

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1807. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. S. 875. An act to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites; with amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2248. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 198). 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. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2814. A bill to amend the second proviso in section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 883); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 2815. A bill to provide hospitalization for certain persons who served in the armed forces of the United States in time of peace; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2816. A bill to provide that veterans who have 10 or more years of service to their credit for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act may receive credit for certain additional periods; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 2817. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2818. A bill to establish the position of Associate Director in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to fix the compensation therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2819. A bill to remove the 10-year limitation on the time within which certain claims against the United States must be presented to the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2820. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 2821. A bill to provide for the control and eradication of certain plant life in the navigable waters, feeder streams, swamps and marshes, and other waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2822. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate and foreign commerce of certain plants and seeds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2823. A bill to provide for a commission to adjudicate claims of American nationals who were prisoners of war of Japan, for payment of its awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2824. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2825. A bill to provide additional funds for cooperation with public-school districts (organized and unorganized) in Mahanomen, Itasca, Pine, Becker, and Cass Counties, Minn., in the construction, improvement, and extension of school facilities to be available to both Indian and white children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2826. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2827. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2828. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2829. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2830. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 2831. A bill authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of the streams, and their larger tributaries, flowing through the Brazoria-Galveston soil conservation district and the coastal plains soil conservation district, in Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. Res. 164. Resolution to create a House committee to investigate the mine explosion at the Centralia Coal Co., mine No. 5, Wamac, Centralia, Ill.; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mie Sagara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2833. A bill for the relief of Isa Okuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2834. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Teiko Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 2835. A bill for the relief of Moy Siew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maymea Whittaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2837. A bill for the relief of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.; 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:

281. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of Slovak Catholic Sokol, Assembly 13, Lisbon Falls, Maine, Paul J. Rovnak, president, and John S. Karkos, secretary, urging congressional investigation of the Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

282. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of the Reverend Charles E. Mason, Manchester, Iowa, and 37 other citizens of Iowa, supporting S. 265, a bill to prohibit advertising of intoxicating beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, who didst promise that by faith Thy disciples might remove mountains, increase our faith, till we no longer are awed by difficulties and frightened by problems. Hold us by Thy mighty hand until doubts shall cease and we begin to believe. Then shall we find all things possible, even Thy solutions to the questions that perplex us. For this we do pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 27, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair submits the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that it be permitted to continue its present hearings until 2 o'clock this afternoon. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Appropriations Committee be authorized to hold a hearing beginning at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate from 4 o'clock this afternoon through Wednesday of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE W. FOLTA TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 1, ALASKA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, April 4, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of George W. Folta, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska, vice Hon. George F. Alexander, term expired. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOMINATION OF CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not intend to make an extended statement at this time, but for the RECORD and in order that no one may be mistaken about the importance of the matter now under consideration, I want to say that I shall not quarrel with the individual opinion of any Member of the Senate in connection with the question of the confirmation of these nominations, but I issue this solemn, and I believe completely true, warning to the Members of the Senate—that action upon these nominations is of the utmost importance, indeed is vital, to the best interests of the United States of America.

I shall not amplify that statement. I am merely saying at this time that whatever we do we should do with reasonable speed, affording opportunity for each Member who has convictions upon this question to express himself. We should proceed with this task, and the nominations of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission should be either con-

firmed or rejected, in the opinion of the Senate, so that the matter of atomic energy in this field of activity may progress in the interest of this country.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 22)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to \$15,000, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Indian Claims Commission, amounting to \$25,000, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISED ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1947 involving an increase in the amount of \$15,000, in the form of an amendment to House Document 101, Eightieth Congress (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DECLINE OF COTTON PRICES—REPORT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the investigation conducted by the Commodity Exchange Authority, relating to the drastic decline of cotton prices (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORTS OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Two letters from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the audit reports of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Archives Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chief Scout Executive of the Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that organization for the year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FINAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director of the national legislative committee, the American Legion, transmitting the final financial statement of the American Legion as of December 31,

1946 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Resolution 31

"Whereas the Congress did return the Public Employment Service to the respective States as of November 16, 1946, and provided for payment of all operation expenses by the Federal Government only through June 30, 1948; and

"Whereas the Congress has appropriated funds to meet the full cost of operating the Public Employment Service since January of 1942; and

"Whereas the Federal unemployment-compensation tax collected on pay rolls of employers has greatly exceeded the entire cost of the operation of the Public Employment Service and unemployment-compensation programs; and

"Whereas the States were required under the Wagner-Peyser Act to appropriate a portion of the expense for the operation of the Public Employment Service from its general fund up to and prior to 1942: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Georgia State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress be, and it hereby is memorialized to provide for the necessary funds to meet all operating expenses of the public employment services subsequent to June 30, 1948; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eightieth Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Georgia.

"Read and unanimously adopted March 19, 1947."

Two resolutions of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Resolution 27

"Resolution relative to congressional support for the Merced County stream group flood control project

"Whereas the Merced County stream group flood control project involves the control of a number of relatively small streams, which, at flood season, carry great quantities of water and threaten the destruction of large areas of valuable agricultural land in the geographical heart of the State of California; and

"Whereas the Merced County stream group flood control project has been authorized by Federal and State legislation; and

"Whereas the specific and immediate appropriation of funds by the Congress of the United States for this centrally located project would lend assurance to the people

of all parts of the State that the Congress intends to proceed with the more vital flood-control projects in California more quickly than the President's recommended budget would seem to indicate: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Governor and the State water resources board are requested vigorously to present to the Congress the need for the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the Merced County stream group flood control project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress is hereby requested to make such appropriation and the President of the United States is requested to approve the same; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate forthwith transmit copies of this resolution to the Governor, each member of the State water resources board, the State engineer, the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and each member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate forthwith transmit a copy of this resolution by air mail, special delivery, to the Honorable BERTRAND W. GEARHART, Representative in Congress from the Ninth Congressional District of California."

"Senate Resolution 28

"Resolution relative to congressional support for the lower San Joaquin River levees project

"Whereas the lower San Joaquin River levees project of construction of channel-improvement works and levee construction and reconstruction on San Joaquin River and tributary channels, consisting of and including bank revetment at scattered locations on the main San Joaquin River channel from Turner cut 9 miles west of Stockton upstream to mouth of Tuolumne River, and on Old River, Middle River, Paradise cut, and lower 5 miles of Stanislaus River; and levee extensions on main channel near river miles 63, 106 and 118, and raising existing levees at various locations on main channel between river miles 60 to 125 and on lower reach of Tuolumne River; said project being described in House Committee Document No. 2, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and authorized by Flood Control Act, approved December 22, 1944; and

"Whereas the specific and immediate appropriation of funds by the Congress of the United States for this centrally located project would lend assurance to the people of all parts of the State that the Congress intends to proceed with the more vital flood-control projects in California more quickly than the President's recommended budget would seem to indicate: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Governor and the State water resources board are requested vigorously to present to the Congress the need for the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the San Joaquin River levees project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress is hereby requested to make such appropriation and the President of the United States is requested to approve the same; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate forthwith transmit copies of this resolution to the Governor, each member of the State water resources board, the State engineer, the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and each member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and House of

Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate forthwith transmit a copy of this resolution by air mail, special delivery, to the Honorable LEROY JOHNSON, Representative in Congress from the Third Congressional District of California."

A petition of members of Friendship Townsend Club No. 1, Miami, Fla., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a timely letter from H. W. Steele, of the Steele Oil Co., of Salina, Kans., urging a drastic cut in the Federal budget for the coming year and eliminating many unnecessary bureaus. I heartily approve of the stand taken by Mr. Steele, and ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEELE OIL CO.,

Salina, Kans., March 7, 1947.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you regarding the proposed budget for coming fiscal year. I feel very strongly that our budget should be cut drastically, much more than the Senate-proposed \$33,000,000,000 budget.

It seems to me that many savings could be effected by paring down many of the unnecessary bureaus which have been built up during the past 14 years of priming the pump and war. Ninety percent of all Federal employees that I have contact with don't start to put out a day's work, and usually there are three men for each job.

I have voted the Republican ticket all my life, and mostly in vain, so I believe since we have finally won a national election, we should show the American people and the world that a democracy can be run in a businesslike manner.

The Republican Party will be betraying the vote of trust given them at the last election if they do not pare Government costs, reduce income taxes, and reduce the Federal debt.

Yours very truly,

H. W. STEELE.

CHANGE OF NAME OF BOULDER DAM TO HOOVER DAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Honorable Robert Stone, former speaker of the Kansas State House of Representatives, urging the approval of the proposal to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Stone's letter printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., March 8, 1947.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I notice H. R. 140 has been approved by the Public Lands Committee and is now pending in the House. It is a resolution to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam.

I hope you will give this your wholehearted support because the dam should carry the name of the great engineer who happened at one time to be our President.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT STONE.

IMPENDING EXECUTION OF DOV BELA GRUNER—PROTEST FROM KONRAD BERCOVICI

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the very noted Konrad Bercovici enclosing a statement, with which I thoroughly agree, regarding the impending execution of Dov Bela Gruner, the Jewish war veteran, in Palestine. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bercovici's statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

On January 1, 1947, Dov Bela Gruner, a 33-year-old veteran of the British Army, was sentenced to hang by a British military court in Palestine for the alleged participation in an attack on the Ramatan police station April 23, 1946.

The only proof of his participation in that attack was the fact that he refused to explain when and how he had been wounded and also his admission that he belonged to a Hebrew organization of patriots.

On March 25, the British judiciary rejected a plea demanding that an appeal from the sentence be considered.

The rejection of this appeal made by Dov Gruner's lawyers for the setting aside of the sentence imposed upon him by a British Palestine court, is tantamount to legal murder. The reaction of all civilized people against our war ally will affect profoundly the relations between Great Britain and the people of the United States. I submit that it is in the interest of peace that our Government intervene before the execution of the Hebrew patriot whose crime was the refusal to submit to the invaders of his homeland. The whole world is now applauding those of our allies' people who fought against the invader and is condemning those who collaborated with him. George Washington too would have been hanged as a traitor by Great Britain had our revolution failed. The aftermath of Dov Gruner's execution may endanger the prospect of peace in this much embattled world.

Since we are the only country left in the whole world where democracy is not mere lip service, I urge this Congress to protest the execution of Dov Gruner, not so much for the saving of a life, which is precious, but because the execution of this patriot will make Palestine a bloody battleground, which will have repercussions in the entire Middle East with the gravest consequences to our own interests, our security and our peace.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report with an amendment the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, and I submit a report (No. 80) thereon.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the views of the minority of the Committee on Rules and Administration on the bill reported by the Senator from Illinois, and request that they be printed as part of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the views

of the minority submitted by the Senator from Arizona will be received and printed as part of the majority report.

INVESTIGATION OF POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report with additional amendments the resolution (S. Res. 81) authorizing the Committee on Civil Service to investigate the appointment of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the views of the minority of the Committee on Rules and Administration on the resolution reported by the Senator from Illinois, and request that they be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the views of the minority submitted by the Senator from Arizona will be received and printed (S. Rept. No. 81).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 990. A bill to amend title V of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, so as to provide that the transferee of any property transferred thereunder shall be entitled to all revenue derived from such property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 991. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 992. A bill to amend section 602 (v) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the payment of disability benefits to certain totally disabled veterans who had insurance in force on August 1, 1946; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 993. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. HAWKES introduced Senate bill 994, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 995. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 996. A bill for the relief of Jim Watanabe (alias Shinichiro Nomura); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 997. A bill to authorize the unconditional grant of all interest of the United States in certain school buildings and temporary housing to educational institutions without consideration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 998. A bill to provide additional funds for the fiscal year 1947 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate bill 999, to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937, RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT ACT, AND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code. It is designed to place these laws on a sound and workable basis and to overcome many of the numerous objections which have been raised by employees in the railroad industry and employers in the railroad industry to the many innovations which were contained in the so-called Crosser Act, which was passed in haste and under pressure at the close of the session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Many of the features contained in the Crosser amendments, which were so strongly advocated by the former head of the Railroad Retirement Board, were designed among other things to carry out experiments in social security and to enlarge the bureaucracy of the Retirement Board, thus providing thousands of new jobs for Government employees who would be paid out of the money contributed to the retirement fund. An analysis of the complaints indicates that railroad workers want their money spent for retirement benefits for themselves and their families, and are not interested in the hiring of additional Government employees. It also indicates their fear that unwise social experiments might endanger the soundness of their present retirement and unemployment insurance systems. This bill proposes to give them the benefits they desire most, at the lowest possible cost.

I opposed the manner in which the House bill 1362, which carried the Crosser amendments, was jammed through this body at the close of the session last year. On July 25, 1946, in the Senate debate, I said:

When this bill was returned from the subcommittee to the main committee, it contained 17 major changes in the existing railroad-retirement and unemployment-insurance laws, and it had in it 73 less important changes. I ask, how can we expect to have the respect of the people of the Nation if we

put a bill of this vast importance through a committee and are willing to enact it into law as it is written, just because we are coming to the close of a session.

This prediction, if I may call it that, has been borne out in the letters of protest which have been sent to my office by hundreds of railroad workers since the bill was signed into law last year. Many railroad employees are asking that the Crosser amendments be repealed in their entirety. Others are asking that they be amended. The general feeling is that the railroad workers, and particularly those among them who have long years of service to their credit, have had their pay-roll deductions increased to pay for a new system of life-insurance annuities for survivors, which they did not seek, and the workers' primary interest, which did lay in a substantial retirement annuity on a sound actuarial basis, received little consideration. Also, many are complaining about the elimination of death-benefit payments which has resulted from the Crosser amendments.

With respect to unemployment insurance, while the employees pay no tax in support of the unemployment insurance fund, they, as well as the carriers, have objected strenuously to the insurance for nonoccupationally incurred sickness and accidents, and the pregnancy and maternity benefits which were added by the Crosser amendments, for they feel these features represent an unwarranted burden on the fund. This bill represents a sincere effort to meet the objections which have been raised to the Crosser amendments and yet to maintain from an actuarial point of view integrity of the funds. It retains the desirable features of the Crosser amendments with certain reasonable modifications. It provides an increased maximum annuity for the employees. The result of these changes will make possible an immediate reduction of one-half of 1 percent and an ultimate reduction of 1 percent in the amount deducted from the employees' pay envelope for retirement purposes.

With respect to the unemployment insurance fund which is entirely maintained by the carriers, a merit system of pay-roll taxation is provided by this bill. This system is a sound and conservative one, similar to that now in effect in 45 of the 51 States and Territories of the United States. This merit system provides that payments into the fund be made on a sliding scale, based upon the amount of money in the unemployment insurance fund. It will avoid, on the one hand, unnecessary assessment of the railroads, while, on the other hand, it will preserve the integrity of the fund, insuring ample reserves to cover all of the demands which may be made upon it under any conditions known or foreseeable at the present time.

I have prepared, for the convenience of the Members of the Senate, a 1-page comparison of this bill with the amendments which were enacted last year, and ask that it be included in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from New Jersey will be received

and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the comparison will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 994) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue

Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HAWKES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the comparison presented by Mr. HAWKES was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Proposed bill	Crosser amendments
(1) Maximum annuity.....	\$135 per month.....	\$120 per month.
(2) Employees' 1947 tax rate.....	5¼ percent.....	5¼ percent.
(3) Employees' tax rate for 1952 and thereafter.....do.....	6¼ percent.
(4) Cash death benefit.....	Restored as accumulated up to Dec. 31, 1946, under the act of 1937.	Eliminated.
(5) Retirement of female employees at 60 years.....	Yes.	Yes.
(6) Disability retirement for any regular employment with 10 years of service.....	Yes; but disability must be occupationally incurred.	Yes; regardless of how disability was incurred.
(7) Disability retirement for work in regular railroad occupation with 20 years of service.....do.....	Do.
(8) Minimum annuity.....	Same as Crosser amendments.	
(9) Survivor annuities.....	Calculated on formula of Social Security Act—reduced about 25 percent from Crosser Act.	Calculated on 1946 formula with death benefit deducted.
(10) Unemployment benefits maximum.....	Same as Crosser amendments.	
(11) Unemployment benefits due to sickness and accident not related to employment.....	Eliminated.	\$25 for 26 weeks.
(12) Unemployment benefits due to pregnancy and maternity.....do.....	Do.
(13) Pay-roll tax rate for employers.....	Merit system with sliding scale from ½ to 3 percent based on fund containing sufficient balance to pay all benefits.	3 percent.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

Mr. CAIN. I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a bill which proposes three amendments to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

These proposed amendments represent the considered opinion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States—an opinion with which I most heartily concur. These amendments are as follows:

First. That a veteran should make a qualifying grade on a civil-service examination before his 5 or 10 points are added to the earned rating. Only a very few—approximately 3½ percent—of veterans seeking employment require the extra points to make a passing grade. Although insignificant in its results, the operation of this particular preference has been the basis for much of the unfortunate criticism directed against veterans' preference, which in turn has made enforcement of the act so difficult. The criticism has been raised that the act places a premium on incompetence because the veteran need not make a passing grade. In my opinion, the objection to this particular preference is well-founded, and in the interest of efficiency in government the veteran should be required to obtain a passing grade.

Second. That a veteran must have a disability rating of at least 10 percent before he is entitled to 10-point preference. Under existing law any veteran with a service-connected disability, even though such is noncompensable by the Veterans' Administration, is entitled to a 10-point preference, instead of the 5-point preference accorded other veterans.

The Congress has already established that 10 percent disability is the minimum for which any disability compensation would be payable. This dividing line ought in all fairness be carried over into this act, so that a veteran with 1 percent to and including 9 percent disability would be on a par with veterans—

many of whom have long combat service—who have not been rated with such minor disability ratings.

Third. That the veteran must have at least a 30 percent disability, service-connected, before his name automatically moves to the top of the list of eligibles. Under existing law a veteran with any degree of service-connected disability who obtains a minimum earned grade of 60 on an examination is eligible for appointment to a civil service job before another veteran who may have a much higher earned grade. As a result of the operation of this phase of veterans' preference, many veterans with distinguished combat records have been the object of unfortunate employment experiences. The Veterans of Foreign Wars has brought to my attention the case of a decorated veteran with 3 years of combat service. This veteran was a 5-point preference eligible, serving under temporary appointment as a contact representative with the Veterans' Administration. He took an examination for permanent appointment, and received an earned rating of 98—which, with his additional five points, resulted in a final grade of 103. He may be forced to yield his position to another veteran whose earned rating was less than 70 and whose disability was noncompensable by the Veterans' Administration. This amendment would still give the compensable disabled veteran a 10-point preference, but would require at least a 30-percent disability before his name would automatically "float" to the top of the list of eligibles.

I wish to take this occasion to compliment the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who, by proposing these amendments, have indicated an appreciation for the responsibility of their prestige and position which other groups might well emulate.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars co-sponsored the Veterans' Preference Act, and have continually carried the fight for compliance with the spirit and letter

of that act. The act has been in operation for almost 3 years, and this great overseas veterans' organization has come to doubt the soundness of its contentions in supporting those points which it now intelligently seeks to alter.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the record a letter I recently received from Omar B. Ketchum, the national legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and a copy of the bill I am introducing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Washington will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 999) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (1) of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (Public Law 359, 78th Cong., 58 Stat. 387) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) those ex-service men and women who have served on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States and have been separated therefrom under honorable conditions and who have established the present existence of a service-connected disability which is compensable under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or who are receiving disability retirement benefits by reason of public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the War Department, or the Navy Department."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. In all examinations to determine the qualifications of applicants for entrance into the service, 10 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under sections 2 (1), (2), and (3), and 5 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (4) of this act: *Provided*, That such points shall be added only to earned ratings which are equal to or greater than the minimum rating for qualification as announced by the Civil Service Commission for the particular examination: *Provided further*, That in examinations for the positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians competition shall be restricted to persons entitled to preference under this act as long as persons entitled to preference are available and during the present war and for a period of 5 years following the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President or by a concurrent resolution of the Congress for such other positions as may from time to time be determined by the President."

SEC. 3. Section 7 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. The names of preference eligibles shall be entered on the appropriate registers or lists of eligibles in accordance with their respective augmented ratings, and the name of a preference eligible shall be entered ahead of all others having the same rating: *Provided*, That, except for positions in the professional and scientific services for which the entrance salary is over \$3,000 per annum, the names of all qualified 10-point-preference eligibles whose service-connected disability has been rated by the Veterans' Administration to be 30 percent or more shall

be placed at the top of the appropriate civil-service register or employment list, in accordance with their respective augmented ratings."

The letter presented by Mr. CAIN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES.

Washington, D. C., March 24, 1947.

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: My assistant director, John C. Williamson, has advised me of your recent conversation with him, and of your desire to strengthen the principle of veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Since our cosponsorship of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, the National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, has devoted an appreciable part of its activity toward plugging the loopholes of the act and shoring up the various phases which, through half-hearted administrative practices, have become almost empty gestures of preference.

Law making is far from an exact science. The continual enactment of amendatory, clarifying, and perfecting legislation in each Congress attests to an almost axiomatic principle of statutory construction—that only through the operation of a law may one detect its weaknesses and question its purport.

This has been our experience with the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. On the one hand we have sought to strengthen the act by enlarging on the preference principle, and on the other hand, as in this case, we feel that we must further strengthen this principle by a reconsideration of certain preference factors which act as deterrents to efficiency in government as well as more wholesome employment experiences among veterans themselves.

The national legislative committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars, had this problem under study for some months. On March 7, 1947, at a meeting in Washington, D. C., the committee by an overwhelming majority voted to direct me to seek legislation in the Eightieth Congress which would amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 as follows:

First, that a veteran be required to obtain a passing grade before his 5 or 10 points preference has application.

Second, that before a veteran is eligible for a 10 points preference he must have been rated by the Veterans' Administration with at least 10 percent of service-connected disability.

Third, that before a 10-point preference eligible is placed at the top of the list of eligibles he be rated at least 30-percent disability, service-connected, by the Veterans' Administration. Those veterans with less than 30-percent disability would still be 10-point preference eligibles but would take their place on the list of eligibles in accordance with their augmented ratings.

It is our earnest hope that legislation will shortly be introduced in the Congress incorporating these amendments and that the Senate Committee on Civil Service will bring such a bill up for early hearings.

The interest you have expressed in these proposed amendments is greatly appreciated by this office.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,

Director, National Legislative Service.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—
AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Tur-

key, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON ECONOMIC SITUATION
(S. DOC. NO. 21)

Mr. TAFT, Mr. President, in the course of his testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Philip Murray submitted various economic questions, which I then submitted to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Mr. Griffith, the head of that Service, has submitted to our committee a report dealing with the present economic situation. His report is of such interest that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

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

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LIQUIDATION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE
SYSTEM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 918) to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the Selective Service records, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 13, to strike out "(a)"; on page 2, lines 15 and 16, strike out "Records. (b) Authority" and insert "Records and authority"; on page 2, line 23, strike out all after "tem" down to and including "1947" on page 2, line 25; on page 4, strike out lines 1 to 22, inclusive, and on page 5, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive; on page 5, line 5, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"; on page 5, line 10, strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)"; on page 5, line 16, strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; on page 5, line 17, after the word "employees", insert "(not to exceed 1,200 in number by November 1, 1947)"; on page 5, line 19, after the word "amended", insert ": Provided, That the compensation of such persons shall not be in excess of that provided in said act"; on page 5, line 20, strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)"; on page 7, line 7, after the word "section", insert ", or any person or persons who shall unlawfully obtain, gain access to, or use such records,"; on page 7, line 19, strike out "(a)"; and on page 7, strike out line 22, and on page 8, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to say that the House did not agree to the amendments reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee and adopted by the Senate. It is so important that this new board be established on or before next Tuesday that in talking with members of the committee it seems to be unanimously agreed that there is nothing else for the Senate to do but to concur in the House action, although we feel that the county record boards should be retained in being for the next 3 or 4 months. There is undoubtedly justification for the plan adopted by the House,

as there also is for the Senate plan. Our committee, in informal expression, feels it best to advise the Senate to concur in the amendments adopted by the House.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Can the Senator from South Dakota advise us as to the nature of the House amendments?

Mr. GURNEY. The amendments made by the House restored the bill to the form recommended by the President. There will be established in each State one central records office where all State records will be accumulated; and the records will be serviced there. The number of employees will be decreased from the present figure of approximately 7,200 to 1,200. The House has made it mandatory by an amendment that the number of employees in the new board nationally shall be reduced to 1,200 on or before November 1, 1947. I hope that answers the Senator's question.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, and that the President pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to sign this measure so that it can be sent to the President even though the Senate may not be in session tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make a brief comment on the suggestion made by the Senator from South Dakota. I think some objection should be raised, because I do not believe that the amendments of the House are in the interest of national security at this time.

Mr. GURNEY. I am in complete agreement with the Senator; and if there were any chance of properly presenting the case within the next 2 days, I think that would be the course to take.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the Senator from South Dakota is in agreement with me. Nevertheless, I think the record ought to be made perfectly clear, and the responsibility for this action placed where it belongs—not on the Senate, but on the House.

I think this is no time for such a liquidation of the Selective Service System of this country as is contemplated by the action of the House. I think that for the time being we ought to keep our Selective Service System operating on a county basis so far as the records and offices are concerned. I think it should be on a county-wide basis, in order to make it perfectly clear to the world that we will stand ready to defend the peace.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the bill during the recess of the Senate. Without objection, the order is made.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR A REPORT BY FORMER COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, perhaps out of order, I should like to complete the transaction which I started yesterday on the floor, but was asked by the leader on the minority side to discontinue at the moment. It has to do with the extension of Senate Resolution 77 which was adopted on January 31 last authorizing the extension of time for the completion of the report of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the Seventy-ninth Congress. They held hearings at San Francisco and perhaps at some other points in the West during the past summer. The shorthand reporter who took the notes was sent to the hospital before he had completed the transcript. On January 31 in order that the report might be completed we asked for and obtained an extension to March 31. The gentleman is still in the hospital, but his helpers are working on the report. We have an investment in this matter, and it will cost no additional money to complete the report.

Day before yesterday, March 26, I submitted Senate Resolution 97 proposing to extend until May 31, 1947, the time for the completion of the report. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands. I now ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that it be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire if there is any controversy about the situation.

Mr. BUTLER. None at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nebraska if this is the matter he referred to yesterday.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; it is the matter about which the Senator from Kentucky asked me yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 97? The Chair hears none, and the committee is discharged from the further consideration of the resolution.

The Senator from Nebraska now asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 97) submitted by Mr. BUTLER on March 26, 1947, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority granted to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys under Senate Resolution 315, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to July 30, 1946, relating to studies and investigations of matters referred to such committee, as heretofore extended, is hereby further extended to May 31, 1947, for the purpose of allowing additional time in which to make a report to the Congress.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF WILLIAM R. McCOMB

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as in executive session, I call attention to the fact that on the Executive Calendar there is the nomination of Mr. William R. McComb, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor. The nomination was taken up yesterday by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and by unanimous consent of the entire committee the nomination was ordered reported favorably. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be now confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that the nomination has the approval of all the members of the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no controversy about it in any way whatsoever?

Mr. ELLENDER. Absolutely none.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William R. McComb, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

HISTORY OF PROPOSED FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE LEGISLATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, yesterday I had intended to call the attention of the Senate to the fair employment practice bill introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

In the last session the bill to eliminate discrimination on account of race, creed, or color—the fair employment practice bill, S. 101—was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, of which committee I had the honor to serve as chairman.

The complete story of what happened to that legislation is contained in a summary report to the committee which I, as chairman, presented at the end of last year. In that report, which has been printed, I presented an objective and historical account of each measure which our committee considered. Because of the great interest in the history of this legislation, and because of the value it will be to anyone interested, I request that the historical account of the fair employment practice legislation which appeared in my summary report be printed at the close of my remarks.

The summary report points out that 50 witnesses, representing over 100 national organizations, appeared in support of S. 101, and, although the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], sought testimony in opposition to the bill, no one opposing it requested a hearing.

In view of the wide public demand for legislation to eliminate discrimination in

employment, because of the extensive consideration already given to such legislation, and because it is incumbent upon the United States at this time to prove to the world that democracy in the United States really operates for the welfare of all people, regardless of their race, creed, or color, I hope that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], my successor as chairman of the committee which will be considering Senate bill 984, introduced yesterday by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], will see to it that the bill is given prompt and speedy consideration. I hope also that when this bill is reported from the committee the Senate will act likewise.

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

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

On January 6, 1945, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry was introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, for himself and six other Senators. The bill, subsequently known as the bill for a Fair Employment Practice Commission, S. 101, was referred to this committee. The measure, with minor changes, was the successor to S. 2048, first introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress, with bipartisan sponsorship and which, after hearings, was favorably reported by this committee on September 20, 1944.

The bill was designed to eliminate discrimination in all employment relations which fall under the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Government. It forbade discrimination in (a) Federal employment, (b) employment under Government contracts, and (c) employment and activities affecting interstate or foreign commerce which are subject to Federal control in respect to labor relations. It applied equally to employers and to unions, forbidding discrimination by unions against members, employees, or employers.

A board of five members, to be appointed by the President, with Senate ratification, and to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, would be created to administer the act. The Federal courts would be empowered, after appropriate judicial hearings, to enforce cease-and-desist orders found to have been properly issued by the Commission.

Mr. TAFT introduced S. 459, a bill similarly designed to eliminate discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. It differed from S. 101 chiefly in that it did not provide for any judicial enforcement or judicial review.

