAN, 1947-51, NORTH CAROLINA MEDICAL CARE COMMISSION

For building, first, new general hospitals; second, health—medical—centers; and enlargement of existing hospital facilities.

One hundred counties in State.

Seven new hospitals in what might be termed "rural counties."

Twenty-three modern health centers—these centers being removed from urban areas.

Eleven hospital districts.

When erected these additional facilities will provide for 7,200 additional beds in the State, distributed as follows:

One thousand five hundred beds to mental hospitals, plus 3,374 additional beds, if the State acquires United States Camp Butner, Durham.

Seven hundred beds to tuberculosis hospitals.

Four hundred beds to medical health centers.

Four hundred beds to university teaching hospital.

Four thousand two hundred beds to be distributed on basis of need to new hospitals and for enlargement of existing hospitals.

#### THE PEOPLE'S HEALTH IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

My contention is that this subject of good health cannot be restricted by race or by geography. Like many other States, North Carolina's No. 1 problem at this time is to seek better health for its citizenship. There is no iron curtain surrounding this State. One million five hundred thousand citizens from every State in the Union visited free of charge the Great Smoky Mountain National Park during the 1946 season, with over 2,000,000 expected this year. We have in the universities and colleges of North Carolina more students from the North, East, and Middle West than any State south of a line beginning on the southern boundary of the State of Pennsylvania extending westward to Kansas.



While each State must first shoulder the responsibility in the improvement of the general health of its people I contend that our national economy and welfare, as well as our National Defense, is now so closely linked together that the health and welfare of the people of North Carolina, as well as that of Arizona, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma is tied closely to and concerns the health and welfare of every State in the Union, economically and socially.

To support that contention consider these economical reasons:

Years ago in the days of the buggy and wagon the citizens of my State purchased these vehicles in Winston-Salem and other points within North Carolina. Today we send our money to Michigan for cars, trucks, and tractors; to Ohio for tires and tubes, to the Middle West for fine farming machinery; we trade on the New York, Chicago, and New Orleans stock exchange.

What are some of the social reasons? A plague in North Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Maine, can be planted in Oregon or Washington within 12 hours. Thousands of fine lads from every section of the country were stationed in Army camps in my county and throughout the South, hundreds and hundreds of them married Southern girls, and conversely young men from the South went North and West and married girls in those areas.

All this means the breaking down of so-called State lines, the South, the North, the East, the West, and I am glad to see that day arrive.

But it imposes a problem healthwise since surely these families will from this day henceforth be closer drawn together.

Another reason to support my contention that this subject of health poses a national cooperative effort, I point out that we combined our efforts and created the atomic bomb, won a ghastly war, and we will never change the Selective Service indictment until we combine our efforts and place the power of this Government behind a great health program.

#### THE AVERAGE MAN WATCHING THIS CONGRESS

The average man in the smaller and rural communities of this Nation, where over 21 percent of the people live, who vote and in so many cases think alike, and who seemed to have been forgotten, are watching this Congress. The people in these communities do not understand and may not be greatly concerned with reciprocal trade agreements, tariff techniques, budgetary controls, freight rates, but they understand what mental deficiency, hernia, and syphilis mean.

#### CUT THE BUDGET WISELY

My closing plea, this House must cut the Budget wisely, so as not to penalize the essential services of this Government.

I ask, too, that each Member of the House study the health of the people of your State, contact the State survey director in your State, whose name is listed within the body of my remarks, to determine what progress is being made, and get behind this Hill-Burton bill. Remember that in this presentation I have dealt only with the youth. I trem-

ble to think what the record would be if we included the old and very young.

Surely, from a selfish point of view it is not fair for the great State of Kansas to furnish a larger percentage of its youth for the military draft than North Carolina.

Surely, we will not face the possibility of another war and see 5,000,000 proud, young Americans, a great reservoir of manpower for national defense, rejected because of physical and mental handicaps.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I commend the gentleman highly on the splendid presentation he has made here, particularly that part which deals with the great movement in North Carolina to improve the health of the citizens of North Carolina and all those who may sojourn in that State.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, slightly more than 5 years ago, on Opana, a lonely Hawaiian hill, two enlisted Army technicians were delayed from their breakfast by transportation which failed to arrive. They climbed back into the trailer which housed the aircraft warning equipment they had been operating for the past 3 months. For lack of anything better to do, they turned on the equipment and watched the indicating screen which, during the months they had been observing it, had failed to indicate anything out of the ordinary. But this morning was to be different. This was Sunday morning. This was December 7, 1941.

We know now the story of what happened. Suddenly the indicator sprang to life. Little pips jumped across the screen—pips of light which signaled the approach of many aircraft. More than 100 miles away, the pips became Japanese aircraft—bombers and fighters, bound for Hawaii.

Frantically, one of the men yelled a warning into a field telephone. That warning, as we well know, failed to take root in fertile ground. The day that will live in infamy recorded itself in history.

History also is the story of how our professional fighting forces—prepared, perhaps, for a battle, but certainly not a war—rushed to the job of putting out the conflagration; a conflagration which grew until it threatened to engulf us all. That conflagration brought men and women from all walks of life rushing to the assistance of the professional fighters. After a desperate and costly struggle, it finally was brought under control. The men and women who survived returned to their homes and their work, to the old problems of civilian life, leaving the professional forces to guard the smoldering embers. World statesmen met to author a program to prevent those embers ever from bursting again, not only in our time, but in any man's time. With the memory and the scars of the

holocaust fresh in our minds, we, as a Nation, firmly resolved that this program would be carried out.

Yet—and historians may look back on this moment as unbelievable—with permanent peace still a goal waiting to be won, we here in Congress are debating a proposition to emasculate the only effective instrument at our disposal which will assure the attainment and maintenance of that goal.

Once more, the indicators of danger are jumping across the screen. Once again, the field phone is ringing. Once more, the warnings are being sounded. History will record whether or not they fall on fertile ground. It is imperative on this occasion that they do, lest a world-wide Pearl Harbor jeopardize the future of our civilization.

Our military leaders warn that the proposed action to cut appropriations for national defense at this time is an open invitation to disaster. Yet there are men among us who choose to ignore that warning. I do not choose to be one of those men. Let the names of those who do ignore it be broadcast to the Nation. Let their names be known to the millions of Americans who fought for a new world as men who would sell them down the river for thirty pieces of silver, men who place ill-considered campaign promises above the security of the Nation.

This warning of our professional military leaders is no hysterical appeal dictated by false emotion. This appeal is dictated by stark, fearsome fact presented by the only men who are fully aware of the precarious position in which the proposed action would place our armed forces, and thus our national security. These are men of unquestioned integrity and ability. These men have no political ax to grind. They merely are charged with the preservation of our way of life.

Who are these men? What are their warnings? What could be lost if the warnings are ignored? Examine the answers to these questions in the cold light of the present world situation. Then pass judgment.

These men, the leaders of our military forces and the head of our Department of State, tell us that a further cut of the national defense budget invites disaster. Their names are indelibly stamped in the memory of every true American—Eisenhower, Marshall, MacArthur, Forrestal, Patterson, Spaatz, Nimitz, and many others. These are the men who guided this Nation through its most desperate hour. They are men who have no allegiance to any political platform, although several would be acceptable to either political party as a Presidential candidate were they of a mind to accept. These men already are faced with a tremendous task and the minimum machinery with which to accomplish it. Now they are to be placed on the altar by the Budget hatchmen to chop their meager forces further, not in the interest of world peace but to facilitate the meeting of campaign promises. Their warning may be summed up in three words—"invitation to disaster."

Do not make a mockery of their warnings. Do not make these men the Billy Mitchells of our time.

What could be some of the results of this proposed cut?

First, there is the problem of carrying out our vital occupation mission, the success of which must be assured if world peace is to become a reality. Secretary Patterson tells us that our funds and the strength of our occupation troops in Europe and in the Far East are presently at the lowest level consistent with performance of the mission. Yet we propose to make necessary a reduction of 100,000 men in the over-all strength of the Army and further, a reduction in funds needed to feed the already near-starving people of the American-occupied areas. That such action would be an invitation to disaster is not merely my personal belief. General MacArthur and General Eisenhower tell us the same thing in plain, simple language.