A subcommittee of this committee was appointed by the chairman, Mr. MURRAY, to consider the bill, and hearings were set for 3 days, beginning March 12, 1945.

In the House of Representatives, within a month after the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress, 13 separate bills were introduced proposing the creation of a permanent FEPC. Because hearings had been held on almost the identical bill the previous session, the House Labor Committee, to which committee these bills had been referred, reported H. R. 2232 introduced by Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, without any further public hearings. The bill was reported on February 20, 1945. The Rules Committee held a series of meetings on House Resolution 146, Mrs. NORTON's request for a rule on the bill. The committee failed to give the bill a rule by a tie vote, 6 to 6. Thereupon, on April 27, 1945, Mrs. NORTON filed a discharge petition (218 signatures required to discharge the Rules Committee from consideration). On December 10, 1945, Mr. GORE, of Tennessee, informed the House that only 157 Members had signed the petition.

Mrs. NORRON then resorted to the parliamentary device, the rule of Calendar Wednesday. On Tuesday, September 25, when the customary request to suspend the next day's Calendar Wednesday was made, she objected. On Wednesday, September 26, however, within 15 minutes after the session began, Mr. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, moved the adjournment of the House, and it carried by a vote of 74 to 31, thus ending the calendar and legislative day. Later efforts by Mr. MARCANTONIO, of New York, were similarly unsuccessful.

In the hearings held by the subcommittee of this committee approximately 50 witnesses, representing over 100 national organizations, including major church, labor, educational, welfare, business, and race-relations groups appeared in support of S. 101. Although the chairman, Mr. CHAVEZ, frequently sought testimony in opposition to the bill, no one opposing it requested a hearing. S. 459 was opposed on the grounds that the bill would fail in its purpose because of its lack of enforcement powers.

The bill was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee on May 17, 1945, with a unanimous recommendation for favorable action by the committee. Some members of the committee had requested a week's time in order to see if a compromise bill could be drafted which the whole committee could agree upon. The request was agreed to and on May 24 when no compromise bill appeared possible the committee by a vote of 12 to 6 favorably reported S. 101.

On January 17, 1946, during the Senate morning hour and after the routine morning business had been dispensed with, Mr. CHAVEZ moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 101. Upon a roll-call vote, his motion was carried 49 to 17. Mr. CHAVEZ then began to discuss his bill. Later on, at approximately 3:45 p. m., Mr. MCKELLAR moved the adjournment of the Senate, which motion was adopted by a voice vote.

The following day, when the Senate convened, following the routine prayer of the Chaplain, Mr. BARKLEY, the majority leader, moved that the Journal of the prior day's proceeding be approved without reading. Mr. OVERTON objected and then moved to correct the Journal to include therein the prayer delivered by the Chaplain on the preceding day. The correction of the Journal and the appeal from a ruling of the Chair on a point of order—whether the correction of the Journal or the consideration of S. 101 was the pending business—remained the business before the Senate until February 7, 1946, when Mr. BARKLEY withdrew his appeal from the Chair, the motion to correct the Journal of January 17 was withdrawn, and Mr. BARKLEY moved approval of the Journal, which was approved by unanimous consent. S. 101 then became the unfinished business of the Senate.

A cloture petition with 48 signatures was then filed by Mr. BARKLEY. On Saturday, February 9, the vote on cloture was taken. The vote was 48 to 36, and lacking the necessary two-thirds, the cloture rule was not invoked. Mr. CHAVEZ then moved to displace S. 101 in favor of an appropriation measure. His motion was adopted 72 to 12, and S. 101 was restored to the calendar, where it remained until the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned.

A RETURN TO LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEM

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject A Return to Local Self-Government, delivered by him at the annual dinner of the Bar Association of St. Louis at St. Louis, Mo., March 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRISIS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Crisis in American Education," prepared by him for delivery before the Alabama Education Association at Birmingham, Ala., on March 28, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSOLIDATION OF AMERICA'S OVERSEAS AIR SERVICES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the bill to consolidate America's overseas air services, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND ECONOMIC STABILIZATION—ADDRESS BY EDWIN G. NOURSE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Public Administration and Economic Stabilization," delivered by Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, before the American Society for Public Administration on March 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ABUSE OF POWER—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Abuse of Power," from the Washington Post of March 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICE MAKERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Price Makers," from the Washington Post of March 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PORTAL-PAY BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Portal Pay Bill," from the Washington Evening Star of March 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISM—STATEMENT BY ERIC JOHNSTON

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives on March 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT AIR-LINE SITUATION—ADDRESS BY W. A. PATTERSON

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "An Appraisal of the Current Air-Line Situation," delivered by W. A. Patterson, president, United Air Lines, Inc., before the Bond Club, at Chicago, Ill., on January 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETO THREAT AGAINST AID TO GREECE—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Veto Threat Bars UN Aid to Greece," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY OF UNITED STATES—ARTICLE BY ELLIOTT ROOSEVELT

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article en-

titled "A Plea to America," written by Elliott Roosevelt and published in the Nation of March 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY GOVERNMENT IN GERMANY—ADDRESS BY MAX RHEINSTEIN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on military government in Germany, delivered by Max Rheinstein, of the University of Chicago Law School, Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BRICKER obtained the floor.
Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Connor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Overtown
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McGrath	Thye
Dworshak	McKellar	Tobey
Eaton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is necessarily absent on official State business, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from New

York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SUSPENSION OF NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that, as in legislative session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 69, House bill 1240, and Calendar No. 70, House Joint Resolution 76, the latter measure being a companion measure to the former. House bill 1240 would provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

I may say that the majority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has reported these two maritime measures from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He is unavoidably absent from the Senate today because of illness, and has asked me to present the bill and the joint resolution to the Senate for immediate consideration.

The two measures are emergent in nature. The present waiver of certain laws regarding vessel inspection and navigation standards would end on March 31, 1947, next Monday, with the expiration of the Second War Powers Act. If these bills are not signed by the President before that day every American flag line vessel now on the oceans, except possibly the liner *America*, would be sailing in violation of the law; the effect of non-enactment would be to take every American vessel off the ocean.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of the two measures, House bill 1240 and House Joint Resolution 76. I assure the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that all I contemplate doing is to make a brief explanation of what the two measures provide, and if it should appear that there is any controversy over them, and any undue debate ensues, I shall immediately call for the regular order, so that the Senate may resume consideration of the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on the basis of that assurance, I have no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska with respect to his request for unanimous consent. Have both measures been unanimously reported?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall have to ask a member of the committee to answer that question. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] can answer it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that the two measures have been unanimously reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They are both of an emergency nature. The Senator from Nebraska has explained them briefly. We must waive these navigation inspection laws in order to keep our passenger ships on the seas. The Army is very anxious to have this done because the transportation of troops is involved. There is no American ship now flying the American flag, with the one exception of the liner *America*—these measures relate to passenger ships—that would come strictly within the rules and regulations. We held a lengthy hearing on the measures. The majority leader is personally very much interested in the matter, and it is something which must be done this week.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my understanding is that the President in his message on February 3 requested extension of these two war powers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to propound another question. The extension of these powers was approved at the last session after a favorable recommendation by the Committee on the Judiciary. It is my understanding that no new matter has been inserted in the legislation, and that the measures merely provide for an extension.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For an extension, yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make a further clarifying statement respecting House bill 1240, which has to do with certain of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. The majority leader states that the bill gives the Secretary of War authority to waive vessel-inspection laws for those vessels operated by the War Department for the carriage of Army personnel and supplies all over the world. The War Department is operating some 15 such vessels on a bare-boat charter basis from the Maritime Commission. If the waiver authority is not renewed, the War Department will be prevented from bringing personnel home. Its own fleet of vessels, owned by it, are classed as "public vessels" and do not come within the purview of the vessel-inspection laws, but they would be wholly inadequate to take care of the War Department's problems. The waiver proposed by the bill would extend only to the end of the calendar year, December 31, 1947. I take it from that analysis that there is no new grant of power contained in the extension which we ask.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I may, I should like to say further that in the meantime, of course, the shipowners are doing what they can to withdraw the ships from wartime operations and place them under the navigation and vessel-inspection laws. But with respect to some of them it will require a year to accomplish that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 1240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1240) to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAIVER OF COMPLIANCE WITH VESSEL INSPECTION AND NAVIGATION LAWS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 76.

The joint resolution grants to the Commandant of the Coast Guard the authority to waive such vessel inspection laws as he deems necessary for any American flag vessel. The authority is continued for 1 year, to April 1, 1948. By that time it is expected that the majority of American flag vessels on the seas will conform to all statutory inspection standards.

It should be pointed out that we are not reducing safety standards by these bills. We are merely continuing the status quo so that American vessels may continue to sail. The standards are being constantly improved, but it has been impossible to meet the rigid high American standards, the highest in the world, with war-built vessels constructed hurriedly during the war.

The legislation is approved by all Government departments and by all shippers, as well as by the maritime unions. The President specifically requested their enactment in a message February 3.

I will say that both measures were passed by the House more than 2 weeks ago, and were reported to the Senate in exactly the form as passed by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the two maritime measures, House bill 1240 and House Joint Resolution 76, during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILLENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lillenthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David E. Lillenthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in the committee which considered the nomination of David E. Lillienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, I voted against the nomination. I welcome this opportunity to discuss with the Senate the reasons why I voted against Mr. Lillienthal. To that end it is my purpose to introduce for the consideration of the Senate evidence which is not in the printed record but is nonetheless fact. The Senate is entitled to every available bit of information. No Senator should cast his vote with any doubt in his mind as to whether or not he is doing the right thing for his country. When there is any doubt as to the qualifications of appointees they should not be approved. This is too important a place to fill with one who does not have the complete confidence of the Senate as well as of the people of our country.

Frankly, I wanted to vote with the President for the President's appointee. I listened to the testimony for weeks hoping that I could finally do so. I have been in an executive office, and I appreciate the responsibility that rests upon an executive to choose men for important places. If this were an appointment of a member of the official family of the President, I would go much further than I am willing to go in confirming the nomination of Mr. Lillienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In the Atomic Energy Act Congress has definitely laid down the policy, fixed the authority, and created a joint committee of the House and Senate to constantly keep in touch with the operations of this Commission. This Commission is essentially an arm of the Congress, the legislative branch, and in our consent we have a responsibility rising almost to the level of the original appointing authority. I wish these appointments might have been such as to receive the unanimous and prompt approval of the Senate. We had an instance of such an appointment when General Marshall's name was recently submitted to the Senate. His nomination as Secretary of State received unanimous support and acclaim in Congress as well as on the part of the public. This responsibility is so great that there ought to be the same general confidence on the part of the Senate and the people of our country that has been expressed in General Marshall as Secretary of State. But Mr. Lillienthal has been a controversial figure wherever he has held public office, from Wisconsin to Tennessee, and thence to Washington. Many trust him; many do not.

The issue before the Senate is not whether Mr. Lillienthal is a Communist. If the President of the United States should send to the Senate for confirmation the nomination of a Communist as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the President himself ought to be tried. But it is very difficult to ascertain Mr. Lillienthal's political philosophy, from our record or from his record. He testified that he is not a Democrat, a Republican, nor a Communist. He says he is an independent and a liberal. Those terms permit a variety of interpretations and being self-proclaimed

they help very little in our consideration of the propriety of this appointment.

The record does show that Mr. Lillienthal was a sponsor of the Southern Conference on Human Welfare. That is a perfectly laudable name and implies a very noble motive back of the organization. One can readily understand how Mr. Lillienthal would be induced to sponsor such an organization if he did not know about it and did not care to look into it. But Mr. Lillienthal was in a very important place. He was the head of TVA. His name had been broadcast to the country. He should have investigated and should have known that this was a Communist-front organization, not interested in human welfare but in carrying out the party line. An able administrator in his position would have made such an investigation before permitting the use of his name as a sponsor.

For weeks I have tried to separate the truth from the propaganda in this case. It has been difficult. There has been much confusing propaganda regarding Mr. Lillienthal and the power interests. I received many letters prior to the committee vote, and some since, charging that this is a fight between the Power Trust and Mr. Lillienthal, who, according to the letters, stood for the people. From 6 years' association with Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, I have some knowledge of the power and utility interests. I was contacted by the representative of one of the large power companies. He came to Columbus and took a couple of hours of my time one Sunday morning a short time ago attempting to prove to me that it was to the vital interest of the Republican Party to confirm the nomination of Mr. Lillienthal. This was the only utility man who talked to me on this matter at any time, during the hearing or since.

Likewise, I received many letters from scientists throughout the country asking me to vote for Mr. Lillienthal. It was difficult to understand the extreme interest in Mr. Lillienthal on the part of this group until there came to my attention since the hearing the following memorandum, which may account for many of the letters which I have received, and which, no doubt, many other Senators have received.

This announcement was on the letterhead of the Federation of American Scientists, 1749 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. It is dated February 21, 1947, which was during the hearings. The memorandum is addressed to member associations, from W. A. Higinbotham. I presume Mr. Higinbotham is the secretary, vice president, or a director of the association. This is what he said to members of the association:

This situation about the confirmation of Mr. Lillienthal looks better at present than it has for some time. I think we can take a great deal of credit for the effect of our efforts on his behalf. Other organizations and the press of the country have done a splendid job. It is hoped that the committee hearings will end this week and that the nomination will go to the Senate some time next week.

Our latest information is that at the moment the vote would be approximately 54

to 41 for Lillienthal. Obviously this is too close for comfort since you can never hope for anywhere near full attendance in the Senate. We cannot relax our efforts until the vote is taken.

There are some Senators who have not yet committed themselves either way and in their case it might be well to continue exerting what pressure we can in the form of letters and wires. They are: MILLIKIN, BALDWIN, RUSSELL, COOPER, SALTONSTALL, LODGE, FERGUSON, BALL, THYE, EASTLAND, IVES, LANGER, YOUNG, BRICKER, CORDON, MARTIN, MAYBANK, MURRAY, WATKINS, CAIN, REVERCOMB, WILEY, and MCCARTHY.

That is the end of the important part of the circular. Mr. President, my investigation has revealed that neither this association nor Mr. Higinbotham has registered under the Lobbying Act.

But the real question before the Senate is the competence of David Lillienthal as an administrator. Ordinarily that question is resolved by a study of a man's record. This country's economic system, in spite of what some few may desire, remains a capitalistic profit-and-loss system. In such an economic order Mr. Lillienthal has never operated. He is not a business man. He so testified. He never managed a business and made it work, nor has he operated in government where he was answerable to the taxpayers whose money he handled. He is a lawyer transformed, as he said, into an administrator. For 6 weeks I have tried to determine what he meant and now he qualifies under his own test. Remember, Mr. Lillienthal's whole experience from which we can judge is as a Government-kept man, spending the money of the taxpayers. Upon that basis a guide to determine Mr. Lillienthal's ability may be determined by applying these tests, which I have attempted to apply.

First. Can he efficiently, successfully, and economically handle this atomic energy project?

Second. Does he possess the desire and ability to work harmoniously with the Congress and Government Departments?

Third. Does he have the desire and ability to choose capable and loyal personnel to carry out the will of our people expressed in law?

In the first place, spending other people's money does not make a great administrator. Spending \$150,000 for publicity may make a popular one, but not a good one. In public office, as so many of us know, it is easy to spend money and very difficult to save it. During the whole of the first year that I held the office of governor of my State there was only one man who came to my office asking me not to spend money. Every other one, every other group, every other delegation wanted public money. So the test of an administrator, in my judgment, is not in the spending of money, or the amount that can be spent, but the effectiveness with which it is spent, and the saving of the taxpayers' dollars which is accomplished in essential operations. The record shows that in the TVA there were projects ranging from building dams to generating power, from manufacturing fertilizers to the curing of hams. Nine million dollars worth of fertilizer was sold in one year in competition with private industry, and \$2,000,000

was given away at TVA under Mr. Lilienthal as administrator.

A farmer from my home State appeared in my office a few weeks ago. He supported Mr. Lilienthal. He was a TVA experimental farmer. In consideration for the fertilizer which was given him he kept books and reported his results to the TVA. For a long time before TVA was ever thought of the farmers in my State were using fertilizer and keeping records of the results.

So with unlimited funds, with very little control over expenditures—and we had very little control over them, as Congress well knows—and things to give away to make people feel good, one can with proper publicity make himself well known and perhaps, in certain places, well liked, but certainly it is not a test of a great or even a good administrator.

The second test is whether or not the appointee can, and will, work willingly and thoroughly in accord with the Congress. I do not have to call to the attention of this body this fact—because too many have been here throughout the years when they have had association with the TVA and Mr. Lilienthal—that there have been constant irritations between at least a portion of the Congress and Mr. Lilienthal over his operation of the TVA. In the agricultural experiment work TVA did not cooperate with the Department of Agriculture, which was equipped and qualified to carry on such work, but chose to work outside the authority and direction of that important executive department. The record shows that Mr. Lilienthal was unwilling or unable to work with the colleagues chosen by the President in TVA. It is important to note that none of them appeared to testify for him in this matter. The record is replete with his difficulties with Dr. A. E. Morgan as Chairman of TVA.

We might have hoped that in this new and grave responsibility, Mr. Lilienthal would take a different attitude. As I shall later indicate, the record shows that he is carrying into this job the same practices that characterized his inability to work with Congress and his associates in TVA. So by this second test he falls far short of being a great or even a good administrator.

In the third place, a test of an administrator is his ability to choose proper men to work with him. In my judgment this is the most important test.

What was Mr. Lilienthal's record at TVA? I bring to the attention of the Senate, Mr. Clapp. He already has been disapproved by a committee of the Senate. That committee has voted against the confirmation of Mr. Clapp on about the same record as we had before our committee and upon the proof that Mr. Clapp is a mere shadow of Mr. Lilienthal, expressing his ideas and carrying out his programs.

We do know from the record also that there were communistic activities in the TVA. Some admitted before the committee Communist membership. Others admitted attending meetings where Communist matters were discussed. Mr. Lilienthal testified that he did not know

about it. A good administrator would have known about it and would have put an end to such activities immediately.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1938 and 1939, in which 6,100 pages of testimony were taken, as the Senator, I am sure, knows, involved a most thorough examination of all of the activities of TVA, and that there was not a single mention before that congressional committee by any witness of any communistic activity in the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. BRICKER. But there is plenty of mention of it in this record, and I am speaking of this record.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, when the Senator says there is plenty of it in this record, I wish to know to what he refers and to which witnesses he refers.

Mr. BRICKER. Several witnesses admitted it. Williams admitted it and Hart admitted it, others admitted attending meetings where Communist activities were discussed.

Mr. McMAHON. Is it not a fact that former Representative Starnes, who a short time ago conducted an investigation of Communists, found, after thorough investigation, three clerks who admitted membership in the Communist Party—three clerks among 18,000 employees? Is not that the extent of the Communist activity in the TVA, I ask the Senator?

Mr. BRICKER. I think the testimony in these hearings was that as many as 54 people were either associated with Communist activities or were members of organizations in which Communist activities were paramount.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator will find that in the whole set-up there were, not 56 or 54 members of the Communist Party, but 3 Communists who attended labor meetings at which 54 persons were present—which is quite a different thing from having 54 members of the Communist Party.

At any rate, the Dies committee—which I think can fairly be said to have been not inactive in seeking to bring to light evidence of Communist activities—after its investigation reported that there were three persons—messengers, I believe, or low-paid clerks—who had been members of the Communist Party. I say to the Senator that if he wishes to be fair, I think he will admit that in the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad or the B. & O. Railroad or the United States Steel Corp., or any other large corporation, there is likely to be a much greater percentage of such employees than in the TVA.

Mr. BRICKER. In such organizations there may be both Communists and fellow travelers; and the number of Communists in the TVA can be multiplied many times, in arriving at the number of those who might be considered fellow travelers. I was governor of my State, and I know that other Members of the Senate have been governors of their States. I can speak for my own State,

as I know they can speak for theirs. Among all the thousands of employees of the State of Ohio, when I was governor, if there had been a Communist among them and if there had been Communist meetings held anywhere or if there had been any subversive-organization meetings held anywhere, I would have known about it, and any State employees who might have been involved would have been dismissed immediately, as they should have been dismissed from the TVA organization.

One young man who was actively connected with many left-wing organizations came before us and testified to the fact.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. It is my understanding—and I should like to ask the Senator if my recollection is correct—that the investigation made by the Dies committee did not cover all employees of the TVA, but covered only those at Knoxville, Tenn., who constituted only a small fraction of the total number of TVA employees. I further understand that the number of fellow travelers and Communists who were found by that committee to be employed in the TVA were only those who centered around the Knoxville territory.

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to have that correction made.

Mr. OVERTON. It is frequently stated that only 9 or 10 or 12 Communists were found out of 54,000 employees, or some such number, when, as a matter of fact, the investigation was confined to only a very small portion of the TVA.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not know the extent of the Dies committee investigation. I have not read it, and I was not a Member of Congress at that time. In making up my mind concerning this matter, I have not relied in any way on the testimony developed in that investigation, but I have done so solely upon the record made in this case.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Is not the Senator from Ohio aware that Mr. Starnes, in testifying before our committee, stated that there was not a single scintilla of evidence or a single imputation which could fairly be drawn from their investigation that David E. Lilienthal was a Communist?

Mr. BRICKER. I have said that.

Mr. McMAHON. Or a fellow traveler or in any way tainted with communism?

Mr. BRICKER. I have said that already in my presentation.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the record show that Mr. Lilienthal, while connected with the TVA, took any vigorous action intended to discourage or stamp out communistic activities within that agency?

Mr. BRICKER. The record shows that he took no such action, and he admitted he did nothing about it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then it is interesting to speculate as to what would be the reaction on the part of Mr. Lillenthal, if he were confirmed for this position, concerning the recent order of the Chief Executive of the United States designed to purge all public agencies of Communists and communistic activities. That would place a great burden upon any person holding the responsible position which Mr. Lillenthal has been nominated to hold as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is exactly correct; and it also places a great burden on the Senate. A little later I shall follow up further in that regard.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not wish continually to interrupt the Senator from Ohio, but I think the record should be kept straight. I wish to inform the Senator from Idaho that the Atomic Energy Act contains a mandatory provision requiring that in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, unlike any other authority or agency or department of the Federal Government, there shall be an FBI investigation of all personnel before they are finally placed on the rolls of that organization. Of course, there was no such provision of law, no funds were appropriated by the Congress, and no authority was granted the FBI to make such investigations of Government employees generally throughout the Government, in all governmental departments and agencies.

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to have the Senator's suggestion, because it falls directly in with what I shall say later on that point.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What does the record show regarding whether the FBI has made an investigation of the Chairman and members appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission and also all of its employees?

Mr. BRICKER. I shall come to that matter a little later if the Senator will permit me to do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What does the record show about the 45 persons whose names were sent to the TVA in 1941, to be investigated as to their subversive activities? Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. BRICKER. What I have been reciting here is all the information I have. Does the Senator refer to some part of the Dies investigation?

Mr. FERGUSON. The employees' names were turned over by another agency and were sent to the TVA. Does the Senator know what was done by the TVA?

Mr. BRICKER. I admit I am not familiar with that.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Ohio is not familiar with it?

Mr. BRICKER. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was not put in the record?

Mr. BRICKER. No; not while I was there.

One of the young men, however, who was actively connected with left-wing organizations—and he testified before the committee—although not admitting that he was a Communist or connected with Communists, was promoted successively, until at the present time he holds a position, in one of the housing agencies of the Government, paying him \$8,200 a year. We do know from the record that there is serious doubt as to the motive back of the dismissal of one, Mr. Smith, in the TVA, who opposed Communist activities. He had been promoted also until the time when the radicals took after him and he was dismissed. This certainly should have come to the attention of Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has referred to the fact that Mr. Smith was dismissed. I suppose the Senator refers to Mr. James L. Smith.

Mr. BRICKER. He is the man.

Mr. HILL. Does not the record show that at the time when Mr. Smith was discharged, he had a hearing which lasted for 7 days, and a number of volumes of testimony were taken, and not in one line or word of the testimony was there any mention, directly or indirectly, to the effect that Mr. Smith's discharge occurred because of any Communist prejudice or Communist activities? Furthermore, is it not true that it was not until after question was raised about the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal to the Atomic Energy Commission that Mr. Smith ever said anything about Communists?

Mr. BRICKER. The record is replete with his testimony as to the Communists being after him and as to what differences they had had with him, and that they were the ones who were carrying on the prosecution and had the testimony taken.

Mr. HILL. Yes. But the Senator did not answer my question. The record shows that Mr. Smith testified before the Atomic Energy Committee that the Communist influence was responsible for his being discharged. But I asked the Senator whether it is a fact that in the hearings, which consumed 7 days, and in which volumes of testimony were taken on the question of whether Mr. Smith should be discharged, there is not a word or line of testimony from Mr. Smith or from anyone else about any Communist activities.

Mr. BRICKER. I am not relying upon that; I am relying upon the statement made before the committee.

Mr. HILL. I understand the Senator is relying on the record before the committee, but would not the better record be the record made in 1939, at the time Mr. Smith was discharged? In other words, before Mr. Smith was discharged in 1939, there was a hearing to determine whether or not he should be discharged. The hearing consumed 7 days,

comprising volume after volume of testimony, and in not one line or word in that testimony was any reference made to communistic activities. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. BRICKER. I have answered the question. I am relying upon the record made before our committee, and there is testimony in that record about it. I have not reviewed the other record. We are not trying Mr. Smith here, we are trying Mr. Lillenthal, who testified in this hearing that he did not know anything about that case. I am speaking to his record as an administrator.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right, the issue here is as to Mr. Lillenthal. But the Senator from Ohio is citing testimony from a witness, Mr. Smith. The witness, therefore, is subject to impeachment. The Senate has a right to know how much credence, how much confidence, it should place in this witness, James L. Smith, whose testimony the Senator is now citing. That is why I refer to the fact that in all the 7 days of hearings before Mr. Smith was discharged, on the question whether he should be discharged or should be continued in service, there was not one word from Smith or any other witness about any communistic activities.

Mr. BRICKER. I am not quoting Mr. Smith.

Mr. HILL. I go further and say that in 1938 or 1939 the same James L. Smith testified before the special investigating committee of which the late Senator Donahey of Ohio was chairman, a joint committee of the House and Senate, investigating complaints about the TVA, and not one word of his testimony before that committee makes any mention of any communistic activities, or anything of the kind.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator will note what I have said. I have not quoted from Mr. Smith's testimony, but, for the purposes of this record and in arriving at my determination to vote against Mr. Lillenthal, I have cited the fact that Mr. Smith had been a loyal employee, that he was discharged when the radicals took after him, and that Mr. Lillenthal testified he knew nothing about the case.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. All I want to say is that the Senator is right; that in 1947 Mr. Smith did make that statement before the Senator's committee on atomic energy, but in 1939, when there were hearings to determine whether or not Mr. Smith should be discharged and just before he was discharged—and he had a good lawyer, by the way, representing him at the hearing—not one word was said about any communistic activities or about the fact that the Communists were trying to have Mr. Smith discharged.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I understand perfectly what the Senator from Ohio is talking about. He is discussing the record that was before his committee, the record with which he is familiar.

I should like to leave this thought with the Senator: There have been millions of men who have been discharged in the United States who did not know at the time why they were discharged; and it is very conceivable that this man Smith, at the time of the first hearing, did not know the sinister efforts being made against him by communistic influences in the TVA. Communists do not always openly announce their purposes or objectives. When Mr. Smith found out about it he had a perfect right to bring it to the forefront and put it before the committee of which the Senator from Ohio is a member.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is entirely correct. I have not read the record to which he refers, but I do know of many instances of men having been railroaded out of their jobs in the Federal Government because someone set out to "get them," and the Federal Civil Service Commission gave them very little protection.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. It developed during the hearing before the Public Works Committee of the Senate that Smith's attorney, whom the Senator from Alabama described as a very able attorney, was an attorney of the TVA, selected by the TVA to represent Smith. That attorney was not an attorney of Smith's own choice.

The charges were brought by the UPWA—United Public Workers of America—which was recognized then, and is recognized now, as a frontal organization for Communist activities. That organization was formed in the TVA with the consent of TVA to compel Smith to confer with them from time to time. They disagreed with Smith about this and about that, I think intentionally, and they preferred the charges, and when the charges were preferred TVA selected the attorney for Smith, and it was TVA prosecuting Smith and TVA defending Smith. Of course, there was very little evidence brought out favorable to Smith.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield a moment further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. I think that if the Senator from Louisiana had read the record of the 7 days' hearings—I do not know that he did not read it, he certainly was not required to read it—

Mr. OVERTON. I heard the evidence before the committee.

Mr. HILL. I think that if the Senator from Louisiana had read those 7 days' hearings of testimony from Mr. Smith, he could reach but one conclusion, and that would be that Mr. Smith had an absolutely fair, impartial consideration of his case.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, many of the so-called Communists and radicals in the valley were adolescents enthusiastically working in the field, but somebody higher up was working at the job, agitating it, and promoting the activities. In my judgment, that inspiration was

within the TVA itself. Such activities might not be serious in the TVA, but they would be very serious in the Atomic Energy set-up. Moreover, employees of the TVA were engaged in activities outside of their duties which would bring discredit to the record of the administration of that Authority. There was testimony that the employees of the TVA were involved in agitating a strike, involved in labor organization disputes within the valley, involved with Guild difficulties with the newspapers of the community. So in the test of choosing men to work with him, which is a very important matter, Mr. Lillenthal does not measure up to a great or even a good administrator.

And now what is Mr. Lillenthal's record since assuming the responsibilities of Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission? That is a most important question.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. Before the Senator proceeds to another aspect of the subject, he is not unaware of the fact, of course, that some of the most prominent businessmen from the Tennessee Valley came before the committee and testified as to the high esteem in which Lillenthal is held in the valley. Of course, the Senator is aware of that.

Mr. BRICKER. I have heard the testimony, and I have tried to analyze it. Practically all of them have had favors of some kind from the TVA under Mr. Lillenthal's administration, but more significant than that is the fact that not one of those with whom he had been associated in TVA, in the administration of that Authority, came here to testify for Mr. Lillenthal, with the exception of Dr. A. E. Morgan, who testified against him.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator hear the testimony of Mr. Schlemmer?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; not only that, but I rode downtown in a taxicab with him that day after his testimony.

Mr. HILL. He is the head of a large woolen mill in Chattanooga, one of the largest in the South, and has worked with Mr. Lillenthal on TVA. Of course, the employees of TVA did not come here and testify. If they had, some would have said, "He just brought these men up here."

Mr. BRICKER. I said "associates," not "employees."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Schlemmer had worked with him. He is not with the TVA now. He is an independent businessman, who is operating a great mill at Chattanooga.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the testimony was, if I am not mistaken, that he was buying power from Mr. Lillenthal, and had very fine relations with him.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator should undertake to exclude everybody who is getting power from the TVA, there would be very few left to testify.

Mr. BRICKER. In the valley, that is.

Mr. HILL. In the valley, of course. The TVA serves everybody, from the

humblest citizen to the greatest industrial plant.

Mr. BRICKER. That is exactly true of the operations of the TVA in the valley.

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

Mr. BRICKER. Has the Senator a question to ask?

Mr. HILL. I was interested in the statement by the Senator that Mr. Lillenthal had not cooperated with the Department of Agriculture, and I was wondering whether there was testimony given, in sum and substance, to that effect, and whether that was one of the indictments.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; but his experimental work in the TVA was exclusive of the authority of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will yield further, does he not realize that in doing that Mr. Lillenthal was doing exactly what Congress directed him to do, and that that has been one of the great things about the TVA. Instead of operating, as the Senator would term it, or as most of us term it, as a bureaucracy spreading out from Washington, all over the country, and trying to run everything from Washington, the TVA sought to get maximum cooperation and maximum use out of the local authorities within the valley. That is essentially why the farm organizations and other units so strongly favor Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. BRICKER. It was also supported by Federal appropriations.

Let me proceed now, Mr. President, to the question of the record, since Mr. Lillenthal has assumed responsibility as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. At the end of the hearings, we finally received a report on the employees which had thus far been chosen by Mr. Lillenthal and his associates. It seems from the record that his associates had very little to do with the choosing. These records were certainly such as to challenge the interest, consideration, and thorough investigation by the committee. So at that meeting when we received this information, I moved first, that the committee employ competent counsel to make a thorough and intelligent investigation of these employees so that we might report it to the Senate. At the desire of the committee to vote and to report out these nominations that was turned down. Second, I asked that the personnel records of the Commission itself be put into the record before the Senate. That request was turned down on the ground that they were secret files. Finally, I asked that a complete analysis be made of those employees, especially where there might be some question as to their character, efficiency, or loyalty and that such analysis be included in the report of the committee to the Senate. That analysis was made but I do not think it is in the report. In order that it may be available to everyone I want to read to the Senate a memorandum, which is an analysis of the records of employees of the Atomic Energy Commission who had

been chosen under Mr. Lilienthal's direction.

MARCH 10, 1947.

Memorandum to Senator BOURKE B. HICKEN-
LOOPER.

Subject: Review of Atomic Energy Commission security files.

A careful review was made of certain of the security files on a few of the key employees in the Washington headquarters of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he proceeds further with the reading?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood, in connection with the question asked by the Senator from Connecticut, that the law required that the FBI should make an investigation of all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the law, yes. That was enacted by the last session of Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I to understand now that the record shows that the FBI investigated only some of the employees of the Commission, and that the list presented is only a partial list of the employees?

Mr. BRICKER. That is all I have here.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator from Ohio state whether or not the record shows that the FBI ever investigated the members of the Commission? It is a rule, for instance in the Judiciary Committee, for us to ask the FBI and the Justice Department to investigate the record of individuals appointed to be judges of United States courts. The FBI makes the investigation and submits the report to the Justice Department, and the report is available to the Committee on the Judiciary. I assume that the members who were appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission are somewhat like judicial officers. They hold high position. Was there or was there not an investigation made of the members of the Commission, either before they were named or after they were named?

Mr. BRICKER. If the Senator please, as soon as I finish with the matter I am now discussing, I shall make a complete statement on that point:

A careful review was made of certain of the security files on a few of the key employees in the Washington headquarters of the Atomic Energy Commission. A total of 23 files was reviewed, and out of this number, derogatory information of a significant nature was developed in 5 cases.

A brief summary—

And this is not mine—

A brief summary of the derogatory information in these cases is listed below:

I am reading from that summary.

1. John Lancaster Burling, age 34, married, attorney, member of the Atomic Energy Commission; legal staff. As a member of the United States Department of Justice, Office of Alien Enemy Control Unit from 1941 to 1946, Burling is reported to have given to an unauthorized individual information from Government files concerning an enemy alien. The file contains no further information concerning this incident.

I want to say, Mr. President, that anyone who would give out secret files of any department of the Government, important or unimportant, has no business on the legal staff of the Atomic Energy Commission.

2. Herbert S. Marks, age 39, divorced, general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, previously employed in a legal capacity at TVA and Bonneville from 1935 to 1940. Associated Gas & Electric Corp., New York City, 1940-41. War Production Board, 1941-45. Department of State (special assistant to Secretary), 1945-46. The record discloses that the applicant, Herbert S. Marks, is a strong advocate of state socialism. His integrity has been questioned by a number of people interviewed. He is said to have followed a policy of expediency in handling his work. He is believed by many to be completely a self-server. He has spoken in the defense of a number of left-wing individuals and groups. He is, or has been, a member of the Lawyers Guild and of the United Federal Workers. He was refused—

Hear me!—

He was refused a commission in the Navy because he "did not possess the requisite qualifications for appointment" (wording taken from a letter from Navy Bureau of Personnel to Marks).

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of fact, does not the record show that there was no information as to whether the disqualification was because of his lack of ability to pass the physical requirements of the Navy or for some other reasons?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator may remember that at the hearing I asked that that particular point be investigated. The record was sent back and a further check was made, and the record as it stands here now was confirmed. So there is no evidence any place that the disqualification was of a physical character, but rather that Marks was rejected because he was not qualified by reason of his left-wing associations, and I have read to the Senate the recital that was made in the record.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Unless the Senator has some additional information than was disclosed to the committee, there is nothing on the record submitted to the committee that would indicate whether he was rejected because he did not pass the physical test, did not have the physical qualifications required by the Navy, or for some other reason.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the able Senator from Ohio able to tell the Senate why the Navy files were not placed in the record, and why an investigation was not made to ascertain whether or not the cause was a physical defect or a mental defect?

Mr. BRICKER. I asked for that information, and, so far as I know, the investigation was made, and the action taken was based entirely upon the record, of which this is a review. Has the

Senator from California read that record?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Completely?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That which was submitted to the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. Has the Senator read only the survey, or has he read the complete record?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have read the survey.

Mr. BRICKER. I have read the complete record, and there is nothing in it anywhere to indicate that any physical defect prevented Mr. Marks receiving a commission. I think the remainder of the review, or synopsis, rather, will clarify that in the Senator's mind.

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

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that the remarkable course was taken by the friends of Mr. Lilienthal of presenting character witnesses as to Mr. Marks, who was not at all on trial before the committee? Were not several character witnesses for Herman S. Marks produced, and did they not testify in order to make a showing for him, and was that not done because it was realized that something was wrong with him?

Mr. BRICKER. I did not know at the time the reason why they were produced, but that might be the reason.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

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

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

Mr. McMAHON. I ask the Senator if it is not true that the record discloses that Mr. Marks resigned from the Lawyers Guild at the time of the split in that organization, when those who did not want to go along with what some believed were Communist tendencies and leanings resigned from the organization at the same time, if I am not mistaken, that Justice Robert Jackson resigned?

Is it not further true, I will ask the Senator, that the so-called character testimonials which were introduced in the record came only after a savage attack was made upon Marks' character? In view of the attacks which had been made on Marks' character, I am sure the Senator from Tennessee would not suggest that it was improper that he should call in, or try to have called in on his behalf individuals who could testify as to his real character.

I will ask the Senator further if among those who testified to Mr. Marks' character were not Mr. Dean Acheson, the Acting Secretary of State; Mr. Philip D. Reed, of General Electric; Mr. Donald Nelson, former Chairman of WPB; and a gentleman associated with the Detroit Electric Co. who worked with Mr. Marks under fire in London? The Senator from Ohio certainly remembers that character testimony.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not remember the testimony as suggested here. I remember witnesses came before the committee and testified for Mr. Marks, as did John Lord O'Brian also.

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

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

Mr. STEWART. I am interested in the remarks just made by the Senator, or rather the portion of his prepared statement from which he read concerning the reasons why Mr. Marks was refused a commission in the Navy, or admission into the Navy. Which was it?

Mr. BRICKER. He was refused a commission in the Navy upon his application for a commission.

Mr. STEWART. What was the basis for the refusal? Will the Senator state that again?

Mr. BRICKER. He was refused a commission in the Navy because he—and I quote from the Navy files—"did not possess the requisite qualifications for appointment." In parentheses appear the words "wording taken from a letter from Navy Bureau of Personnel to Marks."

Mr. STEWART. The question asked by the Senator from California would suggest that perhaps his lack of qualification was due to some physical defect. It seems to me that is an important point. Why can it not be ascertained whether or not the difficulty was physical or whether it was something else?

Mr. BRICKER. It may be well to have that done. I asked that the record be sent back for further investigation to determine that point, and the record came back with the same statement in it.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Along that line, on page 317 of the record appears the testimony of Col. Walker L. Cisler, Chief Engineer of Power Plants, Detroit Edison Co., who testified under oath that during the war he had served overseas and then later was transferred to the European theater of operations where he became chief of the public utilities section of the supreme headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Forces, as a member of General Eisenhower's staff. That is what Colonel Cisler testified, speaking of Mr. Marks:

And I could give you instances of where these men, Mr. Marks among them, were right up where the firing was going on. And I recall particularly in the Netherlands we were trying to get power back so that coal mining could be resumed, because we realized the importance of getting that coal mining going.

And the Germans had destroyed 80 percent of the power-generating facilities before they left. All that had to be repaired.

During that period, Mr. Marks was with me. He traveled with me in a jeep and in a command car. He slept with me, and he ate with me. And I think I know the man. There is no question in my mind. He is a 100-percent American. He is in no sense a Communist nor does he have any communistic ideas. I think he is a man of sterling quality, a man of great loyalty to our form of government.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. Did the Senator indicate a while ago that he had knowledge that Marks is unqualified physically?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to know about that. It is a matter which to me seems important.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely raised the point based on the record I had seen and on the information which had been given the committee, whether the Senator from Ohio perhaps had information which we did not have and which was never produced in the record itself which would show that Marks had been rejected either for one or the other reasons. The wording that was used in the report could have been used had Marks been rejected because of lack of physical qualifications.

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

Mr. BRICKER. Let me ask a question of the Senator from California before I yield. A commission was refused Marks, was it not, on the ground that he did not possess the requisite qualifications for appointment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I think that reason could apply to either requisite physical qualifications or these other qualifications. I am not arguing that point with the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. I have read many of the letters in this connection, and I believe that if the disqualification were physical the letters would have detailed what it was. The Senator may remember that I expressly asked that that matter be checked as well as one other point I shall refer to a little later on. The record was returned to the department, a further check was made, and there was no change in the language.

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further so I may pursue the inquiry I was making?

Mr. BRICKER. I will yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. In a matter of this sort I do not think anything should be left simply to guess. We are asked to pass upon the qualifications of the men who are appointed as members of the Atomic Energy Commission, and we are in a way, in performing that function, acting as a jury. I never thought it was wise to leave matters to a jury to guess about. If the application of Marks for a commission in the Navy was turned down by the United States Navy because of communistic tendencies and he was not fit to receive a commission in the United States Navy, then, so far as I am concerned, he is unfit for any other Government employment. I should like to know the facts about that matter.

Mr. BRICKER. Perhaps the remainder of the statement with regard to

Mr. Marks will give the Senator more light.

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

Mr. BRICKER. Let me read the remainder of the statement. I think it will answer, in part, the question asked by the Senator from Tennessee.

I continue to read from the Rhodes report:

The Navy Bureau of Personnel file further indicates that Marks "has a tendency to become allied and associated with radical actions and organizations. It has not been established that he is a radical himself, but the over-all impression is that his intelligence, energy, and enthusiasm have at times placed him in a position where his ethics and integrity have been criticized."

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. As I understand, that information comes from the Navy.

Mr. BRICKER. It is from the Navy personnel files.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The evidence is in this very record that Mr. Marks attended Communist meetings in Tennessee at or near the TVA. I read from page 240 of the hearings:

Senator McKELLAR. Now, I will ask you if Mrs. Elizabeth Winston Todd in this same Dies committee investigation did not testify to attending meetings with Frank D. Alexander, Melvin Siegel—

Incidentally, he has just been appointed on the Atomic Energy Commission, too—

Herbert S. Marks, Nelson Travis Barr, Mr. Niehoff—

And various others. This evidence shows that he attended Communist meetings at Knoxville, Tenn.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Of course, we do not know who made this investigation for the Navy. We do not know with whom the investigator talked. We do not know the source of his information, or upon what he based his report. We do not have the details as to who wrote the language in the Navy report. However, there is a gentleman whom I think all of us know, at least by reputation. I refer to Mr. John Lord O'Brian, of New York City. I think it would be the unanimous opinion of Members of the Senate that there is perhaps not an abler lawyer, a more estimable gentleman, and a finer American than John Lord O'Brian. As we all know, he is what is called a regular Republican. I suppose he has been a Republican all his life. Several years ago he was the Republican nominee for United States Senator from the State of New York. It seems to me that there could not be a better witness.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator mean to imply that being a regular Republican is a matter of commendation or of criticism?

Mr. HILL. In the opinion of many, regularity is a virtue.

Mr. O'Brian testified before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I shall not read all his testimony, because I do not wish to delay the Senator's speech. However, he stated that he met Mr. Marks in the winter of 1934-35, when he was special counsel for the Tennessee Valley Authority. He related that he was in contact with Mr. Marks from the winter of 1934 and 1935 to the early spring of 1939. He said:

I worked on briefs, worked in conferences, conferred with witnesses, did all of the work incident to that type of case. Mr. Marks was there practically all that time. I finished that work in the early spring of 1939.

He gives further details about his work with Mr. Marks, and states that when he came here to be general counsel for the War Production Board the first person he sent for, the first man he brought into his organization, was Mr. Marks. Mr. O'Brian stated:

The first appointment I made when I came there, in addition to the lawyers that were already there—there were five or six lawyers there at that time—was Mr. Marks; because of his character and his ability, I sent for him. He was the first person I sent for. He was at that time one of the chief counsel for the receivers or trustees of the Associated Gas & Electric Co. of New York. The trustees had been appointed by the court. First he was reluctant to come, because he was receiving a slightly larger salary where he was. His wife was very ill. She died shortly thereafter. And he did not want to break up his home. But he accepted the appointment.

Mr. O'Brian then told about the work which Mr. Marks did as his assistant in the War Production Board. Perhaps the most difficult problem he had was the problem of power. He speaks of the long-standing conflict between what he called public power and private power, and how Mr. Marks headed the Power Division for months; and even when he was not the head of it he did most of the work for the division.

Mr. O'Brian further stated:

Personally I have always thought that of all the work done by the War Production Board, there was no single division which made a greater contribution to the war than the Power Division, because electric energy turned out to be the lifeblood of war production.

Mr. O'Brian told what Mr. Marks did in that Division. Finally he said:

But I know this man intimately. And any suggestion that he is a Communist or has communistic tendencies, or has subversive tendencies, is just sheer nonsense.

Now, I say that with a full understanding of what I am saying.

He is a man who, from what I have read in the papers, one would think was much like Chief Justice Vinson. Marks is a self-made lawyer. He has never been in politics. I don't think he has ever made a political speech in his life. He is an earnest, hard-working lawyer of extraordinary ability, and a very fine man, and has a rather shy personal character.

I submit to the Senator that in view of John Lord O'Brian's intimate knowledge of and association with Mr. Marks, not for a few weeks or months, but over a period of years, there could not be a better or more credible witness than this very great and able and distinguished man, John Lord O'Brian.

Mr. BRICKER. There has been no criticism of Mr. Marks' legal ability, so far as I know.

Mr. HILL. No; but—

Mr. BRICKER. Let me finish my statement. There has been no criticism of his legal ability. I have not tried to make any. John Lord O'Brian did testify for him. John Lord O'Brian is an excellent lawyer. I in no way reflect upon him or his judgment. He has related his contacts with Mr. Marks. John Lord O'Brian thought so much of him that he asked for his deferment from the draft in order that he might help him carry on his work. During the time he was doing such work for Mr. John Lord O'Brian, no doubt he felt exactly as he testified.

Mr. HILL. The Senator does not deny what he said, that it was sheer nonsense—

Mr. BRICKER. But it is not sheer nonsense when the United States Navy turns down an applicant for a commission because he is not qualified, and because he has been associated with leftist organizations. That is not sheer nonsense.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I will yield for a question, but not for the Senator to read the record further.

Mr. HILL. This man who has known him intimately and worked with him through the years says it is sheer nonsense to say or imply that he has any communistic tendencies.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I think it is the responsibility of Members of this body to determine whether the assurance on the part of one individual attorney, whether he be from New York City or elsewhere, should be taken in lieu of the statement and recommendations of the Navy Department. So far as I am concerned, I should like more enlightenment on that score, so that we may know whether this man's appointment as chief counsel was either approved or recommended by Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. BRICKER. It was recommended by Mr. Lillenthal, and he was brought to the Atomic Energy Commission by Mr. Lillenthal from TVA.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then apparently, Mr. Lillenthal has completely disregarded the statement submitted by the Navy Department.

Mr. BRICKER. Evidently so.

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

Mr. BRICKER. Before yielding to the Senator from Iowa, let me state that I asked at the hearing that a more complete investigation be made of all these appointees about whom there was any

question, and that an attorney be chosen to make such complete investigation, in order that the Senate might have the truth and all the truth.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask the Senator to yield to me to make a correction. I know that the Senator is sincere in what he says. I merely wish to keep the record straight. Mr. Marks was employed by the TVA prior to the war.

Mr. BRICKER. From 1935 to 1940.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He came to the Atomic Energy Commission from the State Department.

Mr. BRICKER. I did not mean to imply that he was brought there directly; but he was in TVA. I want the record to be completely accurate. It must be remembered that Mr. Lillenthal brought Mr. Marks into TVA in the first instance.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is no question about that.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is there anything in the record indicating that Mr. Marks was at any time suffering from a physical disability?

Mr. BRICKER. I know of nothing.

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

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

Mr. STEWART. Is there not some way in which the Senate can obtain the information from the Navy? I should like to know the actual facts. If they trailed him, as they might have done, and found that he went to places where he probably should not have gone and associated with people with whom he should not have associated I should like to know it. I think the Senate is entitled to know it. This man is chief counsel of one of the most important commissions ever created, and this body is called upon to consider the nominations of its members. I should like to know about it.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree that the Senate should know.

Mr. STEWART. I am not satisfied with the testimony which has been read here concerning Mr. Marks. I want to know what the Navy meant by its report.

Mr. BRICKER. I asked that the Senate might be advised about it.

Mr. STEWART. Is there any way in which the Senate can obtain that information?

Mr. BRICKER. That is up to the membership of the Senate. I shall make a motion to that effect at the end of my presentation.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has been very kind and his yielding has been very helpful in clarifying the subject. I thank the Senator for his generosity in yielding. I am sure the Senator knows a most eminent citizen of his own State, a gentleman for whom I am sure he has the highest regard, a regard which I assure the Senator I share. I regret that the senior Senator from Ohio is not

present on the floor of the Senate, probably having another engagement, because I should like to have him listen for just a moment to the estimate of the newly elected head of the Federation of Churches of Christ in America, Mr. Charles P. Taft. In a telegram to the committee on the subject of Mr. Marks, Mr. Taft said:

I had occasion to work extremely closely for 3 months almost daily with Herbert Marks, general counsel, Atomic Energy Commission, under circumstances which gave me full opportunity to know his loyalty to the United States and his economic views. Any such charges as have been made against him during the hearings on the confirmation of members of the Commission are without foundation and truly outrageous. Such baseless attacks on a person like Marks, whose ability would command high position in practice of our profession but who desires to give his life to the public service, are unpatriotic and seriously damaging to the progress of the United States. Glad to testify if heavy schedule during next 2 weeks would permit.

CHARLES P. TAFT.

Mr. BRICKER. I have a high regard for Mr. Taft. But he did not listen to the testimony; he does not know the facts which I have brought before the Senate; he knew nothing of the record except by personal contact with Marks in an official position. The telegram may be more persuasive with the senior Senator from Ohio than it is with the junior Senator.

The third man I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate is Mr. Richard O. Niehoff. I read further from the Rhodes report:

3. Richard O. Niehoff, age 39, married, employed as training specialist by TVA from December 3, 1935 to June 5, 1942. OPA and National Housing Agencies 1942-1946. State Department for a short period late in 1946. Training specialist for the Atomic Energy Commission. Niehoff, according to information contained in the security files of the Atomic Energy Commission, attended Communist meetings in the Knoxville area while employed at TVA. It appears that if these were not Communist Party meetings they were attended by Communists, and at these, Communist affairs were discussed.

4. James Thomas Ramey, age 32, married, member of the Tennessee Bar Association. Employed 1941-47 by TVA, first as an assistant to the public manager, later as senior attorney. According to a report in the Atomic Energy Commission security files, Ramey, in making application for a passport on or about April 20, 1937, crossed out the words "and defend" on the application and inserted in longhand following the words "United States" this statement: "and will so far as my conscience will allow, defend it." The report also discloses that as a student at Columbia University Law School, he became involved in an argument over the administration of the moot court, and during this caused to be printed inflammatory matter concerning the dean of the school. When called before the dean, Ramey admitted the statements were untrue. It was also reliably reported that while in the TVA legal department Ramey urged that certain evidence, which by the preponderant weight of authority was inadmissible, be brought to the attention of the court through some accidental extrajudicial method.

After this testimony was brought before the committee in executive session I asked if he might be a member of some

religious faith which was, as a matter of principle and conscience, opposed to the taking of an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States. So far as I know, that record was sent back also; it is my understanding that it was sent back for the purpose of a check upon that question. But this is the record as it is now before the Atomic Energy Commission in its security files, and as it was presented to the committee which investigated these appointments.

I continue reading from the Rhodes report:

5. Joseph Volpe, age 33, married, member of the New Jersey Bar, present position deputy general counsel of Atomic Energy Commission. During the war Volpe served on the staff of Gen. L. R. Groves in the Manhattan project. In this position he was investigated, cleared for access to top secret information. It is to be noted that a thorough check and investigation of his background by the FBI failed to disclose any derogatory information concerning Volpe. However, as a result of investigation it was discovered that Volpe's brother, Edward, a New York garment worker, in 1944 applied for and was accepted in the membership of the Yonkers branch of the Tri-County Communist Political Association, 45 Warburton Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y., an affiliate of the Communist Party, United States of America.

I do not claim that Mr. Volpe was in any way responsible for his brother or for his brother's association with the Communist Party. There is nothing in the record which would damage Mr. Volpe's record. The only thing that caused concern was that although these records came to the Atomic Energy Commission on the 13th day of February, as I remember or the 15th day of February, they were not brought to the attention of the Commission, according to our information, until the 4th or 5th day of March. Perhaps by reason of poor administration somewhere in that establishment the Atomic Energy Commission failed to obtain the information as to its own appointees.

After a report on these records, I stated to the committee in executive session, with no member of the Commission present and with no employee of the committee present, that I intended to vote against Mr. Lillenthal's confirmation, and stated my reasons for it very definitely. I did that on the ground that here is positive proof that Mr. Lillenthal is carrying out in the Atomic Energy Commission the same kind of program that he instituted and permitted to be carried out in the TVA. Two of the employees, at least, to whom I have just referred, were personally brought by Mr. Lillenthal from the TVA. Here is proof positive that the appointee of the President tends toward the left, wants around him employees who are radically inclined, or else he pays no attention to such matters as I have just brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, please remember that that executive meeting took place on Friday. On Saturday morning I was called at my home in Columbus, Ohio, by a representative of a press association who gave almost a verbatim report of what I had said in the executive session

of the committee. On Sunday, the next day, an article appeared in a newspaper giving practically what I have related here to you. But it was not until Monday that we voted, and not until after that that this information was made public by me.

I want also to bring to the attention of the Senate the personnel set-up that has been instituted thus far under Mr. Lillenthal, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Atomic Energy Act provides for certain positions at certain salaries. Those positions have been filled. The law further provides that—

In the performance of its functions the Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission. Such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws.

Meaning the civil-service laws and the Classification Act.

I believe that provision is perfectly clear—that the Atomic Energy Commission was to effect an employment and salary scale within the range of all other Government operations as defined by the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, which provides a top limit of \$10,000, except for the unusual and unforeseen position which might from time to time have to be filled. But what set-up has the Atomic Energy Commission created?

The following positions have been created and excepted from the Federal Classification Act:

First. Herbert S. Marks, general counsel, salary \$14,000.

Second. Comptroller—now in process of selection—salary \$14,000.

Third. Edwin E. Huddleson, deputy general counsel, AEC grade 17, initial salary \$12,000.

Mr. President, they have not followed the civil-service classification, but they have set up an Atomic Energy Classification for their employees.

Fourth. Joseph Volpe, Deputy General Counsel, AEC grade 17, initial salary \$12,000.

Fifth. G. Lyle Belsley, Director of Organization and Personnel, AEC grade 17, initial salary \$12,000.

Sixth. Paul W. Ager, Director, Office of Budget, AEC grade 17, initial salary \$12,000—effective February 10, 1947.

Seventh. W. J. Williams, Deputy General Manager for Field Operations, AEC grade 17, initial salary \$12,000.

Eighth. John A. Derry, Assistant to General Manager, AEC grade 16, initial salary \$10,000.

Ninth. Richard O. Niehoff, Assistant to General Manager, AEC grade 16, initial salary \$10,000.

Tenth. Deputy general managers (in process) AEC grade 17, initial salary \$12,000. I do not know how many dep-

uty general managers they intend to appoint.

Eleventh. Other directors of offices and key technical positions at AEC grades 16 and 17.

All this, Mr. President, is under this new Atomic Energy Commission set-up, without regard to the civil-service laws or the salary schedules of the other departments of the Government.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Commission has generously provided that all those in so-called AEC grades 16 and 17 will be granted a \$1,000 increase in each of the next 2 years. Does further evidence have to be introduced that Mr. Lillenthal cannot live within the framework of established Government practice? Mr. President, the general counsel and comptroller of the Atomic Energy Commission, in violation of the spirit and in my judgment the letter of the law, are now being paid more than the Solicitor General of the United States and more than the Comptroller General of the United States.

There were many other positions ranging from \$9,700 down to \$3,773 under the Atomic Energy Commission grade. There were likewise 16 part-time consultants employed at \$40 per diem. This shows that the Chairman appointed by the President has a peculiar capacity for spending money and disregarding the ordinary standards set up by this Congress. In the face of such facts, how can Mr. Lillenthal be claimed to be a great or even a good administrator?

Moreover, the chairman of the Senate committee requested of the President a report on the appointees to the Commission and the General Manager. I read that letter and the President's reply:

FEBRUARY 25, 1947.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is approaching the close of its hearings and investigation upon the matter of qualifications of your appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Manager thereof. The committee is anxious to complete its work in order that a report to the Senate can be made in this most important matter at the earliest possible moment.

While the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 specifically authorized the joint committee to utilize the service, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of Government, the Senate section, sitting as such, does not seem to possess this authority and the Members of the Senate section believe that justifiable criticism can be directed if we do not exhaust all reasonable avenues for the securing of information upon which to base our final recommendation.

Because these are Presidential appointments the committee feels this matter should be taken up with you directly and primarily. The committee is also of the opinion that we will be asked on the floor of the Senate whether or not we have secured all available information.

The importance of these appointments being great, the committee feels obligated to respectfully request authority from you to any investigating agencies of the executive or administrative branches of Government to put into the hands of the committee all

information possessed by any such agency or branch bearing upon each of the appointees to the Commission and the General Manager thereof. The committee members further feel that it will be most helpful if you can see fit to make available to the committee such information and reports upon these appointees as may be possessed by you.

Among the agencies of Government from which the committee would desire information are, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army and Navy Intelligence Departments, the Intelligence Section of the Manhattan District, and such other departments and agencies as might have available information.

The appointees to the Commission, of course, are Mr. David E. Lillenthal, Chairman; Dr. Robert F. Bacher; Mr. Sumner T. Pike; Mr. William W. Waymack; Mr. Lewis L. Strauss; Mr. Carroll L. Wilson, General Manager.