What about our Navy? Secretary Forrestal has told us in plain words what the proposed cut would mean: our Navy would be immobilized. To his words of warning have been added those of Admiral Nimitz.

Our Air Forces, which will receive approximately 58 percent of the funds budgeted to the War Department, would be forced to absorb a staggering setback.

Both General Arnold and General Spaatz have told us repeatedly that a 70-group Air Force is the minimum force necessary to meet our interim peacetime requirements. Budget cuts to date have already whittled that program down to 55 groups and those at only 80-percent strength. Now we propose another reduction which would slice the program to 35 groups, of which only 3 would be available within the continental limits of this country.

Perhaps even more important is the fact that research and development programs will be seriously curtailed. General Spaatz warns that, with such funds curtailed, we can expect to have a second-rate Air Force in 3 to 5 years. A second-rate Air Force, we all know, is no better than none at all in this atomic age. We can stock pile atomic bombs but we cannot stock pile an air force. New planes do not grow on bushes. Research and development is a slow and costly process. None of the planes with which we fought World War II were developed after hostilities began. The B-29, for example, went on the drawing boards in 1938.

This example of what could happen to our air forces applies to the other branches of the military organization as well. It will mean having not only a second-rate air force, but a second-rate military establishment throughout.

But, most important of all, with our armed forces budgeted into impotency, our diplomats will be seriously handicapped in their peace negotiations with the rest of the world. We cannot bargain effectively with the world if we are not prepared to back up our statements any more than a man can expect to win at cards if his opponent holds all the trumps. Our diplomats have too few trumps as it is; do not weaken their hand

further. Remember, eloquence and logic alone cannot win world arguments.

Add to all this even further curtailment of our vital Reserve training programs, procurement of new equipment, abandonment of vital bases. All these are items of major importance. Previous reductions have already eliminated the minor items.

I would question the wisdom of a bank president of an already inadequately guarded bank who would fire guards to obtain additional funds to redecorate his bank. Today I question the wisdom of this proposal to cut national-defense funds so that we might reduce income taxes.

We must find a means of picking the fruit without cutting down the tree.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), for February 19 and 20, on account of official business.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN), for Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. HESELTON, for Wednesday, February 19, and Thursday, February 20, on account of attendance at a funeral.

Mr. WOODRUFF (at the request of Mr. DONDERO), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. GWINN of New York (at the request of Mr. GAMBLE), for 3 days, on account of official business.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, 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, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1353. An act to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 19, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 19, 1947, for the continuation of full committee public hearings on air accidents.

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

An executive meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with Secretary of State George C. Marshall will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol, on Thursday, February 20, 1947, at 11 a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

367. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of June 29, 1940 (Public, No. 674, 76th Cong., 3d sess.; 54 Stat. 686), to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes, to vest in the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics certain powers necessary to the performance of his functions and duties in regard thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

368. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting a copy of the Twelfth Annual Report to Congress of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

369. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, together with accompanying papers, a report of the Secretary of War dated January 31, 1947, made in compliance with a provision of the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 136); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

370. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, transmitting the Nineteenth Report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended September 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 137); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

371. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 16, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports for flood control on the lower Mississippi River with a view to determining whether additional flood protection should be provided for the St. Johns levee district, Missouri, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on October 8, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 138); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

372. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the availability of corporate funds for the fiscal year 1947 (H. Doc. No. 139); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

373. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$82,000 for the Federal Communications Commission (H. Doc. No. 140); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

374. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for the month of June 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

375. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for the month of July 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### 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. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities. House Report No.