The committee desires that I express our appreciation to you for your cooperation in this matter, and again I state that this matter is being respectfully submitted to you, rather than being taken up by the committee directly with the agencies involved.

Because the committee feels the urgency of taking final action at the earliest possible moment, this letter is being delivered to you by hand, with the hope that your action in connection herewith may be had at the earliest possible moment.

I have the honor to remain,

Most respectfully yours,

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Chairman, Senate Section,
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

That letter was answered on the 1st day of March 1947 by the President, as follows:

MARCH 1, 1947.

HON. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Chairman, Senate Section,
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HICKENLOOPER: I have your letter of February 25, in which you advise that the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy submits the request that I authorize the investigating agencies of the executive branch of the Government to present to the committee all information possessed by any such agency bearing upon each of the appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Manager of such Commission.

It has long been the established policy that all such investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department of the Government and that congressional or public access to them would not be in the public interest. I believe that it would be unwise to change this established policy and to set a precedent that would seriously prejudice the future usefulness of these investigating agencies.

For your information, be advised that the records of the investigating agencies of the executive branch of the Government were checked at the time the appointees in question were named to the Commission.

No derogatory information was contained in any report. Before answering your letter of February 25, I have had a current check made of the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army and Navy Intelligence Departments and the intelligence section of the Manhattan District, and I wish to advise you that no derogatory information with reference to any of the appointees to the Commission, or with reference to the general manager of the Commission is contained in the files of these agencies.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it from the letter of the President that he merely indicates that the files of the FBI and the other files do not show anything derogatory to any of the members. Does the Senator know whether or not that indicates that the FBI ever made an investigation, or is the reference merely to their regular, normal files of clippings and things which may be mailed to them?

Mr. BRICKER. The letter was written, I understand, on the basis of what was before these various boards at the time. No investigation was made. I say advisedly, and I think on authority, that no investigation was made of any member of this Commission when he was appointed. No investigation has been made since that time of any member of the Commission, or of the general manager, and no investigation was requested by the President of the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The question undoubtedly will recur again during the debate, so I feel I should clear it up.

Immediately following this letter I took the trouble to make inquiry, and I can assure the Senator that it is a fact that the FBI has never made an investigation of any member of the Commission or the general manager. I do not say that as affecting either side of this argument, but in the interest of having the facts on this issue, which we might as well establish at this time.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the truth of the matter is what all of us are trying to determine.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator find in the law that the joint committee, if it desired to hold a joint session, could have the FBI make an investigation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Without doubt the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has full authority—I have forgotten the exact language—to utilize the services, facilities, personnel, and equipment of all departments and agencies of the Government, which would include the FBI, in my opinion, in matters coming strictly within the jurisdiction of the joint committee. This was not the joint committee acting. This was a committee of the Senate, but, also, in my opinion—and I defer to others who are more familiar with the practice than I—the Senate section of the joint committee is a committee of the Senate, and did not have the authority to command the services of the FBI in an investigation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield for a further question of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Iowa agree that the law provides that the joint committee could use the FBI to investigate the manager or any

member of the Commission or any employee of the Commission?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Without the slightest doubt.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. In order to bring to the attention of the Senate the attitude of the Chief Executive, the President's letter said:

It has long been the established policy that all such investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department of the Government and that congressional or public access to them would not be in the public interest.

It might require legislation.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. In view of the statement made by the able chairman of the Senate committee, I wish to ask whether or not any effort was made to have the FBI investigate any of the members of the Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator directing the question to me?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; as chairman of the committee.

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I can say to the Senator from Tennessee that the committee authorized and directed, and I carried out the authorization and direction, that I get in touch with the FBI to request an investigation, if we were authorized to have one. The FBI—and I agreed—said they had no authority to conduct such an investigation, under the circumstances. These were Presidential appointments, and while the atomic-energy law requires that all employees of the Commission itself be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that does not apply to the appointees to the Commission.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator means those who are employed by the Commission?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. Therefore, when we encountered that prohibition of law, or custom, or whatever the situation is, as affecting these files as Executive files, we then took up the matter, and I wrote the letter to the President which was quoted a moment ago by the Senator from Ohio. Because they were Presidential appointees, and we took it up directly with him, with the request that this information be furnished us.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator knows that it is customary to have FBI investigations of men who are nominated for Federal judgeships and who have to be confirmed by this body. Is there some provision in the law creating this commission which prohibits such an investigation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield for an answer—

Mr. BRICKER. I yield further.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my understanding that the investigations of Federal judges and United States attorneys—

Mr. STEWART. They are likewise Presidential appointments.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Coming, as they do, under the Department of Justice, the Department of Justice itself is charged with the responsibility of making the investigations. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is an arm of the Department of Justice, and the Department of Justice, which in turn is charged with the responsibility for the qualifications of such appointees, uses in turn its subordinate department in order to inform itself, and in turn makes the recommendations to the Judiciary Committee. Outside of that, unless specifically directed, they take the position that they have no authority to conduct investigations for anyone except the Attorney General and the President, or as specifically directed by law.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. It has been suggested that Mr. Marks may have been suffering from a physical disability at the time he was refused a commission in the Navy. I should like to ask the Senator if his committee investigated as to whether Mr. Marks was under a physical disability at that time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio has accurately stated the procedure we followed. We had access eventually to the information files of the Atomic Energy Commission, which contained the report to which the Senator from Ohio referred, and the report did not clarify the reason. We sent back the report for further check, and a check consisting of several pages was added to the report. By that time the hearing was fairly well at the end, and the language of the original report was not altered, changed, or amplified, as a matter of fact.

Mr. KEM. Was Mr. Marks before the committee as a witness?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. Marks was not before the committee as a witness. It must be borne in mind that the name of Mr. Marks was not before the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. KEM. Was there any reason why he should not be called as a witness?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. None whatever.

Mr. KEM. Was there any reason why he could not be asked, "Were you under a physical disability at the time you were refused a commission in the United States Navy?"

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There was no reason whatever.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more observation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to suggest that the question of personnel, I think, in the minds of most of the members of the committee, is largely a matter of administrative policy and is not necessarily fundamental in connection with the matter of confirmation of appointees to a commission. I think the Senator from Ohio perhaps places a little different inter-

pretation upon certain qualities and qualifications than other members of the committee do, and perhaps he ascribes greater importance to that aspect of the matter than do the other members of the committee. But Mr. Marks was not before the committee for confirmation. He is an administrative or an executive employee, depending on his duties with the Commission.

Mr. KEM. As chairman of the committee, does the Senator from Iowa want the Senate to understand that there is no reason to believe that the rejection may have been on the ground of a physical disability?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I would be totally unfair either to those who support Mr. Marks or those who oppose him, if I drew any conclusions other than the conclusions that any Member can draw from the language contained in the record.

Mr. KEM. There is nothing on that point in the record?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not assume that the report conclusively says that he was unfit because of his social or broad political beliefs, nor do I assume that he was unfit because of physical disability. I can only rely on the printed statement in the record. I would have to make up my conclusions from that, and they are not clear.

Mr. KEM. I regret the Senator from Iowa cannot enlighten the Senate further.

Mr. STEWART and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the chair.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. I understand Mr. Marks has been employed as chief counsel for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BRICKER. That is right.

Mr. STEWART. Is it the Senator's understanding, then, that a correct interpretation of the law requires that Mr. Marks be investigated and reported on as an employee?

Mr. BRICKER. That is my understanding.

Mr. STEWART. As well as any one of the employees?

Mr. BRICKER. He is one of the employees.

Mr. STEWART. Has that been done?

Mr. BRICKER. It has been done for the Atomic Energy Commission by the FBI.

Mr. STEWART. Is the report available to the committee and to the Senate?

Mr. BRICKER. I cannot say; but a brief synopsis of the report was read by me a moment ago.

Mr. STEWART. That is the source of the Senator's information about the action by the Navy?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct. That is only a portion of it.

Mr. President, I have just read the President's letter to the chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee. The President, no doubt, felt that there was nothing derogatory in the record of these men, otherwise it would have been a crime to appoint them, and he would not have done it. But in this important responsibility the Senate should not be required to rely upon the judgment of the

President. Before we vote, we should have available to us these records in order that we can decide for ourselves if they contain any derogatory information. I am advised, as I said a moment ago, that no investigation has been made by the Department of Justice, the FBI, or any other department of the Government of the members of this Commission or the General Manager, and that the President did not ask for any such investigation. Such an investigation, I submit, should be made and this committee and the Senate should know the facts. The partial information that we have succeeded in getting—that which I have referred to regarding the employees hired by the Commission—came to us at the very end of the deliberations. Fragmentary as it is, that information not only reflects upon the ability of Mr. Lillenthal as an administrator but, in my judgment, proves his utter incompetence to build about him an organization to protect the interests of the American people in this vital field of atomic energy. One who was turned down by the Navy, one who qualified his oath of allegiance to his country, and others with leftist leanings reflecting upon their integrity and their loyalty to the country certainly and undoubtedly ought to be sufficient to convince the Senate of the necessity of denying confirmation to Mr. Lillenthal.

Here is a project that represents an investment of the American people of over \$2,000,000,000. It does not belong to the scientists, it does not belong to the Army, it does not belong to the administration, it does not belong to the left-wingers, it does not belong to any group of our people, but it does belong to the whole people of America, and it should never be put in the hands of doubtful persons. Before my vote in the committee, I received hundreds of letters. They were divided about evenly for and against Mr. Lillenthal. Since my vote in the committee I have received 322 letters and telegrams approving my action, and only 46 disapproving it. There is great doubt in the minds of the American people as to the competence of Mr. Lillenthal. I know there are grave doubts in the minds of many Senators. I likewise feel that there are but few on the floor of this Senate who would in the first instance have chosen Mr. Lillenthal for this vitally important place.

This is our last chance to clean up this organization. The Senate cannot police the job. We cannot fire the employees already chosen or hereafter to be chosen by Mr. Lillenthal and his associates. I am not voting against Mr. Lillenthal as an individual. I like him personally, but I do doubt his ability to do the job in the interest of the American people. He is not by any fair or true test a great or even a good administrator. I am voting for America, for my people, their safety and their security, and, it may be, for the betterment of the whole wide world. If we fail here, the results may be terrible; but if this job is properly done, the world may well have reason to acclaim our patriotism and our courage.

So, Mr. President, I desire to submit a motion. I move—

First. That the nominations of David E. Lillenthal, Robert F. Bacher, Sumner

T. Pike, Lewis L. Strauss, and William W. Waymack to be Commissioners of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of such Commission, be recommitted to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for their further consideration; and

Second. That the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy be authorized and directed to investigate the records of all officers and employees heretofore appointed by the Atomic Energy Commission, and to hold such hearings as may be necessary, with a view to ascertaining whether such Commission has acted in an improper or incompetent manner in the exercise of its powers of appointment; and

Third. That the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy request the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make a thorough investigation of each Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission and of the General Manager of such Commission, and to make a full and complete report concerning the results of such investigation to such Senate Members.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit with instructions.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. BRICKER. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the motion of the Senator from Ohio debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is debatable, and it is in order.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield the floor at this time.

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

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

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

Alken	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Connor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McGrath	Thye
Dworshak	McKellar	Tobey
Eaton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr.

BRICKER] to recommit with instructions to the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the nominations of members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, early in March of this year I appeared before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and informed the members about a certain Government corporation which I had been investigating. I told them that some of the facts I had obtained at that time pointed the finger of suspicion at one of the individuals whose name was before that committee for consideration. Unfortunately, at that time most of my report was based on suspicion only and for that reason I requested them to keep my report off the record. Perhaps this will explain why there is no mention of my report in the book on Senators' desks, but today I have on my desk a certified copy of the original charter of this corporation and also other certified facts and statements regarding the operations in the Tennessee Valley during the past 14 years.

Recently I showed a copy of the charter of this Government corporation, the TVA, to several Senators and asked them to assist in the investigation and render an opinion as to its legality. Yesterday the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] expressed his opinion as to the legality of this corporation, which can be found in the RECORD. Before presenting a copy of the charter for the RECORD, there are a few important facts to which I should like to call attention.

This corporation was so unusual that Auditor T. Coleman Andrews of the General Accounting Office in his audit report to Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller of the United States, dated May 1, 1946, thought it necessary to include this statement:

No act of Congress, Executive order, or Federal statute specifically authorized the creation of this corporation.

He further stated in his report that the ownership of the stock of this corporation by the United States Treasury was not consistent with any other cases. This corporation has often been referred to as a little farm project in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. President, I wish to inform Members of this body just what kind of a little farm project this particular corporation is. First, the name of the corporation is the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., the charter of which is recorded in book, Miscellaneous J, page 175, at the office of the secretary of state in Nashville, Tenn., under date of January 24, 1934. This particular corporation was organized, not by little Tennessee Valley farmers, as has been claimed, but by three men, namely, Arthur E. Morgan, Harcourt A. Morgan, and David E. Lillenthal. Mr. President, these men are not farmers; they are rather prominent employees of the Government.

In the organization of this corporation these men issued 100 shares of capital stock valued at \$1,000, not in their own names, but in the name of the United States Government, but they retained

unto themselves all the powers of administering the affairs and funds of the corporation, and it is expressly stated in the corporation's charter that the United States Government itself was owner of the stock in name only and would not even have the customary voting privileges.

Mr. President, perhaps under the circumstances it is just as well that the United States Government did not have any powers over this corporation, because I am informed that Members of Congress did not even know about the corporation until several years after it had been organized and in operation. In fact, I am informed that even yet they are unable to find in the record any act of Congress or Executive decree authorizing the creation of the corporation.

I wish to refer to some of the powers these men have under the charter of the corporation. Section 5 states that the minimum amount of capital with which the corporation shall commence business is \$1,000. Section 7 states that the corporation is to have perpetual existence. Section 4 of the charter states that the stock of the corporation is to be subscribed for by the incorporators but is to be issued and held in the name of the United States of America. I invite attention to this statement contained in section 4:

All rights and privileges of stockholders whatsoever, including voting rights, are to be exercised on behalf of the United States by the Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Section 9 further states that the number of the directors of the corporation shall be three, but that the directors need not be stockholders of the corporation. Election of the directors need not be by ballot. The directors shall have the power without the assent or vote of the stockholders to make or alter bylaws of the corporation.

We have a situation in which three men organized a perpetual Government corporation without the knowledge or consent of either Congress or the executive branch of the Government and conferred upon themselves the powers of czars, leaving the Government with only the financial responsibility.

Mr. President, we find under section 3 that the general nature and objectives of the business to be transacted and carried on by this corporation are as follows: To conduct and carry on the business of producing, raising, manufacturing, buying, selling, and dealing in farm products, livestock, goods, wares, and merchandise of every class and description; to lend or advance money; to guarantee the obligations or to endorse the notes of individuals, firms, corporations, or others with or without collateral or security of any kind whatsoever. Also included is the power to acquire by purchase, to hold, sell, or otherwise deal in stocks, bonds, or any other obligation or security of any corporation or corporations; to apply for, obtain, register, purchase, lease, own, use, sell, assign, or otherwise use or dispose of any copyrights, trade-marks, trade names, brands, labels, patent rights, letters pat-

ent of the United States or of any other country or government.

Mr. President, permit me to call your attention to the fact that under this charter these men have the power to trade, buy, or sell patents with any country in the world. That does not even except the atomic bomb.

In looking over the financial statements of this corporation I find that on March 12, 1934, it received Federal funds in the amount of \$300,000. So far as I have been able to determine, the only consideration which the Federal Government received in return for this unauthorized \$300,000 grant was a certificate for 100 shares of common stock, valued at \$1,000, in a corporation which they did not even know existed.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should prefer not to yield until I complete this presentation. Then I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. HILL. The Senator does not desire to yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware declines to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the event that that \$300,000 should prove insufficient for the operations of this world-wide corporation we find, under section 3, paragraph D, that those men conferred upon themselves the power to borrow money, to make and issue notes, bonds, debentures, obligations, and evidence of indebtedness of all kinds without any limit as to the amount—thousands, millions, or billions of dollars—all in the name of a corporation of the United States Government, which Congress did not know even existed. It is not my intention to attempt to rule on the legality of this corporation; but I cannot conceive how any man or group of men could be so presumptuous as even to think that they had the moral right to confer upon themselves such great powers—powers which exceed even those conferred upon the President of the United States by the Constitution.

Apparently the incorporators of this corporation have explained all of this with the simple statement that the corporation was created during the depression era for the purpose of administering relief; but the mere fact that they created the corporation with unlimited, world-wide powers, and extended the life of the corporation in perpetuity, absolutely refutes that explanation.

Mr. President, I am not charging those men with ever having used those broad powers, nor can I say that they did not use them. The period between 1934 and 1945 seems to be a closed book, and one which so far it has been difficult to open. The only facts I have recently been able to obtain about the operation of this unusual Government corporation are as follows:

First. On March 12, 1934, the corporation received \$300,000 of Federal funds without any authorization by Congress.

Second. In 1936 David Lilienthal and Harcourt A. Morgan exercised their

powers under the charter to appoint two men on the board to act for them.

Third. David Lilienthal admits that he and his associates in organizing this corporation were acting in their capacities as individual citizens, and not in their capacity as Directors of the TVA.

Fourth. The Tennessee Valley Authority did make contributions to this corporation in the form of supplies, and also some of the personnel of this new corporation were on the pay roll of the TVA.

Fifth. In a letter written by T. Coleman Andrews to the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, under date of May 1, 1946, he pointed out that David Lilienthal and his associates had entered into an agreement on July 12, 1935, with the Land O' the Sky Mutual Association, Inc., a corporation of the State of North Carolina, whereby the said Land O' the Sky Co. would act as the disbursing and collecting agency of the TVAC.

Sixth. Moreover, in the same letter, Mr. Andrews told Mr. Warren that David Lilienthal and Mr. H. A. Morgan had appointed two substitutes to take their places on the board. Mr. Andrews further cautioned Mr. Warren that the new directors of this Government corporation, the TVAC, have not held a directors' meeting since February 20, 1941, and that all of the records of the corporation and all of the activities of the corporation have been under the supervision of the Land O' the Sky Co., who in turn have appointed a certain Mr. John E. Barr and conferred upon him the power to operate this Government corporation.

Seventh. There is known to be one note dated June 1, 1942, in the amount of \$3,000, bearing interest at the rate of 2 percent, which John E. Barr, acting as manager for the TVAC, has loaned to the Land O' the Sky Co., and that note was unpaid as of June 30, 1945. Mr. Barr is the manager of both the Government corporation and the Land O' the Sky Co. which received the loan.

Eighth. There is a so-called Mountain Valley Cooperative, Inc. (address and sponsors unknown at this time), and the TVAC owns 4,000 shares of their stock, valued at \$20,000.

It is known that the TVAC has made a gift to this corporation, in which it owns stock, in the amount of \$7,000, apparently in cash. We also find that this corporation is still operating and is now recognized as a corporation of the United States Government. Yet under the charter of the corporation the Congress has no control over this illegitimate offspring, and so far the Congress has not officially recognized it.

I also understand that John E. Barr has had complete control of that corporation ever since 1941. I sincerely doubt that there is any man in the United States except John E. Barr who actually knows all that has happened within that corporation since that time.

Mr. President, for a few moments I should like to examine a part of the record of the TVA itself, to see what has been going on within that organization.

After the incorporators of the TVAC—the new corporation—had excused their irregularities by claiming they were a relief agency sponsoring and financing the organization of cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley area, and then when I found in the 1946 Annual Report of the TVA a note stating that there were also operating in the area 175 cooperative organizations which were sponsored by the TVA itself, I became more than interested. Therefore, I began an investigation. I not only find that 175 corporations were formed in that area during the past 14 years, but I also find that the TVA itself with Government funds has subsidized those cooperatives to an extent as follows:

1942.....	\$1,202,442.44
1943.....	1,472,767.26
1945.....	1,740,296.00
1946.....	2,066,511.00

Mr. President, I am sorry that those are all the figures I have been able to obtain in that connection. I do not know what happened in the other years. But those contributions were made by the TVA to those cooperatives, in the form of free merchandise, without any expense at all. I am not charging that the TVAC itself received any part of those contributions, since I have no proof. In fact, in a letter dated March 7, 1947, addressed to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and signed by David Lilienthal, he denied receiving any assistance. I quote from that letter:

No funds were at any time advanced to it by congressional appropriation or by TVA.

But I also find that that statement is contradicted by a statement in a letter signed by Gordon Clapp, general manager of the TVA, and the man scheduled to take David Lilienthal's place on the Board. I now quote from Gordon Clapp's letter:

The TVA did cooperate and assist in the objectives by making limited office supplies available to the TVAC and designating certain of TVA personnel to carry on the administrative functions of that corporation.

Mr. President, from that contradiction Senators can draw their own conclusions.

The officials of the TVA have tried to picture those organizations as being composed of groups of farmers engaged in reclamation projects in the Tennessee Valley. I have on my desk a certified copy of the charter of incorporation of one of those corporations, namely, the Norris Cooperative Society, Inc. I shall read a few sections from that charter to show what kind of cooperative organizations the Government has been sponsoring in that area with those millions of dollars. I read, first, a portion of the charter showing the type of business the cooperative was to engage in, or was engaged in:

(b) To produce, manufacture, buy, sell, store, handle, process, transport, distribute, deliver, and/or generally deal in and with farm machinery, implements of husbandry, building materials, household goods, dry goods, clothing, groceries, meats, foodstuffs, milk, cream, and all dairy products, farm products and supplies, fuels of all kinds,

gasoline, oils, greases, lubricants, and all manner of petroleum products, tires, tubes, and all automobile and motor-vehicle supplies and accessories, and commodities, produce, goods, wares, and merchandise and articles of commerce of whatsoever name, nature, character, or description; to conduct a general merchandising and mercantile business without limitation as to classes or products of merchandise; to grease, wash, repair, and otherwise service automobiles and motor vehicles and to perform and render other services to and for the owners of motor vehicles.

Mr. President, it is claimed that that organization was operating in the Tennessee Valley, but I find that the scope of operations of the organization was set forth in the charter as follows:

To associate itself with other consumers' cooperative societies throughout the State, the United States, and foreign countries for purposes of mutual aid; to advance the consumers' cooperative movement as a system of business.

Further in the charter of incorporation we find the following, in section (i):

The business or purpose of the society is from time to time to do any one or more of the acts and things hereinabove set forth and to have one or more offices to carry on all or any of its operations and business, and, without restriction or limit as to amount, to purchase or otherwise acquire, hold, own, mortgage, deal in, sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of real and personal property of every class and description, or rights or interests therein, in any of the States, Districts, Territories, colonies, or dependencies of the United States, and in any and all foreign countries.

Mr. President, as has been pointed out, the TVA officials have claimed that those cooperatives are composed of small farmers in the Tennessee Valley. I hold in my hand a list of the names of the incorporators of the Norris Cooperative Society, Inc. I shall read the names at this time. By the way, I wish to say that everyone of the incorporators is working for the United States Government. Thus, we find that we are not subsidizing small farmers in the Tennessee Valley, for the incorporators are Government employees. I now read their names:

R. G. Crossno, a creamery manager, drawing \$2,000 a year from the Tennessee Valley Authority; J. W. Bradner, Jr., drawing \$5,200 a year; R. L. Kidd, drawing \$2,000 a year; Marie White, \$4,000 a year; W. E. Lee, \$1.25 an hour; Robert Brandau, \$1,620 a year; L. W. Arthur, \$2,600 a year; L. Bolling, \$1,800 a year; and J. D. Williams, \$3,200 a year.

Mr. President, there is not a farmer in the group.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Can the Senator from Delaware advise us how many persons are required in order to incorporate a corporation in Tennessee? It would be interesting, in connection with the point now before us, to see whether they were acting merely as incorporators. I am very much impressed by the long list of names which has been read. Apparently, in incorporating that organization—under the laws of Tennessee, I as-

sume—more incorporators than were necessary were used. Let me inquire whether the corporation is chartered under the laws of Tennessee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That corporation is chartered under the laws of the State of Tennessee, and the record of it is filed in the office of the Secretary of State of Tennessee, in Charter Book, Miscellaneous M, page 121, under date of May 7, 1935. I hold in my hand a certified copy of the charter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator that if more than the minimum number of incorporators was used, that would tend to remove from our minds the idea that what are known as dummy incorporators were used. If more than the minimum number of incorporators were used, that would seem to indicate that the incorporators were actual incorporators, and not, in fact, dummy incorporators.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question which may help to answer the query of the able Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. First let me inquire the date of incorporation of the organization.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was incorporated on May 7, 1935.

Mr. FERGUSON. I may say for the record then, if the Senator will further yield, that in 1934, when the Tennessee Valley Cooperatives Association was formed—the organization about which the Senator first spoke—only three persons signed the articles of incorporation—indicating that in 1934 three were sufficient to incorporate.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to say, following the remark of the able Senator from Michigan, that if only three were necessary to incorporate at the time of the creation of this corporation, then the use of a great number of names would show that they were in fact incorporators and real actors in the creation of the corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator. I have here a certified copy of another of these cooperatives that were formed, named the Knoxville Cooperative Association, Inc. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read from this charter, but I will state that this group planned to engage in practically the same industries as those covered by the Norris Cooperative, and they have extended their authority to do business in any and all foreign countries. I shall read a list of the names of the incorporators of this particular corporation. I wish to say first that with one exception every single man listed as an incorporator is an employee of the United States Government.

By the way, a copy of this charter of the Knoxville Cooperative Association, Inc., is recorded in Book Miscellaneous M, page 125, under the date of May 8, 1935: Ned H. Sanford, \$6,800; Paul T. David, \$4,000; Bernard Frank, \$4,500; L. Lancaster, \$3,300; Howard P. Emerson,

\$2,600; Cecil E. Pierce, \$4,000; Laverne Burchfield, \$2,600; William C. Bowen, \$4,000; and Edward Thornhill, unknown, who apparently is not on the pay roll. In 1936, in an amendment, we find Bernard Frank, drawing \$5,200, added his name to the charter, and Howard P. Emerson, engineer, drawing \$3,200. Every man but one was on the pay roll of the United States Government.

Mr. President, during the course of my investigations I began to think that perhaps I was selecting the worst of the corporations out of a total of 175, so I went back to page 42 of the annual report of the TVA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should rather not yield at this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask a question about the Knoxville Cooperative.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should prefer before yielding to place all this information in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware declines to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On page 42 of the annual report of the TVA we find the Southwestern Virginia Cooperative Association, of Lebanon, Va., listed as a typical example of the cooperatives which they have sponsored. The report shows that TVA sold to this particular corporation 1,450 tons of fertilizer, and had assisted them in obtaining credit for \$100,000. On page 42 of the report it is also shown that this corporation was capitalized at \$10,000.

Here are some facts regarding this typical example which they did not reveal in their report. It is true that the TVA sold this corporation 1,450 tons of fertilizer, but I have concrete proof here that they also gave them free of charge 3,050 tons, with a market valuation in excess of \$85,000, about which they did not tell us. I also find that the loan, instead of being \$100,000, was \$175,000, at an interest rate of 2½ percent.

Here we have a corporation capitalized at \$10,000, and during 1946, the first year of business following their organization, the Government loaned them \$175,000, and also gave them free of charge \$85,000 worth of material for distribution to their customers.

It has been suggested that Congress should by law abolish the TVAC as a Government corporation; but I am not sure that we can do that. How can Congress abolish a Government corporation which so far the Congress has never created or authorized? I think the proper procedure in this case is for us by appropriate resolution to ask the Department of Justice to take action immediately to have the charter of this corporation revoked, and at the same time to institute proceeding to collect every dollar of the taxpayers' money, plus all interest charges, that has been wasted by these men in our name, and without our consent or authorization. It is time that we serve notice on all Government

officials that they are going to be held accountable to the people for their actions. The old slogan that "The King can do no wrong" is dead, and we are not going to revive it again in the American form of government.

Mr. President, this is merely a part of the record of David Lilienthal, this great business executive, but if this is a fair sample of his ability and skill in management, then I shudder to think what we will find when we investigate the Tennessee Valley Authority, a corporation into which the Government of the United States has poured more than \$700,000,000 during the past 14 years, and from which we have never yet had an accounting.

The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission will have within his jurisdiction power to control the destiny of the civilization of the world. Such power must of necessity be entrusted only to those whose personal ambitions are without any shadow of doubt submerged in a consuming desire to serve and preserve civilization and our own constitutional form of government.

Mr. Lilienthal is a man whose entire life has been dedicated to the procurement of more and more power, and to accomplish this ambition he has defied all the laws of our land by helping to create a Government corporation and conferring upon himself and his associates unlimited powers, in perpetuity, and for the purpose of administering these powers he has secured \$300,000, or perhaps even more of the taxpayers' money without seeking any authorization of Congress.

I think Mr. Lilienthal's philosophy is best described in these, his own, words:

This Government, and every government, is and must be a government of men and not of laws.

Therefore, Mr. President, I cannot and will not join in voting to confirm the nomination of such a man to a position where he will hold in his hands the power of preservation or destruction of the entire world.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a copy of the charter of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

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

STATE OF TENNESSEE CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY ASSOCIATED COOPERATIVES, INC.

First. The name of this corporation is the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

Second. The address of the principal of the corporation in the State of Tennessee is to be located at Knoxville, county of Knox.

Third. The general nature of the business and the objects and purposes to be transacted, promoted, and carried on by this corporation are as follows:

A. To promote, organize, establish, manage, finance, coordinate, and assist in any way whatsoever in the development of cooperative enterprises in the Tennessee Valley and contiguous areas; to hold and administer funds received from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and other Government

agencies for the cooperative enterprises to be fostered by this corporation; to set up, manage, develop, and finance a chain of cooperative enterprises throughout the above areas through the organization of subsidiary or related corporations whose ultimate members or shareholders will be the individuals engaged in the particular activity, agricultural, manufacturing, marketing, or otherwise, which the particular subsidiary or related corporation will control and operate, and which subsidiary or related corporations will ultimately organize their own central control and form an organization which will take over the assets and liabilities of this corporation; to receive and administer gifts or grants of money or property of any kind whatsoever.

B. To produce, raise, manufacture, buy, sell, deal in, and to engage in, conduct and carry on the business of producing, raising, manufacturing, buying, selling, and dealing in farm products, livestock, goods, wares, and merchandise of every class and description necessary or useful for the operations of the corporation.

C. To lend or advance money to, extend financial assistance to, accept bills of exchange, endorse the notes and guarantee the obligations of, individuals, firms, corporations, and/or others with or without collateral security of any kind whatsoever and to buy, discount, sell, rediscount, and otherwise deal in, notes, warehouse receipts, pledges, bills of lading, freight receipts, trust receipts, open accounts, mortgages, and other similar evidences of debt or to loan money and to take notes, open accounts and other similar evidences of debt as collateral security therefor.

D. To borrow money, and to make and issue notes, bonds, debentures, obligations, and evidences of indebtedness of all kinds, whether secured by mortgage, pledge or otherwise, without limit as to amount and to secure the same by mortgage, pledge, or otherwise; and generally to make and perform agreements and contracts of every kind and description.

E. To improve, manage, develop, sell, assign, transfer, lease, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise dispose of or turn to account or deal with all or any part of the property of the corporation and from time to time to vary any investment or employment of capital of the corporation.

F. To apply for, obtain, register, purchase, lease, or otherwise to acquire and to hold, own, use, develop, operate, and introduce, and to sell, assign, grant licenses or territorial rights in respect to, or otherwise to turn to account or dispose of, any copyrights, trademarks, trade names, brands, labels, patent rights, letters patent of the United States or of any other country or government, inventions, improvements, and processes, whether used in connection with or secured under letters patent or otherwise.

G. To the same extent as natural persons might or could do, to purchase or otherwise acquire, and to hold, own, maintain, work, develop, sell, lease, exchange, hire, convey, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of and deal in, lands and leaseholds, and any interest, estate and rights in real property, and any personal or mixed property, and any franchises, rights, licenses, or privileges necessary, convenient, or appropriate for any of the purposes herein expressed.

H. To acquire by purchase, subscription or otherwise, and to hold for investment or otherwise and to use, sell, assign, transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise deal with or dispose of stock bonds, or any other obligations or securities of any corporation or corporations; to merge or consolidate with any corporation in such manner as may be permitted by law; to aid in any manner any corporation whose stocks, bonds, or other obligations are (held or in any manner guar-

anted by the corporation) or in which the corporation is in any way interested; and to do any other acts or things for the preservation, protection, improvement, or enhancement of the value of any such stocks, bonds, or other obligations, or to do any acts or things designed for any such purpose; and while owner of any such stocks, bonds, or other obligations to exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges of ownership thereof, and to exercise any and all voting powers thereof; to guarantee the payment of dividends upon any stocks, or the principal or interest or both, of any bonds or other obligations and the performance of any contracts.

I. To do all and everything necessary, suitable and proper for the accomplishment of any of the purposes or the attainment of any of the objects or the furtherance of any of the powers herein set forth, either alone or in association with other corporations, firms, or individuals, and to do every other act or acts, thing or things, incidental or appurtenant to or growing out of or connected with the aforesaid business or powers or any part or parts thereof, provided the same be not inconsistent with the laws under which the corporation is organized.

J. The business or purpose of the corporation is from time to time to do any one or more of the acts and things hereinabove set forth and it shall have power to conduct and carry on its said business, or any part thereof, and to have one or more offices, and to exercise any or all of its corporate powers and rights, in the State of Tennessee, and in the various other States, Territories, colonies, and dependencies of the United States, in the District of Columbia, and in all or any foreign countries.

K. The enumeration herein of the objects and purposes of this corporation shall be construed as powers as well as objects and purposes and shall not be deemed to exclude by inference any powers, objects, or purposes which this Corporation is empowered to exercise, whether expressly by force of the laws of the State of Tennessee now or hereinafter in effect or impliedly by the reasonable construction of said laws.

Fourth. The maximum number of shares of stock which the corporation is authorized to have outstanding at any time is \$100, all of which shall be without nominal or par value.

This corporation is formed to receive a grant from the Federal Emergency Relief Corporation for use in financing cooperative enterprises in the Tennessee Valley area. The stock of the corporation is to be subscribed for by the incorporators and is to be issued and held in the name of the United States of America. All the rights and privileges of stockholders whatsoever, including voting rights, are to be exercised on behalf of the United States by the Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, acting severally, or by such person or persons as the said Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall appoint as their agent or agents to the same extent as if they were the actual owners thereof. Each Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall have the proportionate number of votes that the number of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority bears to the number of shares standing in the name of the United States of America.

Fifth. The minimum amount of capital with which the corporation will commence business is \$1,000.

Sixth. The name and place of residence of each of the incorporators is as follows: Arthur E. Morgan, Knoxville, Tenn.; Harcourt A. Morgan, Knoxville, Tenn.; David E. Lillenthal, Knoxville, Tenn.

Seventh. The corporation is to have perpetual existence.

Eighth. The private property of the stockholders shall not be subject to the payment of corporate debts to any extent whatever.

Ninth. The following provisions are inserted for the management of the business and the conduct of the affairs of the corporation.

A. The number of directors of the corporation shall be three and directors need not be stockholders of the corporation. Election of directors need not be by ballot.

B. The directors shall have the power, without the assent or vote of the stockholders, to make and alter bylaws of the corporation; to fix and vary the amount to be reserved as working capital; to authorize and cause to be executed mortgages and liens upon all the property of the corporation, or any part thereof; to determine the use and disposition of any surplus or net profits over and above the capital stock paid in, and in their discretion the directors may use and apply any such surplus or accumulated profits in purchasing or acquiring the bonds or other obligations or shares of capital stock of the corporation, to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as the directors shall deem expedient; but shares of such capital stock so purchased or acquired may be resold unless such shares shall have been retired for the purpose of decreasing the corporation's capital stock as provided by law.

C. The directors shall have the power, with the consent in writing of the holders of the voting stock issued and outstanding or upon the affirmative vote of the holders of the stock issued and outstanding having voting power, to sell, lease, or exchange all of its property and assets, including its good will and its corporate franchises, upon such terms and conditions as the board of directors deem expedient and for the best interests of the Corporation.

D. In addition to the powers and authorities hereinbefore or by statute expressly conferred upon them, the directors are hereby empowered to exercise all such powers and do all such acts and things as may be exercised or done by the Corporation, subject, nevertheless, to the provisions of the statutes of the State of Tennessee, of this certificate, and of any bylaws from time to time made by the stockholders: *Provided, however*, That no bylaws so made shall invalidate any prior act of the directors which would have been valid if such bylaw had not been made.

We, the undersigned, apply to the State of Tennessee, by virtue of the laws of the land, for a charter of incorporation for the purposes declared in the foregoing instrument.

Witness our hands this 23d day of January 1934.

ARTHUR E. MORGAN,
HARCOURT A. MORGAN.
DAVID E. LILLENTHAL.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BUCK. Is the Senator able to tell us from his investigation what became of the profits these corporations made?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot say what became of the profits of the corporations. Of course, we all know they are nontaxable, and, as cooperative organizations, they do not have to file any accounting with any department of the Government. That is provided in the law under which cooperatives are organized, and apparently that is the reason why they use the cooperative name.

That is merely a thought; I cannot prove it.

Mr. BUCK. Does the Senator assume that such profits as there were were returned to the buyers in the form of dividends?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am suspicious of that, but I have no proof.

Mr. President, I have concluded from my investigation of the TVA and the activities of these corporations that David E. Lillenthal's fundamental conception of government is socialistic.

We have had pictured to us and we have had the Tennessee Valley Authority described to us as a corporation engaged in the production of power for the good of the Nation. They admit being in the fertilizer business. I have a list of 14 different businesses in which the TVA itself is engaged, in addition to power and fertilizer.

First, the TVA is manufacturing in its own plants, or having other plants manufacture, under their patents, the following: First, trailer threshers. I might say that we exported 500 of those from their plants last year. Hay driers, overhead sprinkling systems, refrigeration, both commercial freezers and lockers, seed distributors, lime spreaders, feed grinders, for extracting tannin from oak slabs. They are now constructing a distillation unit at Muscle Shoals for the manufacture of cedarwood oil, plastics from walnut shells, fodder yeast from wood, laminated flooring, prefabricated houses, and last but not least, kitchen flour mills.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit with instructions.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say that I requested the Senator to yield earlier, but he said he would yield at the conclusion of his remarks, only.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator referred to a \$300,000 check which the TVAC cooperative had received. Would the Senator state where the \$300,000 came from?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was told that the \$300,000 came from the FERA. I was also told that the check was made payable to the State of Tennessee, and endorsed over to this corporation. Later I was informed that that was not a true statement, so I went to the office, or had made a call to the office, of Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, and asked for a certified copy of the check. I asked for a certified copy of that check in order to find out how this money was given to this corporation. As had happened in several other cases of records, it seems that this check has become lost. I was told that possibly it was down in Louisiana, but, thus far, they have been unable to locate it. I do not know how the check was written. I only know that it had been claimed by

both sides that it was written. I cannot understand why there is not somewhere in the department a record of that check, from which it could be seen who received the check and who cashed it.

Mr. HILL. The Senator referred to other checks having been lost. Will the Senator please state to what checks he refers?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say other checks. I referred to other records.

Mr. HILL. To what other records does the Senator refer?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not care to go into that at this time, but we do not think that all the records have been furnished. Some may have been included in diaries, for instance.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator said some other checks or other records were lost. I want to know what other checks or what other records were lost. That is what I was referring to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was referring to the \$300,000 check. If the Senator from Alabama can assist me to obtain further information about this check, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. HILL. I can assist the Senator by giving him the facts in this case, if he wants to get the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think I made it plain.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator state that the application for this money was made by the Relief Administration of the State of Tennessee, under the Governor of Tennessee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not state anything about how it was made, or by whom it was received, except that I said it was paid.

Mr. HILL. It was paid?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama, and I will later yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HILL. The Senator realizes of course that this \$300,000 was relief money, does he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps I could answer that best by asking the Senator from Alabama a question.

Mr. HILL. I should be glad to answer a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did the Senator know about the \$300,000 check before I mentioned it?

Mr. HILL. Oh, I knew about it when it came out in the testimony before the Public Works Committee, and I also knew about it from some past testimony with reference to the TVA. If the Senator will yield to me, I shall be glad to tell him what the situation was. The \$300,000 was paid in January 1934 by the Federal Relief Administration here in Washington, through the State relief administration, in the State of Tennessee; application for the money having been made by the State of Tennessee Relief Administration to the Governor of the State of Tennessee.

The Senator will recall that the Federal Relief Administration was the relief agency that was used prior to WPA. That money, \$300,000, was sent down there and, instead of using it in the form

of doles, simply to give people money, that they might not starve, that they might have some food and some of the necessities of life, they proceeded to organize cooperative associations and to use the money to encourage the farmers by helping them plant their crops, setting up canneries for the canning of huckleberries and blueberries, which grow rather luxuriantly in that section, and of vegetables and truck crops of different kinds. The situation was very desperate. There was perhaps no other section of the country in which the farm people were in such desperate economic condition, in which there were so many of them without the means of livelihood. In fact, the situation was so desperate in many sections in that area that farmers and their families were forced to wear old fertilizer sacks as clothing to keep from going naked. So, instead of doling out this money, what they did was to set up cooperative associations, as I have said, to encourage the farmers to plant and to bring in their crops, to can their goods after they were brought in, and to distribute them. That is the story about this cooperative association.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment. I should like to point out that this cooperative was not a relief agency, regardless of what may be said. It was not a relief agency, because it is still in operation. If it was a relief agency, why were the funds administered in the way described by the Senator? They were used to finance cooperatives who were not farmers. These men are not farmers. They are not wearing fertilizer sacks. They are drawing from \$2,000 to \$5,000 from the Federal pay roll. They are not in need of relief. There is absolutely no reason why the taxpayers of the United States should subsidize them to the extent of millions of dollars, through these cooperatives. I cannot say that they are all similar to the one I have been discussing, but I do say that the Senator does not know that they are not.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator. I am very much interested in the statement by the Senator from Alabama as to the purpose of this organization. I have here in my hand a certificate of incorporation issued by the State of Tennessee to the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, and I understand the Senator from Alabama to say that that was organized for the purpose of helping people by means of small cooperatives, in a time when relief was needed. If that be so, why did the directors of the Tennessee Valley Corporation organize this cooperative? Why did not those persons, the farmers or the people in their respective localities, organize the

corporation? That is the first question. Why did the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority including Mr. Lillenthal, do it? The three of them organized this corporation for relief. I understand the money went to Tennessee; why did not local people who were interested in the relief organizations form the cooperatives? Will the Senator answer that?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I will say to the Senator in that connection that there was a desire on the part of Dr. A. E. Morgan and Mr. Lillenthal, working with the State FERA organization, the State relief organization, to help those farmers, or to try to help them get on their feet; which they did.

As the Senator has indicated, those cooperatives are in existence today and are operating without any Federal funds. They received the \$300,000. That money enabled them to do the very thing they had sought to do, which was to lift the people out of their desperate condition, and also make provision for the future, which they have done.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware still has the floor. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, so much of a derogatory nature is being said about the State of Tennessee, that if the Senator will permit me I should like to say—

Mr. WILLIAMS. After the Senator from West Virginia has concluded I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the privilege of having something to say in defense of Tennessee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield later to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me finish. The point I am aiming at is this: What authority did Mr. Lillenthal, as a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, have to organize a corporation of this kind? I think that has a very pertinent bearing upon the question before the Senate. I want to be advised upon that subject.

The character of Mr. Lillenthal is certainly of importance in connection with our consideration of his nomination to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. As a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority did Mr. Lillenthal have legal authority to organize the corporation in question?

Mr. HILL. He certainly had authority under section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to do the very thing he did. I will say to the Senator that the leading man in the organization and the leading man in this work of relief was not Mr. Lillenthal, but was Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, as the letter from the counsel of the TVA clearly shows.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let us not go off on the subject of Dr. Morgan. We are talking about Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. HILL. The other day when the junior Senator from Michigan discussed

this matter it seemed to be believed that the decision had been made by Mr. Lillenthal, whereas the record shows that the leader, the main guide of this organization, was Dr. A. E. Morgan rather than Mr. Lillenthal.

If the Senator will bear with me in that connection I should like to read a copy of the letter from Mr. W. A. Sutherland, the general solicitor of the TVA, addressed to Dr. A. E. Morgan, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., under date of January 18, 1934. The Senator will recall that the cooperative organization was formed on January 25, 1934. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] read most of this letter, but I read the closing paragraph, as follows:

Since the matter is not to be handled by the Tennessee Valley Authority as such, the matter does not properly come before the directors' meeting of the Tennessee Valley Authority; but since you—

That is Dr. A. E. Morgan—

are committing Dr. H. A. Morgan, and Mr. Lillenthal, I suppose you will want their approval of the plan before the letters are sent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I think we are digressing. The point I am getting at, and I want information on it, is this: I want to know why Mr. Lillenthal, as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, organized the cooperative corporation, and under what authority of law he did so.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that he and Dr. Arthur E. Morgan and Dr. H. A. Morgan did not organize it as directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They organized it as individuals. But the work they carried on with that cooperative organization, and which the Tennessee Valley Authority carried on with it, is clearly authorized in section 22 of the TVA Act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let us see if he did not organize it as a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I read from the articles of incorporation:

The stock of the corporation is to be subscribed for by the incorporators and is to be issued and held in the name of the United States of America. All the rights and privileges of stockholders whatsoever, including voting rights, are to be exercised on behalf of the United States by the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, acting severally, or by such person or persons as the said directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall appoint as their agent or agents to the same extent as if they were the actual owners thereof.

Let me ask: Can it be doubted for a moment under that language, that Mr. Lillenthal, whose name was signed as an incorporator, was not acting for the Tennessee Valley Authority when he said that only the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority could be directors of this new corporation; either they or their agents; and when they took the stock of the new corporation in the name of the United States of America and appointed their own agents as directors? Does the Senator then say that the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority were not

acting in their positions as directors of the TVA?

Mr. HILL. No; but I say, Mr. President—

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me finish. Were they not acting as directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority when in signing the articles of incorporation of the cooperative they limited those who could hold directorships in the new corporation to the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. HILL. I refer to the letter that the General Solicitor wrote to Dr. A. E. Morgan:

You will note—

And this is written by the man who drew up this charter—

You will note that I have provided that the corporation is to be formed by the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority and not by the Tennessee Valley Authority itself. I do not believe the Tennessee Valley Authority is authorized under the act creating it to organize other corporations or to hold the stock thereof.

At best, the right is certainly very doubtful. It would be just as easy for the directors to organize the corporation and hold the stock in trust for the United States or to take the stock in the name of the United States, as we have done with the Electric Home and Farm Authority, Inc.

That is exactly what the lawyer who drew up the charter said, and that is exactly what he advised Dr. Morgan after he had drawn it up.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the certificate of incorporation from which I have just read, and which has been made a part of the RECORD, will speak for itself. There can be no question that when this new corporation was organized by Mr. Lillenthal and the other two members of the directorate of the Tennessee Valley Authority, they specifically provided in the articles of incorporation that only the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority could be directors of this newly organized corporation. Either they or their agents had to be the directors of the new corporation.

They had the sole power of selecting the directors. There were no stockholders. There were no beneficiaries. There were no people in need who could elect directors of this corporation. The directors of the new corporation either had to be the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority or their selected agents. That provision is expressly placed in the articles of incorporation, and that limitation is placed upon it.

In my opinion, this provision is germane to the question of the appointment of Mr. Lillenthal to the Atomic Energy Commission to this extent. If Mr. Lillenthal is a man who, when given authority, will go beyond that authority, will act without authorization of law, will step beyond his authority and organize another corporation without legal authority to do so, and organize it and place the power in the directorate on which he is serving, or in his agents, I have grave doubt that we should want to place a man of that kind in charge of the Atomic Energy Commission, or make him a member of that Commission, or

to have control of atomic energy. I am disturbed by that feature, because if Mr. Lillenthal did such a thing in the Tennessee Valley Authority, would he step beyond the law as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission? Those are the questions which arise in my mind on the subject. That is the reason I have discussed the articles of incorporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to read at this point one paragraph for the RECORD. I read from the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, section 2, paragraph 8, as follows:

No member of the said board shall during his continuance in office be engaged in any other business, but each member shall devote himself to the work of the corporation.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I promised I would yield to the Senator from Tennessee after the Senator from West Virginia had concluded.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to say that I do not recognize the right of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to state facts concerning the conditions which existed in Tennessee in 1934. I happened to be a candidate for reelection in 1934, and canvassed the entire State, and I say that whoever told the Senator from Alabama that there were people in Tennessee wearing cotton sacks or other kind of sacks for clothes and were starving there, told him an untruth. I know the Senator from Alabama was not in the State then and did not see the conditions for himself. He does not know them personally. Whoever told him that told him an untruth.

Mr. President, I should like to say one thing further—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

Mr. MCKELLAR. We listened to the Senator a while ago, and he would not be interrupted.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Tennessee—

Mr. MCKELLAR. Just a moment.

I went all over the State. As I stated, we had hard times in Tennessee, just as there were hard times all over the country. They were no worse and no better. We did not have any such times as have been described. I know personally that the statement which has been made is incorrect.

This corporation never made known to me what it was trying to do. It never made known to the people of Tennessee what it was going to do. It did not give to the people of Tennessee any of the \$300,000 which it obtained from some other agency of the Government, whether it was the FERA or some other organization. No benefit and no relief came to the people of Tennessee from the use of the money. I understand that the corporation, dealing for itself, lost the entire \$300,000 in those hard times. That is my information from Tennessee. I cannot vouch for that statement, but that is the best information I was able to get, after I learned for the first time about the corporation.

I keep up pretty well with the affairs of my State. I think I am fairly well known down there, and have been for a long time. I was well known at that particular time. The first time I ever heard of this corporation was when the distinguished Senator from Delaware found out about it and made the facts known to me. The corporation was a scheme for certain individuals to make money, and it seems that they lost money instead of making it.

I agree with the Senator from Delaware in everything he has said about entrusting one of the greatest offices of all time to a man who would conduct it as he has been conducting certain affairs in the locality wholly without authority. He organized a corporation which permitted him to do anything under God's sun. I cannot understand why the Senate should undertake to confirm the nomination of a man like that to such an office. I cannot understand how any Senator—even the Senator from Alabama, whom I have known for a long time, and who seems to be prejudiced in Mr. Lillenthal's favor—can vote for a man of that kind, who has conducted the office of Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the way in which he has conducted it, bringing no return to the people of the United States or to the Government of the United States. In a slick manner, behind other people's backs, he organized a corporation, not in the open light of day, but in a back-handed way.

It is not really a corporation. If I correctly remember the laws of Tennessee, I am quite sure that more than three individuals are required to organize a corporation. The application is on record, but I doubt if it was a legal corporation.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. HILL addressed the chair.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I gave the question of this corporation as much attention as I could, based upon the public records. The corporation was created, and then the mystery started.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Exactly.

Mr. FERGUSON. The General Accounting Office was unable to look into it and make proper reports on it. We have very little evidence on the subject. The able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] raised the question of the motive. I think we ought to go into the motive behind the creation of the corporation by those three men.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not only should we inquire into the motive, but there is a very unusual provision in the certificate of incorporation that only the directors of the Tennessee Valley Author-

ity may be directors of the corporation, and that they may appoint the directors. The directors are not elected in the usual way. If that activity is unlawful, and if Mr. Lillenthal engaged in it, the question is, Would he do the same thing as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may answer the question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe I can give an adequate answer to the Senator's question.

These three men started under the Tennessee Valley Authority. They wanted to carry on some propaganda so they could control the lives and business of the people of Tennessee and the surrounding States. They found that in the opinion of their counsel they could not do so under the Tennessee Valley Authority, so they used the subterfuge of a corporation, acting in such a way, as the Senator from West Virginia has suggested, that no one else could operate the corporation. They wanted to distribute \$300,000 of the taxpayers' money. They wanted to control every dollar, so that anyone in that valley who wanted any benefit from the cooperative would have to go to those three men and say, "Won't you please give me some of the Federal money?" I can read between the lines. If any man down there had said, "I will not be dominated by you," he would not have received one dollar of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I think we should look into the charter, just as the able Senator from West Virginia did. There was a motive behind it. The motive was clear. Those three men wanted to dominate the lives of the people in that valley, and they wanted to do it with the taxpayers' money. They have done it. No wonder they can bring farmers and businessmen here to testify.

I should like to see a real investigation. I should like to see these nominations recommitted. I should like to hear from a representative of the Navy as to why the Navy will not approve Mr. Marks for even an ensign's commission in the United States Navy. We have had no explanation as to why there has not been a thorough examination of this subject. These five names are not in the record which the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] read. Why are they not in the record? Because the committee did not go down into the depths to ascertain the facts as to those men. The time has come when the Senate and the people of America ought to know all the facts. I think the able Senator from Delaware has done a fine job for the Senate in digging into this subject. This may be a small matter. I cannot find reference to it in the printed hearings.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is not there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why not?

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is one of the reasons why the nominations ought to be recommitted.

Mr. FERGUSON. It appeared to the committee that this question had no bearing on the issue. I think it has a great bearing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order to keep the record straight?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Michigan has asked a few questions.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have the answers.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Delaware gave the answer a moment ago. He stated that he submitted this question to the committee in executive session because he did not have the facts, and he asked the committee to keep the subject in executive session.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the able Senator from Iowa why the Senator from Delaware was making this investigation when it was called to the attention of the committee. Why did not the committee go into the facts? The able Senator from Delaware could not find the facts. He is not a member of the committee. He took the question up with the committee. Why did not the committee investigate?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me so that I may reply to the question of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This matter apparently did not come to the knowledge of the Senator from Delaware, and certainly not to the knowledge of the committee, until the committee had practically completed its investigation. It was nebulous at that time. The Senator from Delaware did not at that time have the exhaustive information which he now possesses. Frankly, it appeared to the committee as having no particular bearing on the question of confirmation, and there was no evidence presented that indicated that it would have any bearing on that question. It is a matter which occurred a number of years ago. Inquiry was made and there was a complete lack of any suggestion that Lillenthal received one nickel out of the corporation or that he profited from it in any way. I submit to the Senator from Michigan and to the Senator from Delaware that there was no fact disclosed in connection with this corporation which cast any shadow of doubt upon the integrity, the honesty, the ability, or the intentions of Lillenthal, and we disregarded it for that reason.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course I am glad to have the statement of the Senator from Iowa, who is chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I do not know how much evidence was before the committee; but, as he has said, this information came at the end of the hearing.

I wish to put this question to the able Senator at this time: If the facts now disclosed to the Senate show that Mr. Lillenthal acted without legal authority, acted beyond the law, or in violation of the law, as a director, would it not be germane to inquire whether he might not do the same thing on the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If that question is addressed to me, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me so that I may answer it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to the Senator from Iowa in a moment; but before I yield I should like to say that I do not think that at any point in my remarks I have criticized the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. As stated at the beginning of my statement, I appeared before that committee and presented suspicions on my part. I felt that I should tell the committee about them. I am not criticizing the committee for not accepting those suspicions. The committee knew full well that I would make accusations only if I obtained the facts, and I waited until I did obtain them. I believe that if at that time I had had all the facts which I have presented this afternoon, the committee's decision might have been different. I am not criticizing the committee now. I want that statement in the RECORD. The committee treated this matter exactly in accordance with my request that I meet with them in executive session and not in a public hearing. I did not want to be in the position of condemning anyone until I had all the facts and proof. Today I have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of the charter. I did not have a copy of it at that time. I think the Senator from Iowa will admit that.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Delaware. That is my recollection of the situation, and I am sure it is the recollection of the committee.

To answer the question of the Senator from West Virginia, I will say to him that if I were convinced that Mr. Lillenthal had done anything illegal in this transaction, I would take a completely different attitude. But I submit to the Senator from West Virginia that there still is not one scintilla of evidence in the record that Lillenthal did anything illegal. A corporation was organized under the laws of the State of Tennessee, and it has never before been attacked. Its charter was duly and properly issued to men who were capable of forming a corporation. That authority has never been questioned. There is not the slightest evidence that one dollar of money was converted to the personal or selfish use or interest of Mr. Lillenthal. Prosecution has never been attempted or suggested. There has never been any evidence in the entire record that any violation of law was involved. If there has been such a violation, I ask the Senator from Delaware, who has spent a great deal of time on the matter, to

point out such violation. It would have some bearing on my thinking.

I will further say to the Senator from West Virginia that I may not agree with the philosophy of Mr. Lillenthal in his activities in the State of Tennessee; I may not think that I would act similarly if I were in the same circumstances; but I do say that I am not necessarily the arbiter of my brother's mind. I dare say there are many philosophies, ideas, and programs as to which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and I would be in disagreement, although I think we are generally in agreement.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There are not many disagreements between us.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not many. I may say further to the Senator from West Virginia that if we agreed on every single thing and every single philosophy I would think the Senator was crazy or I was crazy. I know the Senator is not crazy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Apparently I have not made myself clear to the able Senator from Iowa. It is not a question of dishonesty or the taking of money. No one is charging that. The point I make is that if Mr. Lillenthal, as a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, would constitute himself and certain associates the directors of the corporation referred to, when the law declares that he must devote his time entirely to the TVA and there is no authority of law for him to incorporate a company such as those whose articles of incorporation have been read here—if Mr. Lillenthal, as director of the TVA, feels himself beyond the law in that regard, may he not feel himself beyond the law as a director of the Atomic Energy Commission and step beyond the regulations and laws which Congress enacts? There is no question of dishonesty as to money.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield so that I may answer that question? I do not wish to trespass on his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I say to the Senator from West Virginia that upon the premise he has stated I agree with him unequivocally. If Mr. Lillenthal had the idea that he is beyond or above the law or has any desire to overstep the law intentionally and to arrogate to himself powers that are not given to him, I would vote against him. But there is no such evidence in the record, and I do not so believe.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator answer this question, in view of the statement which he has just made? Where is the legal authority under which Mr. Lillenthal acted in organizing this corporation? Is there such authority?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Quoting the words of Mr. Lindsay Warren—I do not have the exact quotation, but I think I can quote them almost exactly—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I may be able to tell him where the quotation is to be found. It is in the budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Warren says that no act of Congress or Executive order or Presidential decree has ever been issued authorizing the creation of this agency.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It was authorized under the laws of Tennessee. It was never claimed to be a Government organization.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The mere fact that this agency was organized under the laws of Tennessee by three men who acted in their capacity as individuals is sufficient. I do not know what greater proof the Senator wants that this man might try to usurp power not reposed in him. If David Lillenthal and the other two men had the right under the laws of Tennessee to organize a corporation and confer upon themselves the power to issue notes in the name of a United States corporation to the amount of millions of dollars if they wanted to, what is there to prevent any one of them from forming many more such corporations?