43. Report placing Gerhart Eisler in contempt of the House of Representatives. Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1350. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1363. A bill to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1376. A bill to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORTON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1713. A bill to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1778. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 731. A bill to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 33. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Pub. Law 711, 79th Cong.), for the purpose of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and to submit its report to the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 126. Joint resolution to authorize the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, Arizona, to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation project; without amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 56. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 57. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 58. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 220. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland; with amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 221. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 234. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2022. A bill to amend title 11 of the Social Security Act to include certain employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2023. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2024. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemptions of single persons to \$1,000 and of married persons to \$2,500, and to increase the exemption for dependents to \$800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (by request):

H. R. 2025. A bill to promote and encourage the building, financing, and ownership of good, permanent homes through the traditional American policies of individual initiative, freedom of opportunity, and local control over local matters; to eliminate slums and blighted areas through assistance to local communities; to facilitate the construction of well-designed rental housing through private enterprise and local assistance for families of low income; and to coordinate the administration of all Federal agencies devoted to such activities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2026. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper compensation to supervisors in the larger post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2027. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2028. A bill to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 2029. A bill to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2030. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2031. A bill to place on the retired list certain commissioned officers of the Army who served during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2032. A bill to preserve the continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes in the cases of alien residents who departed for service in allied armed forces during the Second World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2033. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MUHLENBERG:

H. R. 2034. A bill to provide retirement pay and hospital benefits for Reserve officers who were disabled while serving with the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2035. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2036. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2037. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2038. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2039. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2040. A bill to stimulate business recovery and provide relief from war taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2041. A bill to terminate certain monetary powers of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2042. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care furnished by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 2043. A bill directing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to apply the law of community property to the residents of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 2044. A bill to change the name of the custodial service in the postal service to

that of engineer and maintenance service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2045. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2046. A bill to authorize the coverage of self-employed persons under title 11 of the Social Security Act on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2047. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2048. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2049. A bill to credit for retirement purposes officers and members of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia with service performed in the active military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2050. A bill to provide credit for salary purposes to carriers advanced from the status of village delivery; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2051. A bill to terminate the war tax rate on retail sales of jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 2052. A bill exempting certain projects from the land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws and repealing all inconsistent provisions of prior acts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2053. A bill to abolish the United States Park Police force in the District of Columbia, to transfer the personnel and powers thereof to the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2054. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 2055. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 28 of the United States Code, entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction and maintenance of the United States naval stations and fortifications on the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 106. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1367, a bill to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Res. 107. Resolution to request the Tariff Commission to furnish to the Ways and Means Committee certain information relating to reciprocal trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### 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 Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make on an annual and continuing basis the appropriations necessary for providing urgently needed additional Federal generating capacity in the Columbia Basin and not to require any increase in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to erect a monument to the Unknown Sailor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue its appropriations in support of the rural electrification program and to refrain from enacting any legislation adverse thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### 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. 2056. A bill for the relief of J. C. Bateman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2057. A bill for the relief of Yelchi Nimura (Tomizo Miki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Ohio:

H. R. 2058. A bill for the relief of Guy B. Slater and Grace M. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2059. A bill for the relief of Takeru Kawazoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2060. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bellia, alias Salvatore Antonio Seminara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2061. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Hideko Nishikawa Kawagoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2063. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Williamson, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACY:

H. R. 2064. A bill for the relief of Michael Palazotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2065. A bill for the relief of Jean Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2066. A bill for the relief of Domingos T. Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2067. A bill for the relief of Alexander H. Salgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2068. A bill to provide terminal leave pay for certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of William Park Catchpole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of B. John Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION:

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of Eaph Toler; 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:

125. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of municipal employees, city of Logansport, Ind., favoring amendment of the Social Security Act to include municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

126. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Bronx Post, No. 64, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Bronx, N. Y., urging enlargement of the classes of disabled veterans entitled to free grants of automobiles and amendment to the law fixing the limiting date so that veterans otherwise eligible shall have time necessary to qualify themselves for the benefits of that program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

127. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Yugoslav National Committee in London, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to political freedom in Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we pray for the Members of this body in their several responsibilities. Help them in their offices, in committees, and, above all, as they meet here in legislative session. May they never forget that what is said and done here is not done in a corner, but always under Thy scrutiny. May they feel the weight of their responsibility before Thee, and remember the influence of a good example, that all who come to this place may have a stronger faith in government of the people, by the people, for the people. May the Senators so speak and act that all who wait upon them and serve them may be inspired, rather than disillusioned, by what they see and hear and are asked to do. Lord Jesus, make Thyself real to these men, that each may feel Thee sitting beside him, and hear Thy voice, and win Thine approval in all things. So help them, God, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 17, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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