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, no one has charged Mr. Lillenthal in this case with attempting to take dollars and cents. It is not a question of whether the law of Tennessee permits that corporation to be incorporated. In effect, the real owner of the stock was the United States of America. The United States of America, in effect, formed that corporation. Under the laws of trust, there is no question but that the title to the stock was in the United States. Those men were acting as only trustees of that stock.

The question then is, Under what authority of the United States could that corporation be incorporated, and in that connection, under what authority could the United States be put in as the owner of the stock?

Mr. Warren has said, as shown at page 997 of the present budget—and he there is speaking about the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.:

No act of Congress or Executive order or Federal statute specifically authorized the creation of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

There we have it, in plain language. I should like to ask any Member of the Senate to point out the authority for incorporating that organization and putting the stock in the name of the corporation.

But, Mr. President, we must look further. The other day I said on this floor, and I now repeat, that that was a subterfuge; and the point is, in a case of this kind and of this importance, can we trust a man who would stoop to subterfuges?

Mr. President, I come back to this point: When the General Accounting Office, the accounting firm whose arms are the arms of the Congress, went down there to look into the matter, it was told by the Tennessee Valley Authority—Mr.

Lilienthal, "You cannot audit the books of this corporation." Why? Because they said, "No money of the United States ever went into it."

Mr. President, even the amount paid for the stock—the \$1,000—came out of the \$300,000 belonging to the United States. Was that a charity? Was that \$1,000, which was taken from the taxpayer's money, a charity, one of the charities that we hear so much about? No, Mr. President; that money was taken from the funds and was used to buy the stock, and was put back into the Treasury. Nevertheless, when the General Accounting Office attempted to audit the books of that corporation, they said to the General Accounting Office, "You cannot audit, because the Government does not own anything in this corporation." Yet, Mr. President, the Government owned the \$1,000, which was the cost of the stock of the three stockholders. Why could not the General Accounting Office audit? Simply because Mr. Lilienthal did not want anyone to look into it. He wishes to be all-powerful. He wants to control.

The result of that situation was that from 1934 until 2 years ago the Senate was unable to have an examination made of the books of the TVA. I should like to have everyone read carefully what the Senator from Vermont yesterday put into the RECORD in regard to how the books of that corporation were kept up to as late as 1945. Here we are in March of 1947, and we find that the books of the corporation have been audited only up to June 30, 1945, even after the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has been fighting upon this floor to try to obtain an audit of the books of the corporation. Then we find that we can, finally, obtain an audit. I wish every Senator to read it and then say, after reading it, whether the man at the head of that corporation is the kind of man whom we want to be over the entire atomic-bomb program.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the General Accounting Office keep away from a corporation which it thinks may be a Government corporation merely because someone in that corporation says, "No, go away; this is not a Government corporation"? Is that the yardstick according to which the General Accounting Office proceeds? Surely the General Accounting Office must have agreed that the corporation was not one which it should audit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think I can answer that question. The General Accounting Office never knew about the existence of that corporation until after the passage of the Byrd-Butler bill in 1945, I believe. That is why I say that that period is a closed book, and we do not know what happened.

As the Senator from Michigan has pointed out, it has been very difficult to obtain information in connection with this matter. I desire to read from the record of the hearings on the nomination

of Gordon Clapp, before the Committee on Public Works. At that time we tried to obtain from Mr. Clapp information about the 3,050 tons of fertilizer which had been given to the Southwest Virginia Cooperative, free of charge. I read now from page 192 of those hearings:

Therefore, the 1,450 tons of TVA concentrated phosphate referred to on page 42 of the annual report is not a gift, they pay us for it.

Senator WILLIAMS. Might I ask you why you separated that 1,450 tons and called it an experiment and later you called 6,800 tons as being sold? You sold both lots, or did you give one lot?

Mr. CLAPP. No; we sold both lots.

We were trying to obtain information in regard to the 3,050 tons of fertilizer. If Senators will read the record which was made then, they will find that he consistently denied, all during that day, that he gave that fertilizer. He maintained that he sold both lots of fertilizer. On page 253 of the record of the hearings, when Mr. Clapp was being interrogated on the same question, the following appears:

Senator WILLIAMS. Last Tuesday I asked you the question whether or not the TVA gave free of charge to this particular cooperative the 1,450 tons of fertilizer mentioned in that report, and at that time your answer was "No."

Do you want to change your answer to that?

Mr. CLAPP. No; I don't want to change my answer.

Senator WILLIAMS. All right.

Well, this is another question: Did you or did you not give to this Southwest Virginia Cooperative, free of charge, except as they paid transportation, an amount of fertilizer of 1,450 tons, or more, approximately, during that year? I would like to have a "Yes" or "No" answer on that.

Mr. CLAPP. I will be glad to look into it, Senator.

Senator WILLIAMS. You have answered once that you did not give that, and you said that you knew what you were talking about. And I am asking you now: Did you or did you not give it?

Mr. CLAPP. Senator, the sentence that is in the annual report, which you have referred to—

The CHAIRMAN. I think, Mr. Clapp, the question is quite clear, and you can give a "Yes" or "No" answer. Then, if you want to make an explanation, you may do so.

The question addressed to you is one of whether or not you did give that amount of fertilizer to that cooperative, less costs of transportation.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is right; that or more.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you or did you not do that?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. Chairman, the only way I can answer the question is to say that the 1,450 tons of TVA concentrated superphosphate referred to on page 42 of the annual report was not given to the cooperative.

Senator WILLIAMS. The question I will repeat over again; we will not speak of that 1,450 tons: Did you or did you not give this Southwest Virginia Cooperative free of charge, except for the transportation charges that were paid by them, an amount of fertilizer of approximately 1,450 tons or more?

Now, you should be able to answer that question. You knew what you were talking about the other day, or at least you said you did.

Mr. CLAPP. Senator, I would not be at all surprised if we turned over some fertilizer to them for test demonstration purposes, on

which they paid only the freight. It may have been 1,450 tons. I don't know. It may have been considerably more than that; it might be less. That is a different kind of financial arrangement between the TVA and the cooperatives.

Mr. President, it was not possible to get any information at all from Mr. Clapp. He continually denied having given anything, and only admitted it after being confronted with the concrete evidence that they had given 3,050 tons. Then he admitted knowing it all the time. I think Senators will bear me out that it appears somewhere in the record that his only explanation of the evasion was that I never asked him the exact amount. He said the amount I mentioned was not the 3,050 tons. In other words, if I had mentioned 3,049 or 3,051 we never would have gotten the information. I had to get the information from Lebanon, Va.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator finally yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I finally yield.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Tennessee spoke of my prejudices. Mr. President, I would not speak of the prejudice of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator just takes it from what Mr. Lilienthal has had the newspapers publish about me.

Mr. HILL. No, Mr. President; I would not say anything about the Senator's prejudices.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am not prejudiced in favor of rascals, anyway.

Mr. HILL. I am saying, Mr. President, that I would not say anything about the Senator.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. HILL. I would not say anything about the Senator's prejudices. I would not consume the time of the Senator from Delaware to argue with the Senator about what the conditions were during the days of the depression in 1933, 1934, and 1935. Every Member of the Senate and people throughout the country remember those days. They remember how desperate conditions were. They remember the poverty and misery that existed among the millions of our people and how it was necessary for the Federal Government to reach into the Treasury and pour out hundreds of millions of dollars to keep people in this country from starving.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, the \$300,000 that went into this cooperative about which we have been talking, was relief money from the FERA. Just as during the war we sought to have every Government agency do everything it could to aid in the great effort to bring the full force of America's might and strength against the enemy, so during the days of the depression we sought to use every Government agency to the limit of its capacity to help meet the depression.

These men on the Board of the TVA went into this thing seeking to be helpful, seeking to bring relief to people who were in distress, and to carry out what at that time was the policy and the

program of the Government of the United States. The truth is, they did the job so well in the beginning that instead of losing the whole \$300,000, which might well have been spent or lost entirely, the Bureau of the Budget message for the fiscal year 1948, on page 998, shows that only \$117,314 has to be charged up as relief, has to be charged up as spent and gone. The rest of that \$300,000 is operating through this cooperative today, through capital investment.

The record also shows that it was Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, the then Chairman of the TVA, in 1934, who fathered this proposition, who was the leader and the guiding spirit in it. It was his baby, so to speak. In those early days of the TVA, in 1934, the TVA did not have the same system it has now, with a general manager. It divided its responsibilities into three separate divisions, and one of the three members of the Board was put over each one of the three divisions.

This matter came under Dr. Morgan's division, and it was primarily and basically Dr. Arthur E. Morgan's responsibility.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now interrupt the Senator from Alabama for just one observation. There is nothing in the record anywhere that shows that Dr. Morgan was responsible for it, any more than David Lilienthal or any other man.

Mr. HILL. I called the Senator's attention to the letter from the lawyer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not speaking of the letter from the lawyer, I am speaking of the record. I should also like to point out to the Senator from Alabama—as he said, we are not living in the past—that last year \$2,066,511, was given by TVA to these cooperatives. I do not know how many of them were Government employees, or who received it, but I have no record that any farmer received any portion of it. Perhaps farmers did. They may have received the whole of it, but it is not in the record.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will go into it, he will find the farmers got the benefit of it. He will find it went as relief money to help the farmers in that area, and that they were the beneficiaries of the money.

I previously called the Senator's attention to the letter from the general solicitor of the TVA, Mr. W. A. Sullivan, addressed to Dr. Arthur E. Morgan on January 18, 1934, in which he makes it definitely clear that Dr. Arthur E. Morgan was the leading spirit, that he was the guiding hand, in this matter.

Not only was he the guiding hand in the beginning, but in March 1946 Mr. Lilienthal and Dr. Harcourt Morgan got off the board of directors of this cooperative. Dr. Arthur E. Morgan was on the board, and, insofar as the record shows, Dr. Arthur E. Morgan stayed on the board of the cooperative up to the time he left the TVA, and, so far as the records show, he is still on the board. Certainly he had not left the board at the time he left the TVA. Mr. Lilienthal got off in 1936. Dr. Arthur E. Morgan remained. This is an interesting matter about this cooperative.

The very able and distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made a slashing attack against Mr. Lilienthal day before yesterday. Knowing how thorough and conscientious and able he is, I am sure that before he made that attack he applied himself to the records. I can see him now as he burned the midnight oil going through the records. His distinguished colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] sat as a member of the Atomic Energy Committee. He sat there with the other eight members of that Committee day after day, week after week, listening to the testimony, hearing what the witnesses had to say, observing their demeanor on the stand, their attitude, weighing their evidence, hearing the evidence, considering the evidence. After the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan spent all those weeks, sincerely, conscientiously, and devotedly listening to that testimony and weighing it, the committee came to the Senate with a report of 8 to 1 in favor of Mr. Lilienthal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I like to be courteous to the Senator from Alabama—

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the Senator is through with his speech anyway. I am not delaying him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I have a little more to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will let me conclude. The Senator must remember that I had to stand here about an hour before I had a chance to say anything. I shall try to be as brief as I can. This is an important matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. HILL. So I am sure that, in view of the report, adopted by a vote of 8 to 1, by this committee, that sat for weeks, listening to the testimony, watching the witnesses, examining them, and sifting their statements, before the distinguished junior Senator would find himself in opposition to the great Senator from Michigan—

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

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator should let me finish, because I have been very patient.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think the Senator from Alabama should yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator accused me of prejudice, and I think I should have an opportunity to reply; but I have had to stand here for some time. I will finish my statement, and then I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Delaware has the floor. It is not a question of whether the Senator from Alabama will yield or not; it is for the Senator from Delaware to yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from Delaware did yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator from Delaware has been very lenient.

Mr. MCKELLAR. He certainly has been.

Mr. WHERRY. He has been very courteous to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, so that I think if the Senator from Tennessee asks him to yield, the Senator from Alabama has no right to farm the time out on the floor of the Senate, and if he continues to do so, I shall ask for the regular order and restore the Senator from Delaware to the floor, and the Senator from Tennessee may ask any questions he wants to ask in his own time.

Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield 2 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Two minutes? It is unusual for a Senator to be limited to 2 minutes. That is very hard. Anyway, Mr. President, if I must conclude in 2 minutes—

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Alabama wants considerably more time, I shall be glad to yield the floor in a few minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I merely want to say, I am sure that the junior Senator from Michigan must have combed this record, and all the other records available to him, with a fine-toothed comb. Oh, I can see him now, as he went through these records, to ascertain what they contained.

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

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. I yield, if I may.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from Delaware tried to yield to me.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Delaware has yielded to me, and I cannot yield. If the Senator will let me have 1 minute more, I shall be through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor. Does he yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield to me just a minute, and then I shall be through?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to conclude my remarks.

Mr. HILL. Will not the Senator yield me just 1 minute, to enable me to finish what I was saying?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; in a minute I shall yield the floor.

Mr. HILL. I ask for just 1 minute, that is all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The able Senator from Alabama has indicated that there shall be no disagreement—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. If the rule is going to be enforced, let us enforce it and let us not

have any more speeches in the time of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan can ask the Senator to yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have asked.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what the Senator asked for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Delaware has yielded to the Senator from Michigan for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to preface the question with a remark.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HATCH. If the rules of the Senate are to be strictly enforced, may a Senator preface a question with a remark? Is it not the rule of the Senate simply that a Senator may yield for a question in the form of a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that if the rules are to be strictly enforced, the Senator having the floor can yield for a question only, and the question should be stated directly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I will have to surrender the floor. The able Senator from Alabama made an address, but did not ask a question. I shall take the floor a little later.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, to finish my remarks, I would like to advance to 1946 with just a slight reference to the report of the corporation. I want to read, first, section 5 of the TVA Act, paragraph (m), which says:

No products of the Corporation shall be sold for use outside of the United States, its Territories, and possessions, except to the United States Government for the use of its Army and Navy or to its allies in case of war.

If I am not in error, we were not at war last year, and yet in the report I find that 9,000 tons of superphosphate was exported to the Netherlands; an undisclosed amount of the 153,000 tons of fertilizer which was produced in the ammonium nitrate plant was exported under lend-lease; 480 tons of munitions-grade crystal was exported from the same plant.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In a moment or two I will yield the floor.

Further, we find that 10,000 tons of ammonium nitrate was shipped to Italy; 5,000 tons was shipped to the Netherlands. I am not saying that that is not authorized, but I will read again section 5, paragraph (m), of the TVA Act:

No products of the corporation shall be sold for use outside of the United States, its Territories, and possessions, except to the United States Government, for the use of its Army and Navy or to its allies in case of war.

Much has been said on the floor about the profits shown by the TVA during the past few years. I obtained a record from the TVA showing the appropriations which had been received from Congress

by this Corporation, but here is another appropriation indirectly of more than \$10,000,000, which is not disclosed by this record; that is, in their files. I read:

Under an agreement executed in December 1940, the War Department advanced \$10,228,000 to TVA to cover the cost of constructing a synthetic-ammonia plant at Wilson Dam, Ala., and rehabilitating portions of nitrate plant No. 2 for the manufacture of ammonium nitrate. The plants were operated for the account of the War Department until June 30, 1943, at which time the agreement was terminated and the plants turned over to TVA. Since that date these plants have been used primarily for the production of fertilizers, but, because of the uncertainty of their ultimate value to TVA, they have not been recorded in the fixed-asset accounts.

Again I find:

Two nitrate plants, two villages, and other plant and equipment at Muscle Shoals have been recorded on the books at nominal amounts because of their negligible worth to TVA's operations.

Mr. President, in conclusion I only want to say that I cannot see how in the interest of national defense this body can confirm the nomination of a man at whom the finger of suspicion points as strongly as it does against David E. Lillenthal. I do not claim that I have pointed out any case where any laws have been directly violated; I am not an attorney; nor do I claim to express a legal opinion; that is for the Department of Justice; but I do say we have a case where three individuals have conferred upon themselves powers greater than those exercised by the President of the United States, under the Constitution. I cannot conceive of any man doing that, and I will not support any man who feels that he has the moral right to do it.

In conclusion, I repeat, that from my study of the record of the activities of David E. Lillenthal, I believe his basic philosophy is more than tinged with socialism and dictatorship.

Senators, do not take my word wholly for it. Let Mr. Lillenthal speak his true philosophy of government in his own words. I quote him:

This Government, and every government, is and must be a government of men and not of laws.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following-enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise at this time for the purpose of propounding inquiry of the acting majority leader

as to what the program will be for the remainder of the afternoon, and, primarily, whether or not the Senate will meet tomorrow to continue to discuss the question of confirming the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we intend this afternoon to continue the debate on the pending question, which is the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal. If the debate progresses satisfactorily I believe it is the intention to recess in executive session from today until Monday so that when it reconvenes next Monday the Senate will have before it automatically the question of the Lillenthal nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the statement made by the able Senator from Nebraska I take it that any Senator who desires to leave at this time for the week end may do so without any question in his mind as to whether there will be a vote taken on the pending question tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I think Senators can have that assurance.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a comment on the particular subject now under discussion?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say that the acting majority leader has evolved a program which he believes will operate with greater efficiency than would some other program. I shall not try to oppose it too vigorously, but I express my hope that the Senate will meet this evening, and that it may be in session tomorrow, so that debate on the Lillenthal nomination may be continued, because as I said to the Senate today at the time of convening, I am convinced in my own mind beyond all question of doubt that the vital and almost controlling interest of the United States demands that this question be settled one way or the other with the greatest possible expedition. It is a matter which is beyond the individual convenience of Members of the Senate. It rises far above whether any Senator—and this is no criticism of the Senator from Illinois—whether any Senator wants to go away for the week end or not. In my opinion it goes beyond the question of all private convenience of the Members of the Senate. I can only register my hope, and my insistence, if you please, so far as my one voice is concerned, that the Senate proceed with this matter even though it be arduous work, and continue with it at all possible times and at all reasonable and available hours until it is brought to a finality one way or the other.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Iowa has said concerning the importance of continuing the debate on the pending nomination and the desirability of concluding action on the question at the earliest possible time. I think I fully realize the importance of having action on the subject concluded with some dispatch, whether it means the confirmation of the nominees or not.

My only query, Mr. President, was with respect to what the majority was going

to do, because after all the majority control this situation, and they can either decide to have a session of the Senate tomorrow or to dispense with a session of the Senate tomorrow. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I certainly have no objection to a night session tonight if the majority desire to have one. I shall have no objection if the majority desire to have a session of the Senate tomorrow, at which the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal will be discussed.

Certain Members on this side of the aisle requested me to propound the inquiry in order to ascertain what the majority were going to do so they could make their plans accordingly. If the majority do not propose to have a session of the Senate tomorrow, then some Senators on this side of the aisle perhaps expect to leave for the week end. If the majority expect to have a session of the Senate tomorrow, the Senators will be present. It is up to the majority whether the Senate shall have a session tonight or tomorrow. So far as I am concerned, it will be perfectly satisfactory to me if such sessions are held. I certainly appreciate the seriousness of the situation, and I thoroughly agree with my friend the Senator from Iowa.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I cannot permit this occasion to pass without registering my thorough-going approval of what has been said by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the distinguished chairman of the Senate section of the committee. It is perhaps because we of the committee have lived with this problem now for some 18 months that we are so firm in our belief that it is absolutely necessary, in the interest of the safety of the United States, that the Senate conclude this matter and conclude it speedily.

Our Government has announced a new diplomatic policy to support democracy in Greece and Turkey, and that proposition is being considered now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. President, I say that I have a deep conviction that that is a matter of the highest importance. But certainly it is no more important, if even as important, as seeing to it that we proceed quickly with the business in hand. We are not proceeding with it as quickly as we should proceed. We cannot get ahead with it until we settle the question of the confirmation of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, which will then be able to offer employment to the kind of scientists who lead the universities and who, when they know there is a settled policy and who is going to conduct it, will push this program ahead. I say that every day we delay the confirmation of these nominations we trifle with the safety of the country and tamper with the destiny of the world.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted to make an inquiry respecting the program of the Senate, because I think the Senator from

Illinois is quite right in trying to reach an understanding now as to what we are going to do the remainder of the day as well as tomorrow. I do not think the Senator from Illinois should be in a position of excusing Members from his side of the aisle any more than Members on this side of the aisle should excuse other Members on this side from attendance on the Senate. If there is a possibility of a vote being had tonight on any phase of the Lillenthal matter, I think the Senator from Illinois ought to have a definite understanding as to what is going to happen during the remainder of the day as well as tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I concur in what the Senator from Oregon has said. The reason I propounded the inquiry was in order that we might reach a definite understanding as to what the program would be for the remainder of the afternoon and evening, and certainly whether the Senate will meet tomorrow. Certain Senators have spoken to me about the program, and wanted to know what it would be. That is why I asked the able Senator from Nebraska what the program was to be.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have already answered the Senator's inquiry. I stated that we would continue to discuss the nomination today and do the very best we could in forwarding the matter now pending before the Senate. Of course, it was to be expected that we would have a few statements by Senators who are always anxious to hold the Senate in session at night. Some who would stress the great emergency that exists are the very ones who have asked for vacation periods within the next few days. I will say that more Senators on the other side of the aisle have asked me whether there would be a session tonight and tomorrow, and expressed the hope that there would not be, than have Senators on this side of the aisle.

We are trying to do the best we can to expedite this matter. I believe we have done well so far. The policy committee has set a pace which, if we keep up with it, will dispose of the work that is in process. I am merely the acting majority leader. Personally, I should like to have the Senate stay in session every minute possible, and continue in session tonight as late as we did last night. If Senators wish night sessions, that is all right with me. The chairman of the policy committee is present, and I shall ask him to explain what he proposes with respect to tomorrow, and also next week.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think the Senate does its best work if it is forced to hold too many or too long sessions. I think that if we meet every day from 12 until 6 for 5 days a week, we need the remainder of the time to do the other kind of work Senators have to do, unless there is a real emergency in a particular case when we can finish consideration of a bill, as we did last night by sitting until after 7:30. The Lillenthal nomination is now before us. So far as I now know nothing else will interrupt consideration of that nomination. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has informed

me that the Foreign Relations Committee desires to take up the matter of the Greek and Turkish loan on Monday, April 7. We therefore have all of next week to discuss the Lillenthal nomination. So far as I know nothing has developed to indicate that there is anything in the nature of a filibuster going on or an effort to delay, or anything but the desire on the part of Senators to make their statements as they wish to make them. Should it appear that there is likely to be some delay that would tend to carry it over until Monday of the following week, I should say that by the time we reach Wednesday we ought to meet Wednesday night and Thursday night. I hope we may avoid a session on Good Friday by such night sessions, if necessary. But if we cannot finish the Lillenthal matter by Thursday night, I think we shall have to meet Friday and Saturday of next week, notwithstanding the fact that we are so close to Easter. Our desire is to finish consideration of the Lillenthal nomination, but I see no reason why it should not be finished in the regular time of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, if we can proceed without interruption. We now have it before us for full-time discussion.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course it is spilled milk, or water over the dam, but I think the Senator might agree with me that it is too bad that this nomination was reported on March 10, and that we did not begin to discuss it until March 24. During the intervening two weeks we took the time to dispose of the Presidential tenure bill, which certainly did not have any particular urgency behind it. Certainly the portal-to-portal legislation could have waited until we got this vitally important matter out of the way.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator will remember that that bill was already the unfinished business of the Senate. The portal-to-portal bill was also here before the nomination. Unfortunately, as is so frequently the case, they took longer than we expected. But I think the Senate has worked as diligently as I have ever seen it work, and we have disposed of business as rapidly as possible.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator his opinion as to whether we can reach a vote this evening on the motion to recommit.

Mr. TAFT. My impression is that it ought not to be voted upon until the whole subject is debated. It is open to debate. I expect to make a speech on the Lillenthal nomination, and I should like to make it while this motion is pending. I see no reason why there should be a vote on the motion to recommit until the whole subject has been discussed by the Senate. That is my personal opinion. I am not speaking from the standpoint of party policy. I am only stating my own opinion. Personally, I would object to voting until I

have an opportunity to speak on the Lillenthal nomination.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I can see very many sound reasons for delaying a vote on the motion to recommit until Senators have had an opportunity to discuss the question and canvass the field. I asked the question merely to learn what the Senator thought, and to try to ascertain the anticipated program with regard to that motion.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that the sooner we cease discussing the program, which I think is clear, the sooner we can get on with the business in hand.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator spoke about the possibility of holding a session Friday and Saturday of next week, in the event we do not finish consideration of the pending business by Thursday night. I think that would interfere with the plans of certain Senators on this side of the aisle who are anticipating making Jefferson day speeches. I believe the Republicans recently made Lincoln Day speeches. We were very kind and considerate of Senators on the other side, and permitted Republican Senators to go over the country and spread the doctrine of Lincoln. We would like to have the opportunity to reciprocate by spreading a little Jeffersonian doctrine on Friday and Saturday. I think most of the banquets will be on Saturday night. If there is a possibility of holding a meeting on either Saturday, we would much prefer to hold it tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I see no reason why we should not finish the Lillenthal matter in 4 days next week, including two night sessions. I think the possibility of a Friday session might hasten the procedure next week. That is the only reason I suggested it. We certainly ought not to interfere with the education of the people which is contemplated by the minority leader and his friends.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope we can conclude by Thursday night, so that Senators may get away. Speaking for myself, any Jeffersonian speech I may make will have to wait a year if the Lillenthal nomination is not disposed of.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, for the present consideration of House joint resolution 159, which is a joint resolution to provide for certain deficiencies in appropriations for existing departments. Before the request is acted upon, let me say that I believe that with a moment's explanation I can satisfy the Senate that action on the joint resolution will require only a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if the bill was unanimously favorably reported from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BRIDGES. It was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is a simple joint resolution to provide deficiency funds to take care of the increased salaries which the Congress voted for the various departments of government last year. It does not apply to all the departments of Government. It applies to all of them as to which there is no question. The remaining departments, as to which there may be some question, will be taken care of in a later measure.

The principal items are in the Post Office Department, the Veterans' Administration, the Judiciary, the Federal Works Agency, the District of Columbia, the legislative branch, and various independent agencies. I do not believe that Senators will find anything in the joint resolution except provision for the deficiency in carrying out the act of Congress which provided for the pay increases last year. The House checked the items very thoroughly, and we have checked them. I can see no reason for delaying action. Unless we do our part the March 31 pay roll cannot be met.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lillenthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not believe that any problem has ever come before the Senate which is more important than is the confirmation of the nominations of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I wish to say that my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] was a very regular attendant at all the meetings of the committee. He examined the facts, as the rest of us endeavored to do, in the hearings which extended over a period of 6 weeks. During that entire time the members of the committee held almost daily sessions, at which they had an opportunity to examine witnesses and listen to the evidence. To date there have been presented to the Senate substantially no facts which were not brought to the attention of the nine members of the Senate Section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I ask the Senator if he

is willing to yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum. The Senator is a member of the committee, and has been present throughout the hearings; and I consider that what he has to say is most important.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Connor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McGrath	Thye
Dworshak	McKellar	Tobey
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I pointed out, to date there has been presented to the Senate of the United States no substantial evidence in addition to what had been presented to the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Joint Committee. That committee, consisting of five members of the majority and four members of the minority, after hearing the facts, by a vote of 8 to 1 voted to report favorably on the question of confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lillenthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. President, it has been rightfully said that the Government and the people of the United States have a vast interest in the field of atomic power. Not only have they expended over \$2,000,000,000 in the development of this vast new force; but in our hands, I firmly believe, we hold the future of civilization. Through the use of atomic power we can either benefit mankind or we can destroy civilization as we know it. The sands of time are running out.

About a year ago, Mr. President, as a member of the War Investigating Committee, I had the opportunity of seeing Nagasaki, where the second atomic bomb had been dropped. During the period of the war I had seen a great deal of destruction in England, France, and Germany; but I say to you that I had never seen such destruction as that which had taken place at Nagasaki. The entire community looked as if it had been put

through a coffee grinder and the remainder scattered over the landscape.

So, Mr. President, we have a tremendous responsibility. I believe that the Senate and the House of Representatives recognized that we were dealing with a new force and a new power, the like of which mankind had never known before, and that consequently we had to deal with it in a different way than we had ever dealt with any other great problem facing our Nation at any other time in our history. So, the Congress passed the Atomic Energy Control Act.

There are some persons who have a great fear—and quite correctly so—of expanding Government ownership and control. Yet, the Senate, by unanimous vote, as I recall, recognizing that we had let out of the bottle a genie which never in our lifetime or that of our children will it be possible to get back into the bottle, recognized that the field of atomic power would, of necessity, have to be handled by the Government, and by Government alone.

I desire to call attention to some of the language contained in the Atomic Energy Control Act. I read now from page 1 of Public Law 585:

A program for Government control of production, ownership, and use of fissionable material to assure the common defense and security and to insure the broadest possible exploitation of the fields.

A little later in the same Atomic Energy Act, we find the following, on page 5:

Ownership of production facilities: The Commission, as agent and on behalf of the United States, shall be the exclusive owner of all facilities for the production of fissionable materials, other than the facilities which (a) are useful in the conduct of research and development activities in the field specified in section 3; and (b) do not in the opinion of the Commission have a potential production rate adequate to enable the operator of such facilities to produce within a reasonable period of time a sufficient quantity of fissionable material to produce an atomic bomb or any other atomic weapon.

So, Mr. President, the act itself, as passed unanimously by this body, recognizes that in the very nature of things the Government itself must be the controlling agency in this field.

Mr. President, ample safeguards are provided. The Commission cannot surrender the so-called secrets of atomic energy to any other nation on the face of the earth without first having the specific approval of the Congress of the United States. I quote from section 8, on page 11, of the Atomic Energy Act. It specifically states as follows:

Definitions: As used in this act, the term "international arrangement" shall mean any treaty approved by the Senate or international agreement hereafter approved by the Congress during the time such treaty or agreement may be in full force and effect.

Mr. President, it so happens that Mr. Lillenthal has perhaps had as much background in the field of atomic power as any nonscientific man has had. He was a member of the committee which drafted the so-called Lillenthal-Acheson report which furnished the foundation for the proposal by Mr. Baruch, our rep-

resentative to the United Nations, for the so-called Baruch plan for the international control of atomic energy.

We must constantly keep in mind the fact that this is no secret which we as a people can lock in a safe-deposit box and then feel secure. This is something which we have developed, but which, if given time and industrial capacity and the necessary resources, other nations can develop. The only thing we have now that the other powers do not have is an element of time. It may be 2 years, it may be 5 years, or it may be 10 years; but it is almost as certain as the fact that we sit here or stand here on the floor of the United States Senate, that somewhere in between those limitations, other nations will have developed atomic energy. Unless we are able during that period of time to provide an adequate type of international control over atomic energy, then neither we nor our children nor our children's children will ever spend a tranquil night. In the atomic age in which we live the Pearl Harbor of the future will not be an attack upon a few sitting-duck warships in a distant Pacific harbor, but a simultaneous rocket, guided-missile atomic attack upon every communications center and every industrial center in the United States, on the same day, and perhaps at the same instant.

That is the type of power and force with which we deal here, and, as my able colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has pointed out, this matter is so important not only to the American people, but to civilization itself, that we dare not postpone a decision on the question.

Mr. President, when we recognize that here we have a power which cannot be kept permanently a secret, we must of course understand why some type of international control is necessary. Our representative, Mr. Baruch, presented a plan to the United Nations which has, of course, not yet been accepted.

I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that, insofar as I am concerned, unless we can establish adequate safeguards; unless we can have a system of international inspection and control with no loopholes in it; unless we can make sure that the Commission, having found a violation, can bring the full weight of the United Nations, which we hope by that time will have an adequate military force at its disposal, against the aggressor nations—and certainly we will never have that assurance as long as the veto exists, in its present form, in the United Nations organization—until and unless we have those adequate safeguards, I am unalterably opposed to the surrender of the secrets of atomic energy to any other nation on the face of the earth.

As President Cleveland once said, a condition, and not a theory, confronts us. Other nations do have information. I do not know how many Senators have had the opportunity to see the report of the Canadian Royal Commission. If you have not had a chance to read it and study it, I wish every Member of the Senate would do so.

As long ago as March 28, 1945—and I quote, from page 447 of the Canadian Royal Commission report—a message went from spies in Canada to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is what the message said:

Badeau informs me that most secret work at present is on nuclear physics (bombardment of radio-active substances to produce energy). This is more hush-hush than radar and is being carried on at the University of Montreal and at McMaster University at Hamilton. Badeau thinks that Government purchasing of radium-producing plant is connected with this research.

Mind you, Mr. President, this was in March 1945.

I sat through a number of sessions of the Senate section of the joint committee when the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] told how, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, he had been let in on this very top-secret information, and what was going on at Oak Ridge in the development of atomic power. As far as most Government officials in this country were concerned, as far as most of the American people were concerned, they did not know of this activity until the first bomb dropped on Hiroshima. But in this message it is shown that Soviet agents were on the 28th of March 1945, familiar with certain activities.

Then a few pages later I find this very disturbing information. I quote from page 450. This is what is said in paragraph 2, another message which was passed between espionage agents:

Alec handed over to us a platinum with 162 micrograms of uranium 233 in the form of oxide in a thin lamina. We have had no news about the mail.

So that at least one other power has some samples of uranium.

This development of atomic power is of tremendous and vital importance to us. If I had had any remote idea that any of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission proposed by the President of the United States were Communists, were Communist sympathizers, or were fellow travelers I would not for an instant have voted in the committee, nor would I, in the Senate of the United States, vote for the confirmation of any such person. But after listening to the testimony, after examining the witnesses for a period of 5 or 6 weeks, I wish to say to the Senator that in good conscience I could not have voted in any other way than to confirm the Presidential nominees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer not to yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I prefer to continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this situation, of course, should cause the Senate of the United States to examine the facts. Men may honestly differ in committees or on the floor of the Senate, but I say that in my opinion there is not one iota of evidence presented to the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee which directly or indirectly made out that Mr. Lillenthal, or any of the other nominees of the President

of the United States, was a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler in any degree.

A great deal of evidence did come before the committee from reputable witnesses relative to the ability and the integrity of the various officials. I desire to read just a few bits of the testimony into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Baruch, who, as I have pointed out heretofore, was a representative of this Government in dealing with this vital subject in the United Nations organization, said this:

Mr. Lillenthal I have known for some time, and I think he is a well-qualified man. He is a man of prodigious energy, of driving force. I think sometimes that in his conception of his duty he drives exceedingly hard; and sometimes he perhaps makes enemies or creates misunderstandings.

Then take the evidence of Mr. Owen D. Young.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I think there were introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some newspaper editorials or reports, at least statements by columnists, that Mr. Baruch had privately said that he was not favorably inclined toward Mr. Lillenthal, and did not recommend him. I am not stating that as my own statement, because I do not know. I did read that in the newspapers, and I think it is in the RECORD. Does the Senator know anything about it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say categorically to the Senator from Ohio that Mr. Baruch made no such statement in the executive session of the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee. I was there when Mr. Baruch was before the committee, and there was no indication, directly or indirectly, that he felt any differently in executive session from the way he had testified in the public session.

Mr. BRICKER. I was at both those sessions also, and I agree with the distinguished Senator exactly, but I was referring to what has been said in the press and has been introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have never talked to Mr. Baruch about it. I am wondering if the Senator has any information along that line.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no information along that line.

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

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

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from California has been kind enough to yield to me, and I can enlighten the Senator from Ohio on that very subject. I anticipated, when I saw that the Senator from Tennessee was putting into the RECORD a series of ten articles from the pen of one Frank Waldrop—

Mr. BRICKER. Those are the ones I think I saw in the RECORD.

Mr. McMAHON. Originally they appeared serially in the Times-Herald. He made the statement that Baruch had stated one thing publicly, another thing on the quiet, and that he was making

statements contrary to what he told us. I wrote Mr. Baruch a letter, in which I pointed this out to him, and said to him, "Now, of course, I know it is ridiculous, but nevertheless, since it has been put in the RECORD by the Senator from Tennessee, I think your answer ought to be in the record."

Mr. Baruch answered me, and I placed his reply in the record, in which he said, "Of course, it is absurd; I have not said anything privately but what I said publicly."

Mr. BRICKER. I did not see the letter.

Mr. McMAHON. That is the answer. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now take the telegram from Mr. Owen D. Young, which is in the record, at page 795. This is what Mr. Young has to say:

Because of my interest in public utilities, I became acquainted with David Lillenthal nearly 20 years ago. I regarded him as an adversary, and so naturally watched him with a critical eye. Because of my interest in the international problems of this Nation, I have also watched Lillenthal's work in the atomic field.

As a result, I wish to say that he is a man of clear vision, of executive ability, of firmness and unquestionable loyalty, and in a unique position to serve effectively in the position for which the President has nominated him.

I wish to say to the Senators present that throughout this entire record, as they will find if they will take the trouble to read it, is testimony of men of the caliber of Mr. Young, Mr. Baruch, and a whole host of others, who testify substantially the same way.

I also desire to point out that one of the charges made against Mr. Lillenthal in particular is due to the fact that when he was Chairman of the TVA there was some communistic activity in that organization. I do not condone such activity in that or any other organization, but I wish to point out in all fairness, that the testimony shows that at that time, as I recall, there were from 15,000 to 18,000 employees in the TVA. During that period of time the so-called Dies Committee on Un-American Activities went there to make an investigation. There appeared before us in person to testify Mr. Joe Starnes, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who was chairman of the subcommittee which made the investigation. He appeared before us, and at this point in the RECORD I wish to read some of the testimony:

The most optimistic reports of the party's activities in that area were filed by Mr. Ted Wellman, the secretary of the party for the State.

That is, the State of Tennessee.

In 1937 he said there were 55 Communists in the Knox County area—

Now, listen to this—
that seven of them were employed by the TVA.

Mind you, just seven of them found by the Committee on Un-American Activities in an organization of from 15,000 to 18,000 people!

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like at this point to ask the able Senator from California if there was anything in the record, or if anything was called to the attention of the committee, indicating that there were 45 names of people alleged to be left wingers or of that type, ever sent to the Board of Directors of the TVA? Has the Senator any knowledge as to the 45 names that were sent and as to whether or not only one of those names was ever investigated, and that that person was not removed from the list, and so far as known, the other 44 were not investigated? Is there such knowledge?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no such knowledge, so I cannot answer the Senator's question from first-hand information.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I decline to yield at this time.

I am glad the Senator from Michigan asked that question, for the reason that one witness who appeared before our committee took the position that if a finger of suspicion were pointed at anyone he should automatically be eliminated from consideration. On the day on which that witness so testified I raised the point that that was a very dangerous doctrine for us to agree to or to follow in this country. I need only state that the finger of suspicion can be pointed by any anonymous person at any one of the 96 Members of the Senate of the United States, or at any reputable person in the United States, and if, because the finger of suspicion has been pointed by anonymous people, or otherwise, a person is for that reason to be condemned, then we have gone a long way down the road to abandoning our normal concept of fair play and American constitutional government.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Apparently the Senator misunderstood the Senator from Michigan. This was not an anonymous communication. This was a communication from the Department of Justice of the United States of America. I used the term "another agency." This was not merely someone's imagination. This was sent to them for investigation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Michigan may have some additional information that the Senator from California does not have.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe—and the Senator from Michigan may correct me if I am wrong—I believe that the Senator from Michigan is referring to is an allegation that the Department of Justice at one time sent the names of 45 persons to the Board of Directors of TVA, under the allegation, not necessarily by the Department of Justice, but under the suspicion that the 45 persons were violators of the Hatch Act. I do not believe the allegation went to the question of communistic tendencies, or anything of that sort. That is my under-

standing of the incident to which the Senator was referring.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I see the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] in the Chamber, and I would like to ask him the date of the Hatch Act in relation to subversive activities.

Mr. HATCH. I would like to answer the question of the Senator. I believe the provision as to such activities was in the second bill which as passed, if my recollection is correct, in 1939 or 1940; it was about then. I have not looked at it lately.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would also like to ask the able Senator from New Mexico whether that act does not require that such names be sent in for investigation.

Mr. HATCH. No; it does not. All it does is to require that any person in the Federal Government who is affiliated with any organization which seeks the overthrow of our form of government be discharged, and that no appropriation be made to pay for his services.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Will the Senator from California yield for one moment on that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. This was in July 1941, so it would be in compliance with the Hatch Act that those names were sent in.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a comment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that I was under a misconception with respect to the allegation in question. I was under the impression that the violations of the Hatch Act alleged against these 45 individuals consisted of what we might call pernicious political activities. I am at a loss on that point. I can add nothing to the discussion of it.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I feel quite sure that the Senator from Iowa is correct, because most of the charges respecting violation of the Hatch Act relate to pernicious political activity. There are many sections of the act, including the ones relating to subversive activities, which have never been mentioned. But I think the Senator from Iowa is absolutely correct in his statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not mean to be discourteous to my good friend, the Senator from Michigan, but I should like to move on.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I may have just a moment to make the RECORD clear, I should like to say that these charges were made under the subversive section of the act.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Alabama, and then I must decline to yield further.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I call attention to the fact that the investigation by the

Dies committee was made in the summer of 1940, and Mr. Starnes testified that at that time an affidavit with respect to subversive activities was not required. Furthermore, so far as that matter is concerned here is a direct quotation from Mr. Starnes, if I may be permitted to read it. It is found on page 220 of the hearings before the Committee on Public Works of the Senate of the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Mr. Starnes testified similarly in the Lillenthal hearing, but I happen to have the testimony of Mr. Starnes in the Clapp hearing before me. I quote from Mr. Starnes as follows:

We found very little communism, or evidence of communism, in the Knox County area. According to the report of a Communist organizer, Kenneth Malcolm by name, who was not a native, only 55 members of the Communist Party were claimed by him in the Knox County area and only 7 were employed by TVA as of September 1, 1937. This information was contained in his report to the southern conference of the Communist Party in Chattanooga on September 11 and 12, 1937. He said there were only 55 in the entire area, 33 in the city of Knoxville, 15 over at Mascot, and 5, I believe it was, in Norris, and 2 in Maryville.

A few underlings were found who did have at one time membership in the party. The Communist organizer himself, Mr. Malcolm, stated there were only 7 members in the TVA, 4 men and 3 women.

If the Senator will yield further I should like to say that the distinguished Senator from Michigan in his remarks the other day stated that when this matter was called to Mr. Lillenthal's attention he did absolutely nothing about it. As a matter of fact the record very clearly shows that Mr. Gordon Clapp, I believe it was, submitted the matter to the Board of Directors, and the Board of Directors authorized him to submit it to the Dies committee. Mr. Clapp wrote a long letter telling exactly what had been done and what the TVA proposed to do, and Mr. Starnes testified in the Clapp hearing, and, I believe, in the Lillenthal hearing, that the Dies committee was satisfied with what had been done.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should prefer not to at this time.

Mr. HATCH. I wanted to put something in the RECORD in answer to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well; I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The first Hatch Act was passed in August 1939. That act, I am quite sure, if my recollection does not fail me, did not include the paragraph to which the Senator refers. I think that was in the second act, which I believe was passed in 1940. At any rate, between now and the time the debate closes I shall look up the exact dates and place them in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I pointed out before, and as the testimony by Mr. Starnes showed, there were but seven members of the Communist Party found in the TVA, and the able junior Senator from Alabama has

pointed out that the Board did take action on those cases.

I wish to say to the Senate that I believe that if the situation existing in industrial establishments of all kinds under the American system of free enterprise were carefully checked, establishments having perhaps half as many or perhaps a tenth as many employees as did the TVA, there might be found similar cells of seven Communist members.

As I pointed out before, I do not minimize the situation. I do not say it should be overlooked. I believe that any organization which finds activity of that kind going on should take prompt action, just as the President of the United States recently has indicated that Government departments should take action to clean out activity of that kind, regardless of how small the cell might be.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I must decline to yield at this time. But I do not believe that on that basis, when out of 18,000 or 15,000 employees there were found only seven who were Communists, Mr. Lillenthal should be disqualified for this position. It seems to me that we should examine the record of the man. It is not necessary to see eye to eye with an individual in all his thinking, economic or political, to recognize the fact that the man has tremendous ability and, I believe, deep patriotism. If there were any specific charge that he was disloyal to the Government of the United States, that he was disloyal to the Constitution of the United States, that would be an entirely different situation. To the best of my knowledge no such charge has ever been made. He has been charged with being arbitrary, of doing certain things in the TVA which certain Members of the Senate take, to borrow a British expression, a rather dim view of. But I want to point out the fact that what Mr. Lillenthal did in the TVA was within the laws passed by the Congress of the United States.

There has been much discussion about this situation on the floor of the Senate, but I wish to read several paragraphs from the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. First, to get the general scope and the general philosophy behind it, I read from the act as follows:

That for the purpose of maintaining and operating the properties now owned by the United States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala., in the interest of the national defense and for agricultural and industrial development, and to improve navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive flood waters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River Basins, there is hereby created a body corporate by the name of the Tennessee Valley Authority (hereinafter referred to as the Corporation). The board of directors first appointed shall be deemed the incorporators, and the incorporation shall be held to have been effected from the date of the first meeting of the board. This act may be cited as the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933.

Let us see some of the powers given by the Congress of the United States by statutes passed by both Houses of the Congress and signed by the President of

the United States in the normal constitutional American way of enacting legislation under our system of government. We have heard criticism that he has not followed the civil-service rules as applied to the rest of the Government. But what does the act itself say. Let me read from the act, section 3:

The Board—

Speaking now of the TVA Board—

The board shall without regard to the provisions of civil-service laws applicable to officers and employees of the United States, appoint such managers, assistant managers, officers, employees, attorneys, and agents, as are necessary for the transaction of its business, fix their compensation, define their duties, require bonds of such of them as the board may designate, and provide a system of organization to fix responsibility and promote efficiency. Any appointee of the board may be removed in the discretion of the board. No regular officer or employee of the corporation shall receive a salary in excess of that received by the members of the board.

So the Congress of the United States itself gave to the TVA Board the power which some Members of Congress now question that it should have. Mr. Lillenthal was administering an act which Congress passed. If anyone has any doubts—and there may well be reasonable doubts as to whether any Government corporation should be free from civil-service laws—then under our constitutional representative system of government it is the obligation of the Congress, or of any Member who so believes, to attempt to change the law. We should not blame the man who was administering the law passed by the Congress.

I should like to read another section of the act. There has been some criticism of the fact that certain fertilizers were delivered free of charge. Let us read from the act itself. I read from page 4, paragraph (e):

(e) Under the authority of this act the board may make donations or sales of the product of the plant or plants operated by it to be fairly and equitably distributed through the agency of county demonstration agents, agricultural colleges, or otherwise as the board may direct, for experimentation, education, and introduction of the use of such products in cooperation with practical farmers so as to obtain information as to the value, effect, and best methods of their use.

For a number of years I had heard a great deal about the TVA. I had read considerable about the TVA, but I had never had the opportunity of seeing the TVA in operation. Last November I happened to be in Washington. I went to the Tennessee Valley at my own expense. I decided I would have a look at the TVA.

I spent approximately a week down there, meeting and talking with employees of the TVA organization, and going into various communities in Alabama and Tennessee and holding discussion with farmers, businessmen, chambers of commerce, and ordinary citizens and workers to get their ideas as to how the project was operating.

There has been some misconception that this was a vast experiment in state

socialism, that it was trying to control the local government, that it was trying to supplant the American system of free enterprise with some kind of state socialism. I wanted to see for myself whether that was true. As I say, I talked with persons in all walks of life, and I returned from that trip convinced that, far from being an effort at state socialism, or an attempt to foist a different system upon an unwilling locality or unwilling American citizens in private enterprise, this was the greatest stimulus to private enterprise, to small business, and to those who believe in the American system that this country has perhaps ever had.

I went into some of the communities which had suffered greatly from an economic point of view. I talked with persons who when the TVA had first been proposed, had been vigorously against it. Almost without exception the citizens with whom I came in contact in the Tennessee Valley said that this had been a great boon to private enterprise; that communities which had been almost destitute had come back to life; that new flour mills, factories, and various other industries had come in, and that the people were going to work in new jobs.

This investment of capital was not placed in those localities by the TVA or any governmental agency. Far from it. It was American capital, free enterprise capital, capital raised in the localities, or from outside the localities, by people who recognized the fact that there in the Tennessee Valley was an opportunity to make an investment in the future of America.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I rise to remark that the Senator is making a very important address. Very few Senators are present to listen to him. I do not wish to suggest the absence of a quorum. I am wondering if we could not take a recess until Monday, when other Senators could hear him. A moment ago I spoke with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who understands the situation. I ask him for his assistance. Does not the Senator from Nebraska feel that something could be done?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I agree with the observation of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. This is a very important speech, and Senators should all hear it.

Not more than an hour ago I announced that we would continue in session this evening to see what progress we could make. I did not announce the exact hour when we expected to take a recess. I spoke to the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and asked him if he would rather speak tonight or wait until Monday. He said he would like to finish tonight. So I had made up my mind that we would continue in session until the conclusion of his speech this evening. I have told many Members of the Senate that when that time arrived we would take a recess until Monday.

Mr. HATCH. I feared that that was the exact situation. Senators on both sides of the aisle have been told that nothing further will be done this evening, and they have gone to their respective homes and are missing the very fine and able address which the Senator from California is making. I do not wish to suggest the absence of a quorum, because I do not know whether there would be any more Senators present at the conclusion of a quorum call than there are now. What does the Senator from Nebraska suggest?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to continue in session until 6 o'clock. At that time if the distinguished Senator from California wishes to suspend, I shall be glad to move a recess until Monday, and he can complete his address at that time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is now nearly 6 o'clock. I am sure the Senator from California is modest, and would probably say "No; I will go ahead and finish tonight." But why not take a recess now, and let the Senator from California resume his speech on Monday?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not in a position to make a deal with the Senator from California. I had hoped that we might remain in session until 6 o'clock. Only a short time ago, when the Senator from New Mexico was not present, I was told by Members on the other side of the aisle that they wished to continue in session until a late hour. They wished to have night sessions and sessions on Saturday so as to complete consideration of the unfinished executive business. Now, within less than an hour, we have an unusual request to take a recess at this time.

I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that the Senator from California is making an important speech. All Senators ought to hear it. However, it was the acting minority leader who forced me to say what we expected to do. I have an idea that if I had not been forced to state the program we would have continued in session this evening. Senators would have remained in their seats, and we would not have the trouble we are now experiencing. That is the difficulty we always experience when we make an announcement at half past four in the afternoon as to what the plan is.

Would the Senator from California like to complete his speech now, or would he prefer to continue on Monday?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am perfectly agreeable to finishing now. I am not sure that I would have a larger audience on Monday than I have now. I am perfectly willing to continue.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the RECORD to show that I should like to comply with the distinguished Senator's request. I agree with every word he has said.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Would the Senator be willing to resume his speech on Monday, so that the Senate may take a recess at this time? If there is any question as to responsibility on the part of the acting

majority leader, I will say for the RECORD that at the request of the minority leader I am acting in his place, and I will take full responsibility for requesting a recess at this time in order that the Senator from California may be heard at a later date.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to cooperate with Senators who are interested in the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal, and if it is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from California I shall move in a few moments a recess until Monday. There is some other business to be taken up at this time.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED
JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TERMINATION OF WAR POWERS AND
CONTROLS UNDER SECOND WAR POWERS
ACT—ADDITIONAL CONFEREES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Senate bill 931, to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, is now in conference. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] be appointed additional conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair appoints the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] additional conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENTS TO SENATE RULES

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. I ask unanimous consent to present for immediate consideration four resolutions which were unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 100) reported by Mr. BROOKS from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to the printing of papers, be, and it is hereby, amended by striking out the words "Committee on Printing", where they occur in paragraphs 1 and 2, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Committee on Rules and Administration."

Resolved, That rule XXXIV of said standing rules, providing for the regulation of the Senate wing of the Capitol, be, and it is

hereby, amended by striking out, in the first line of paragraph 2, the words "Committee on Rules" and in lieu thereof inserting the words "Committee on Rules and Administration."

Resolved, That the resolution of the Senate of January 6, 1898, relating to marble busts of Vice Presidents, included in the Standing Orders of the Senate, as shown on page 114 of the Senate Manual for 1945, be, and it is hereby, amended by striking out the words "Committee on the Library" and in lieu thereof inserting "Committee on Rules and Administration."

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 77, relating to payments from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with inquiries and investigations, agreed to June 28, 1945, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out, where they occur in said resolution, the words "Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate" and in lieu thereof inserting the words "Committee on Rules and Administration."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF
HEARINGS ON LABOR RELATIONS PRO-
GRAM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 93, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 93), submitted by Mr. TAFT on March 12, 1947, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the Eightieth Congress on bills and joint resolutions relative to the labor relations program.

PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION OF CER-
TAIN MATTER RELATING TO CONGRES-
SIONAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 89, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) to provide for the printing and distribution of certain matter relating to congressional activities, authorized by section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number, and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Public Printer is authorized and directed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, to print separately from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to make available for sale to the public at a price sufficient to reimburse the expense of such printing, the matter authorized under subsection (a) to be printed or incorporated in the daily RECORD. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and shall be accounted for in the annual report of the Public Printer."

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINA-
TION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lillenthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in order to place something in the RECORD or to make an explanation, but I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes on Monday, the distinguished Senator from California may have the floor in executive session.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator was in the process of making one of the best-reasoned speeches I have heard on the floor of the Senate in this session of Congress, and I wish to give him my very sincere commendation for the contribution which I think he is making to the Lillenthal case. I hope that at the opening of the session on Monday, when the Senator takes the floor again, he will summarize for the benefit of the Senate the major points which he has made in his speech, because I think he will find that if the other Members of the Senate take the time really to grasp the implications of his speech it will have a good effect on the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF
RESOURCES OF THE PACIFIC NORTH-
WEST

Mr. MORSE. I wish to take only a minute or two to call attention to a very serious situation which exists in the Pacific Northwest, about which I shall have much to say as the Eightieth Congress progresses. I refer to the development of the power resources of the Pacific Northwest; to the reclamation program, soil conservation, and the flood-control program; to the whole question of preserving national wealth and supporting projects which will create new national wealth, which will provide employment, with resulting tax dollars, without which we cannot reduce the enormous national debt which is threatening the stability of our country.

I am very much concerned about actions which are being taken on the House side in regard to appropriations, as those actions affect the job which ought to be done of providing for wealth-creating projects, for which increased appropriations are required. So far as my record in the Eightieth Congress is concerned, I intend to serve notice from my side of the Senate as to the type of action which is being taken on the House side with relation to wealth-creating developments in the Pacific Northwest. I want the people of the Pacific Northwest to know at all

times where the responsibility rests for this action. I feel that as a result of the action taken in the Eightieth Congress, great projects which are needed for the development of that section of the country, and, for that matter, for the benefit of the economy of the entire Nation, are being thwarted.

The responsibility in the last analysis must rest upon the majority party in the Eightieth Congress, which happens to be the Republican Party. I want the people of the Pacific Northwest to know that as the campaign of 1948 starts, because if my party becomes responsible for stifling and preventing the development of needed and wealth-producing projects, then it is not entitled to the votes of the people of the Northwest in the 1948 campaign; and, in my judgment, it will not win the campaign in 1948 without the votes of the Northwest.

I shall put the economic welfare of my country at all times above any political advantage to my party. By so doing I shall serve my party best, because if it has to learn the hard way, if it has to learn that once the American people begin to realize the effect of that program on the economy of this country it cannot go forward with the type of fiscal policy which I think the House is giving every indication that it intends to follow. I want to help to bring that realization about.

I hope that my party will come to its senses and appreciate the necessity of going forward with these wealth-creating projects and understand the importance of separating in the national budget items which concern the administration of government, with regard to which I think we can make drastic cuts and great economies, and should make them, and avoid making cuts in appropriations for such important projects as McNary Dam, Foster Creek, Hungry Horse, and the reclamation projects in Washington and Oregon and the Pacific Northwest in their totality, including the flood-control program in the Willamette Valley.

Mr. President, I say that if my party cannot see the importance of going forward with those projects, then it does not deserve the votes of the people of Washington and Oregon in the 1948 campaign. In that campaign I shall not hesitate to place the responsibility for any loss that is suffered by that section of the country because of the fiscal policies of the Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress.

So, Mr. President, I now introduce into the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, resolutions adopted by the Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., in regard to the need for the development of greater power resources in that section of the country in order to meet the great industrial needs of the Pacific Northwest. I ask to have the resolutions printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH,
City of Portland, ss:

I, Will E. Gibson, auditor of the city of Portland, do hereby certify that I have com-

pared the following copy of Resolution 23191, urging the Eightieth Congress of the United States to approve appropriations sufficient to construct additional electric power projects on the Columbia River and its tributaries with a generating capacity, by November 1, 1949, of 318,000 kilowatts over and above the 745,000 kilowatts of generating units now on order, and with a generating capacity of 1,565,000 kilowatts by November 1, 1953, and to make these necessary appropriations available, as rapidly as possible, to the Corps of United States Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, to the end that generators sufficient to supply 1,565,000 kilowatts of power by 1953 may be constructed, with the original thereof, and that the same is a full, true, and correct transcript of such original Resolution 23191 and of the whole thereof as the same appears on file and of record in my office, and in my care and custody.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the city of Portland affixed this 21st day of March 1947.

[SEAL] WILL E. GIBSON,
Auditor of the City of Portland.
By ELBERT G. ROFF,
Deputy.

"Resolution 23191

"Whereas additional multiple-purpose projects must be constructed on the Columbia River and its tributaries to maintain future supplies of electric power sufficient to maintain continued industrial, agricultural, and utility development in the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, through congressional action, has assumed responsibility for the construction of such projects and existing generating capacity in the Northwest has already been fully utilized and present transmission lines of the Bonneville Power Administration are already approaching conditions of full load so that additional power cannot be delivered to load centers on these transmission lines; and

"Whereas the construction of adequate power generating and transmission facilities is necessary to a strong regional economy and to the further development of the State of Oregon, and particularly to the industrial growth of the city of Portland, Oreg., and the area adjacent thereto; and

"Whereas new Federal generating capacity in the amount of 318,000 kilowatts over and above the 745,000 kilowatts of generating units now on order will be required between now and November 1, 1949, to meet the present critical power supply problem and 1,565,000 kilowatts will be required to meet anticipated needs by November 1, 1953; and

"Whereas transmission line materials and equipment are still critically short in supply and an additional transmission line is needed to serve the heavy and immediate load of electric power required to meet the steadily increasing power demands of the Portland metropolitan area and Willamette Valley: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., That the Eightieth Congress of the United States be urged to approve appropriations sufficient to construct additional electric power projects on the Columbia River and its tributaries with a generating capacity, by November 1, 1949, of 318,000 kilowatts over and above the 745,000 kilowatts of generating units now on order, and with a generating capacity of 1,565,000 kilowatts by November 1, 1953, and to make these necessary appropriations available as rapidly as possible to the Corps of United States Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, to the end that generators sufficient to supply 1,565,000 kilowatts of power by 1953 may be constructed; and be it further

"Resolved, That the request of the Bonneville Power Administration now pending before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives for appropriations

for backbone transmission facilities be made available to the Bonneville Power Administration on an annual and continuing basis which will be adequate to enable it to provide a means for the delivery of the necessary additional power to load centers in the region; and be it further

"Resolved, That in view of the public-agency preference of the Bonneville Act, the planning and subsequent appropriations for generation and backbone transmission of Federal power be based on careful engineering and commercial studies of the present and future needs of the Northwest region and that each regional load center in this region be provided with needed power facilities by the Federal agencies regardless of the ownership of the power-distributing agencies having the responsibility for providing service to the public in the regional load centers; and be it further

"Resolved, That the transmission line materials and equipment needed to construct the proposed 230-kilovolt line between Bonneville and Troutdale, which line is necessary to serve the steadily increasing power demands of the Portland metropolitan area and the Willamette Valley, be given priority and the 1948 appropriation be augmented so as to enable this transmission line to be constructed and in service not later than December of 1949; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable JOHN TABER, chairman, House Appropriations Committee; the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES, chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee of the Interior Department; Senator GUY CORDON; Senator WAYNE MORSE; and Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL.

"Adopted by the council March 20, 1947.

"WILL GIBSON,
Auditor of the City of Portland."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before my friends in the House of Representatives proceed as we understand they intend to proceed—at least, judging from the reports appearing in the press—to take action regarding this feature of the Federal budget, I hope they will stop, look, and listen to the people of the Northwest and to their need for these projects.

Mr. President, I also submit, and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, resolutions on the same problem, which have been adopted by the Central Labor Council of the city of Portland, Oreg., and vicinity.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL OF
PORTLAND AND VICINITY,
Portland, Oreg., March 4, 1947.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The following resolution, which is self-explanatory, was adopted by unanimous vote of the Central Labor Council, of Portland, Oreg., at the last regular meeting held February 24, 1947:

"Whereas the critical power shortage in the Pacific Northwest requires the construction of additional transmission lines to areas, the power supply of which is dangerous deficient; and

"Whereas the continued operation and maintenance of the Federal transmission system under the jurisdiction of the Bonneville Power Administration is an absolute necessity if the power loads of the Northwest are to be met; and

"Whereas the continued industrial, agricultural, and economic development of the

Pacific Northwest is dependent to a large degree upon the availability of an adequate supply of low-cost hydroelectric power at points where power is needed; and

"Whereas a determined effort is being made in various quarters to force an increase of the wholesale rate of \$17.50 per kilowatt-year now charged by the Bonneville Power Administration, in spite of the fact that it has been fully demonstrated that the project will pay all costs at the present \$17.50 rate with many millions surplus to the Government besides; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Central Labor Council does hereby go on record as favoring the appropriation of funds for the Bonneville Power Administration, Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation in amounts sufficient to permit operation and maintenance of existing Federal generating plants and transmission system, the development of new generation and the extension of the transmission system so as not to retard the economic growth of the Pacific Northwest and the creation of new opportunities and new jobs; and be it further

"Resolved, That we earnestly protest any increase in the present Bonneville wholesale rates since such increase would deprive the Northwest of the only natural advantage it now enjoys to at least partially compensate for the discriminating freight rates and other disadvantages it suffers; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be sent to President Harry Truman, the Oregon delegation in the United States Congress, American Federation of Labor, Building and Construction Trades Department, State Federation of Labor urging their endorsement and support."

Sincerely,

GUST ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close this part of my remarks by saying again that in the 1948 campaign I wish to be in the position I was in during the 1946 campaign, when I went before the voters in a number of the States of the Union and told them that in my judgment if they really wanted to have sound economy stability of the United States, if they really wanted to have sound economy in Government, insofar as eliminating wasteful expenditures from the administrative side of Government was concerned, then they should put Republicans in the Congress of the United States. In the 1948 campaign I wish to be in a position to make the same arguments to the voters. But I serve notice on my party today that if they go forward with the type of fiscal policy which I think is emanating from the House of Representatives—at least, insofar as I am able to judge from the reports appearing in the press—I will not hesitate in 1948 to point out that what my party should do is turn out of office those Republicans who are guilty of supporting that type of fiscal policy.

Mr. President, I return for a moment to my previous remarks, so as to make my position perfectly clear, because I do not wish it to be misunderstood. I wish it clearly understood that in the 1948 campaign I shall be fighting for the Republican Party; but in that campaign I will not hold any brief for any Republican who seeks to thwart the development of these great wealth-creating projects which I think are so vital to the West and, being vital to the West,

are also vital to the economic stability of the entire Nation.

GALLUP POLL ON THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN FOR AID

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, first let me say that I endorse the statements which have just been made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; and at an early date, when more time is available, I shall wish to comment on that subject myself.

Mr. President, I was interested to read this morning's Gallup poll report on public reactions to the President's proposals for Greece and Turkey. A careful reading of the poll reveals some interesting facts regarding the attitudes of the American public, and it is worth our attention.

The outstanding fact which emerges, of course, is that the public has not yet had sufficient information to enable it to form a consistent opinion. Thus, while a small majority of those polled favor the President's plan for aid to Greece and Turkey, it is clear that they do so for humanitarian purposes, and that they strongly oppose those features of it which involve military intervention or smack of imperialism.

While it is clear that they are willing to make personal sacrifices to aid those who have suffered from the war's devastation, it is equally clear that they would favor giving such aid through the agency of the United Nations.

These are exactly the sentiments which impelled the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and myself to introduce a substitute resolution which, while making full aid immediately available, would call upon the United Nations to set up an organization immediately to handle and distribute this aid on a humanitarian basis.

I should like to point out that this poll was taken immediately after the President's speech, when only one side of the argument had been presented, and before the public had ample time to reflect on its implications.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the Gallup poll to which I have referred printed in entirety in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

THE GALLUP POLL—56 PERCENT SUPPORT TRUMAN PLAN FOR GREEK AID

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 27.—The first complete national survey of public opinion on aid to Greece shows that President Truman's program has substantial backing from the American people.

His view is shown in the following vote among people who have heard or read about the issue of aid to Greece:

"Do you approve or disapprove of the bill asking for \$250,000,000 to aid Greece?"

Aid to Greece

	Percent
Yes.....	56
No.....	32
No opinion.....	12

On the proposed \$150,000,000 aid to Turkey the poll finds the following vote:

Aid to Turkey

	Percent
Yes.....	49
No.....	36
No opinion.....	15

In short, aid to Greece is favored by nearly 2 to 1 and aid to Turkey by about 1½ to 1, at this stage of developments on the issue. Further debate and discussion may alter sentiment.

In probing opinion the Institute covered many aspects of the issue, using a multiple-question technique. A comprehensive ballot was used in the interviewing of voters, their opinions being drawn out by a series of questions dealing with the Greek and Turkish problems.

FINDINGS ARE LISTED

Among the significant findings were the following:

1. Mr. Truman's speech to Congress asking for \$400,000,000 to help Greece and Turkey made a great impression on the American people. More than three out of every four so far say they have heard or read about his speech.

2. While approving Mr. Truman's general policy, the majority express regret that the problem of Greece was not put up to the United Nations in the beginning.

Most voters recognize the reasons why the United Nations was bypassed, but they have faith in the United Nations and under ideal circumstances would have preferred the United Nations to handle the controversy.

3. The majority of Americans are not afraid that the proposed stand in Greece and Turkey will lead to war.

On the contrary, the general feeling is that a strong stand which shows Russia that we are not bluffing will, in the long run, improve the chances of a European peace settlement.

AGAINST APPEASEMENT

The viewpoint of the majority is well expressed in the comments of a Philadelphia office manager, one of thousands of voters questioned in the poll. His statement sums up the typical attitude as follows:

"If we let Russia get away with her aggressive policy she'll start reaching out for more and more and then we're bound to have a war on our hands. Dictators never know when to stop if you appease them.

"I think that putting our foot down now at the risk of war is more likely to bring lasting peace than giving in to the Russians."

4. The people are being fairly hard-headed in their attitude toward money for Greece and Turkey. They're willing to see aid given, but they want American experts sent over to supervise the uses to which the money will be put.

The administration's plan to send such experts is approved by a vote of approximately 8-to-1.

5. The country is anxious, however, to avoid military involvement of any kind in Greece.

This is shown when voters were asked whether they favor sending American military advisers to train the Greek and Turkish armies. The replies were an overwhelming "no."

Early this week Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the United States would send no troops to Greece.

NOT AN ISOLATED INCIDENT

6. There is a very widespread feeling that the so-called Truman doctrine will have to apply to other nations if they get themselves in the same fix as Greece.

In short, the public seems aware that our stepping into Greece may prove anything but an isolated incident, and that we might have to repeat the process in other nations where free government is considered threatened.

7. The only major point on which the public does not seem to be clear is whether the Governments of Greece and Turkey truly have the backing of a majority in those countries.

More than half say they don't know whether the Turkish Government is backed by the people, and about 4 in every 10 say they don't know whether the present Greek Government has the support of a majority of Greeks.

Those Americans who venture an opinion are inclined to think the Grecian and Turkish Governments are supported by a majority of citizens. But the poll clearly indicates that a very large section of the American public is looking to the State Department and other sources for more light on the question.

8. Eighteen months after the ending of World War II the country continues to be anti-isolationist in its sentiments.

When asked whether we should take a strong stand in Europe, the voters indicate a 2 to 1 preference for a positive role across the Atlantic.

SUMMARY OF ANSWERS

Following is a summary of the survey questions and answers in addition to those given in the beginning of this report. The institute is continuing its study of public opinion on the Greece-Turkey issue and will continue its reports at periodic intervals until the issue is settled by a vote of Congress.

"What do you think are the chief reasons for helping Greece and Turkey?"

Principal reasons given by voters: (1) To check communism and stop Russia; (2) Greece is starving, needs food, needs help; (3) to strengthen America's position and keep peace.

"Can you tell me what are the chief reasons against helping Greece and Turkey?"

Principal reasons given: (1) It might lead to war; (2) it would cost too much; we can't afford it; (3) we might forfeit all possibility of Russia's friendship.

"Would you favor sending American civilian experts over to Greece to help supervise the uses to which this money will be put?"

	Percent
Yes.....	83
No.....	14
No opinion.....	3

The same question was asked concerning Turkey, with virtually the same results—77 percent in favor, 17 percent opposed, and 6 percent no opinion.

"Would you favor sending American military advisers to train the Greek Army?"

	Percent
Yes.....	37
No.....	54
No opinion.....	9

"Would you favor sending them to train the Turkish Army?"

	Percent
Yes.....	33
No.....	55
No opinion.....	12

"Why do you think this problem was not turned over to the United Nations to handle?"

Principal reasons given by voters: (1) The UN is too slow, speed is needed here; (2) the UN is not equipped to handle the problem, not ready to meet such issues, has no money to spend and no police force; (3) Russia would use her veto to prevent any action on Greece.

However, 56 percent indicated disapproval of bypassing the UN completely, while 25 percent approved and 19 percent gave no opinion.

"Do you think that lending money to aid Greece and Turkey is or is not likely to get us into war?"

	Percent
Is likely.....	30
Is not likely.....	54
No opinion.....	16

"Do you think the present Greek Government has the backing of the majority—that is, more than half—of the Greek people?"

	Percent
Yes.....	33
No.....	25
No opinion.....	42

"Do you think the present Turkish Government has the backing of the majority—that is, more than half—of the Turkish people?"

	Percent
Yes.....	34
No.....	14
No opinion.....	52

"Suppose other nations find themselves in the same fix as Greece. Do you think the United States will have to do something about it?"

	Percent
Yes.....	68
No.....	20
No opinion.....	12

"Generally speaking, should the United States take a strong stand in European affairs, or should we try to get out of European affairs?"

	Percent
Take strong stand.....	58
Get out.....	32
No opinion.....	10

TERMINATION OF WAR POWERS AND CONTROLS UNDER SECOND WAR POWERS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT (H. DOC. 25)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the conference report was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under Title III of the Second War Powers Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act shall be cited as the 'First Decontrol Act of 1947.'

"SEC. 2. That the Congress hereby declares that it is vital to a free economy and full production in the United States that all emergency controls and war powers under the Second War Powers Act be removed except in certain limited instances.

"The Congress further declares that in each such limited instance the authority for such emergency controls and war powers should not be exercised by the grant of broad, general war powers but should be granted by restrictive, specific legislation.

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of liquidating existing emergency controls and war powers and for the purpose of affording further opportunity for the appropriate committees of the Congress to consider specific legislation granting restricted authority in limited in-

stances, Title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, approved March 27, 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1501. Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the Eightieth Congress on or before the date this section as amended takes effect, Titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this Act and the amendments to existing law made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947, except that such Title III, and the amendments to existing law made by such title, shall remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the following purposes: (a) Allocations of cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, manilla (abaca) fiber and cordage, agave fiber and cordage, tin and tin products, antimony and streptomycin; (b) allocations limited to control of production for export of tractors; (c) allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers; (d) allocations of materials or facilities for export which are required to expand the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States; (e) allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments; *Provided*, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such Title III: *Provided further*, That the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power of allocation under such title: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives thereof. After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby (except subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1940, as amended by the Act of May 31, 1941) shall be in full force and effect as though this Act had not been enacted."

And the House agree to the same.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
J. HOWARD McGRATH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EARL C. MICHENER,
RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
EDWARD J. DEVITT,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
FADJO CRAVENS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the Senate is now in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. By unanimous consent at noon on Monday the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will have the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit the nominations with instructions.

Mr. WHERRY. The Chair is correct, that is the pending business, but unanimous consent has been granted that the junior Senator from California shall have the floor on Monday at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was previously agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 31, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 28 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON
John B. Alsever

NURSE OFFICER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR NURSE OFFICER

Minnie E. Pohe

IN THE NAVY

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

Rear Adm. Alfred M. Pride, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 28 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

William R. McComb to be Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Great and marvelous are Thy works, Lord God. Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants and Thy glory unto their children. We most humbly acknowledge our sins; forgive us and teach us that every renunciation brings us nearer to upright and courageous living. The years gone by are ours by inheritance; the fruits of the future depend upon our decisions. Lay Thy hand upon us that the welfare of our country may be held in the folds of every conscience, and lead us to carry our obligation to the altar of the Lord. O inspire this Congress ever to safeguard the rights of our citizens, until the waste places of our land shall blossom as the rose. In all our intricate relationships unite us in a fellowship of cooperation for the common good, exercising courtesy, restraint, and honor. We pray in the name of the world's Saviour, whose crown mocks all the diadems of time. 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, with an

amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TOBEY, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MAYBANK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) entitled "An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. McGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday that the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign any bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE COMMITTEES ON WEDNESDAY NEXT DISPENSED WITH

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the Second War Powers Act.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRIBUTION AND PRICING OF SUGAR

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 146, to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, 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 Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, SMITH of Ohio, KUNKEL, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House on House Joint Resolution 146 may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD under the title "Seventy-two Pearl Harbors Every Year."

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 10 minutes, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Syracuse Post Standard.

ROME, N. Y., AIR BASE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to me on reliable information today that the Rome, N. Y., air base and depot is to be put in the inactivated class. On the basis of dozens and dozens of protests that I have received from people in my district due to the economic importance of this great air terminal in the central part of New York State, I protest and protest loudly

to the War Department against such action. This is one of the most important air terminal points in central New York State. Although it is not in my district, the people of my district have gained a great deal of benefit from it. I think it is an economic tragedy or calamity, if you want to put it that way, to have this great depot put in the inactivated class. A large part of upstate New York depends upon this base for air communication with the rest of the country. Let us hope the War Department will find ways and means to keep the Rome airport open.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the Centralia mine disaster, together with an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post.

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

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous material.

UNITED STATES SHIPS IN EUROPE ON LEND-LEASE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, since the Greek problem has become the burning question of the hour, there have been extremely interesting developments.

Today we are attracted by a newspaper headline: "1,700 United States ships still in Europe on lend-lease." The item states that Russia holds 577 of these vessels. She has returned none of the ships she borrowed from the United States Navy, and further:

The lend-lease ships figure importantly in Navy plans for aiding the anti-Russian bloc in Europe. The Navy already has sold to Turkey eight surplus minesweepers loaned to England and six minesweepers and other vessels to Greece.

Thus the administration in the operation of its complex foreign policy has loaned 577 ships to be used in the service of the communistic states and sold 14 to Greece and Turkey, who, we are told, are in a death struggle defending themselves against communism.

Considering the history of our Government for the past 14 years and the administration's acceptance and adoption of totalitarian ideals as manifested through their planned and controlled economy, it appears that their distribution of ships gives a true picture of their basic and fundamental devotion

to totalitarian practices—577 for, 14 against.

NOBODY CHECKS GOVERNMENT PHYSICAL PROPERTY

Mr. WEICHEL. 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. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries developed the fact that no independent agency or auditor of the Government makes a regular, periodic, or any other check whatsoever as to the physical property purchased by the Government.

After any agency, bureau, or department once secures physical property, no one in the Government or in the name of the Government, not even the Comptroller General, is authorized to check, examine, investigate, or otherwise periodically find out if any such agency, bureau, or department of the Government actually has the physical property in its possession, whether it is given away, destroyed, or otherwise in control of the Government.

There is no check of the physical property of any kind whatsoever, so that any agency, bureau, or department without fear of detection or exposure, can give away, destroy or embezzle physical property belonging to the United States Government; no one has authority in law or otherwise to examine into the physical property transactions of any agency, bureau, or department. In other words there is no check, examination, or investigation of the physical inventories, if any, of the billions of dollars of physical property purchased with the taxpayers' money.

This probably supports the various statements in the newspapers with reference to the waste and destruction of the physical property of the various departments of the Government. I have heard that the Navy deliberately took to sea a deck load of brand new shoes, had them soaked with water and then ordered them destroyed; that the Army destroyed untold thousands of dollars worth of athletic equipment which could have been very well used by the poor youngsters of this country; and that the Ordnance Department gave away hundreds of millions of dollars worth of machinery.

I do not believe that the agencies, bureaus, and departments should have the absolute discretion of giving away, destroying, and passing on the embezzling of physical property, for there is no check of its operation.

I believe the people are entitled to a periodic check and inventory of the use of physical property, the same as the money transactions, as to whether the agency has the property, gave it away or permitted it to be embezzled.

I am including herewith a resolution whereby there will be a periodic audit and examination by the Comptroller General of the physical property now in the hands of the agencies, bureaus, and departments of the Government:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office, under the direction of the

Comptroller General, shall receive and examine inventories of property furnished as of June 30 for each fiscal year beginning in the year 1939 and thereafter, by every department, agency, and independent establishment of the United States, and by every corporation owned or controlled by the United States. Such inventories shall contain the following information: (a) The value of all property acquired or disposed of during the fiscal year; (b) the value of all property on hand as of June 30 with an allowance for depreciation of such property; and (c) such other information as the Comptroller General shall direct.

Sec. 2. The Comptroller General shall investigate (a) any matter relating to the acquisition or disposition of property by any department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States, and by every corporation owned or controlled by the United States, and (b) any other matter required to be stated in an inventory.

Sec. 3. The Comptroller General shall make a report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session relative to matters examined or investigated by him as provided in sections 1 and 2 with such recommendations for legislation as he shall deem advisable.

Sec. 4. The Comptroller General is authorized to use officers and employees under his jurisdiction for the performance of the duties provided in this act and to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional accountants, investigators, attorneys, officers, and employees as may be necessary without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include two newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have here two newspaper articles which I will insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, and which I hope the Members will read tomorrow morning. One is from the Seminole Producer, of Seminole, Okla., and is entitled "Veteran Care Is War Emergency."

The other is from the Washington Times-Herald of today, and is entitled "Move By TABER Blocks Contracts on Vet Hospitals."

The article from the Oklahoma newspaper tells of the deplorable conditions in veterans' hospitals in Oklahoma. It states that hospital beds, nurses, and doctors are not available in sufficient numbers to furnish even the emergency cases hospital and medical care; that there are waiting lists and that a man cannot even get on the waiting list unless he is an emergency case.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have grilled General Bradley, General Hawley, and the other "sacred cows" over there. They tell me there is no serious congestion to the point where emergency cases cannot be taken care of; but let me tell you what happened in my State just recently. A veteran tried on March 18, 1947, to get in the veterans' hospital at Muskogee, Okla., as an emergency case. The doctors examined him and said he was not an emergency case, and he was put on a waiting list. The veteran died 2 days later on March 20, 1947.

Now we find by the article in the Times-Herald that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has ordered a 2-week's delay in awarding contracts to build veterans' hospitals. We are going to have more deaths of the nature I have referred to. Once more you are going to find that the boys who fought on world-wide battlefronts come home to die on "the battlefields of Republican economy," and Veterans' Administration bungling and red tape.

The newspaper articles follow, and to them I invite your careful attention:

[From the Seminole (Okla.) Producer of March 24, 1947]

VETERAN CARE IS WAR EMERGENCY

The war may be over for the average citizen, but it is not over for many thousands of Oklahoma veterans who cannot find hospital beds in the State when they become ill or incapacitated. That condition exists in Oklahoma, according to Dr. D. H. Miller, manager and chief medical officer of the largest veterans' hospital in Oklahoma, at Muskogee.

Hospital beds, nurses, and doctors are not available in sufficient numbers to furnish even the emergency cases hospital and medical care. Those veterans who have not pursued their "claims" through the miles of "red tape" of the Veterans' Administration and secured a decision from that Federal Bureau that they have a physical or mental disability due to wartime service are not to be admitted, according to the latest announcement, except "in cases of life or death."

That "life or death" decision is a difficult one to make. The veteran who was denied admission on March 18 because he was not a "life and death case," but who died on March 20, gives some idea about how difficult it is to make these decisions.

Oklahoma should have additional hospital beds for veterans. More nurses and doctors are sorely needed. These same professions are in demand in almost every community of the State, and private practice offers a much greater inducement than the initiative-killing positions in the antiquated civil service which supplies the personnel for the Veterans' Administration.

Physical facilities are recognized as a problem also. Everyone recognizes that even without the months delay always prevalent when the Government attempts to build a hospital, the job could not be done in time to meet the present emergency, due to shortage of materials and the labor situation in the construction field.

These are all recognized factors which result in no beds for the men and women who fought the Nation's battles. The condition exists, and the responsible officials of Government know all the facts. They do not, however, come up with any practical solution. Their plea that they are planning for new hospitals to be completed some years hence, does not save the life of a single veteran.

These disabled and sick veterans are just as much a part of the recent war as they were when in uniform. This is one of the war's problems, even though the shooting has ceased. Why cannot our Government apply some of the same methods to caring for these veterans which they applied when the Nation went to war without sufficient manpower or sufficient physical facilities?

It was a patriotic duty to serve either as a gun-toting enlisted man, a nurse, or a doctor during those war days. The recognition due a citizen who was fulfilling a patriotic duty was accorded those who answered the Nation's call. Why cannot that be done now, to meet this phase of our unfinished war?

A fine physical plant exists at McAlester, owned by the State. It is not in use. Med-

ical officers of the Army, detailed to duty there, and Army nurses, detailed there, could take care of many hundreds. Borden Army hospital at Chickasha is closed. It could handle several hundred.

Called to duty, the doctors and nurses would respond. "Swivel chair doctors" by the dozens could be assigned from useless branch offices of the Veterans' Administration. Yes, it could be done with some of the same abilities demonstrated during the war being applied now. We doubt the ability of the present Veterans' Administration brass hats to do it, but it should be done.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of March 28, 1947]

MOVE BY TABER BLOCKS CONTRACTS ON VET HOSPITALS

Ordering a moratorium on the issuing of new contracts, Representative TABER (Republican), of New York, yesterday forced the Veterans' Administration to hold up its Nation-wide hospital program, the Times-Herald learned last night.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee made his demand for the contract-letting holiday directly to General Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, according to high Government sources.

BIDS HELD UP TO APRIL 8

Bradley agreed not to accept any bids until April 8 as a favor to the man who controls the purse strings on Capitol Hill, it was learned. Directly affected are two new hospitals for which contracts were to be okayed next week, and for which funds already have been appropriated.

Chairman TABER is reported to have ordered the 2-week moratorium to investigate excessive spending in the hospital program. He could not be reached for comment last night.

Representative ROGERS (Republican), of Massachusetts, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, said she had heard rumors of TABER's action, but had not been informed of it officially.

PLEDGES INVESTIGATION

"I can say only that anything which holds up beds for ill veterans is a serious situation," the Congresswoman asserted. "I am planning to look into the matter thoroughly."

Reached at his home in Fort Myer last night, General Bradley said he accepted the responsibility for ordering that no contracts be issued until April 8, but added that he did so at the specific request of the Appropriations chairman.

"I have a mandate from Congress to go ahead with the hospital program," he said, "and construction that is under way already is not affected by Representative TABER's request. However, when he asked that no new bids be accepted for 2 weeks, I agreed."

From several sources it was learned that Bradley did not have to acquiesce to TABER's demands, but that he probably did so in order not to offend the Appropriations Committee head.

HOSPITALS BADLY NEEDED

Seriousness of holding up the hospital program—even for a day—was brought into sharp focus last night when it was learned that 3,500 veterans are now awaiting admittance to Veterans' Administration hospitals, and that the Army has 7,000 men in its hospitals that it wishes to discharge into veterans' institutions.

VA authorities have pointed out that the hospital load will increase 20 percent in 5 years and 40 percent in 10 years.

The building program is under supervision of Brig. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, Director of the Military Construction Division, Office of the Chief of Engineers.

TAX REDUCTION AND THE BUDGET

Mr. SMATHERS. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the House passed the Knutson bill. It has been estimated by tax experts that this will cost the Government \$5,700,000,000.

To avoid deficit spending in peacetime it thereby becomes urgent, more so than ever before, to now cut the budget.

Of the budget remaining for consideration 80 percent are allocations for the Army, Navy, and veterans.

The \$64 question is, How can the majority leadership cut this budget without seriously cutting the military and naval budgets? If the Republican leadership do cut the military budget, they will be running counter to the wishes of the American people. The most recent Gallup polls shows that 60 percent of the people who were asked about it do not favor cutting the military budget. They are more concerned about the problems of peace than they are about reduction of taxes at the immediate time.

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

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the people back home are deeply disturbed by the administration's plan to aid Greece and Turkey as a means of blocking the expansion of communism. There is universal sympathy for the suffering which the Greek people are enduring. Our country has not forgotten the heroic defense which the Greek nation presented to the invading armies of Fascist Italy in the war years. Nor are we unmindful of the fact that the sad plight of the Greek people is the direct result of events completely beyond their control.

What disturbs the American people is the effort of our Government to direct our natural sympathies toward these innocent victims of the war to the establishment of a new policy of blockade. Our folks are deeply concerned over the effort to substitute our own Nation for Great Britain as the principal actor in the drama whose plot is the blocking of the Soviet Union's drive toward the west. There is no disposition whatever to sanction the Communist method of economic imperialism in Europe. We do not for a moment accept the Soviet Union's policy of exploiting famine and poverty as the means by which Mr. Stalin and Mr. Molotov expect to communize their neighbors.

But we are vitally interested in the formulation of America's policies, in meeting the issues of our generation. What direction are these policies taking? What are the principles underlying our conduct and determining the role we shall play?

I believe that the White House program is a reaffirmation of the nineteenth century belief in power politics. It is a refinement of the policy first adopted

after the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 designed to encircle Russia and establish a "Cordon Sanitaire" around the Soviet Union. It is a program which points to a new policy of interventionism in Europe as a corollary to our Monroe Doctrine in South America.

Let there be no mistake about the far-reaching implications of this plan. Once we have taken the historic step of sending financial aid, military experts, and loans to Greece and Turkey, we shall be irrevocably committed to a course of action from which it will be impossible to withdraw. More and larger demands will follow. Greater needs will arise throughout the many areas of friction in the world. To be sure, we shall reserve the right to consider each problem on its own merits, but unless we develop a strong and consistent program—a program which we are prepared to back to the limit—the net result will inevitably be a lowering of American prestige and influence and the direct increase of Soviet pressure everywhere.

Let us not lose sight of this fundamental consideration. Unless we do the whole job of blocking Communist expansion and do it alone, we shall defeat the entire purpose of this program. Instead of checking the Soviet Union's rising influence, we run the risk of enhancing it enormously.

The question for Americans to consider is this: Are the probabilities of success in this new undertaking high enough to justify the risk? Are we prepared to pour endless sums of money into Greece, Turkey, and such other areas of the world as may be stimulated by our new policy to require our aid? Are we ready to send military missions overseas in the approved European fashion, recognizing that military missions have historically been followed all too frequently by military forces?

Do we have any alternatives worthy of serious examination? Are there any techniques which offer the prospect of changing the bankrupt methods of power politics, encirclement, and secret alliances? Must we go on muddling through world affairs, repeating in every generation the same ghastly errors of our predecessors?

If we are sincere in the beliefs we so constantly express, there is a new policy and a new organ which represents that policy. We ourselves have been the most instrumental Nation in the world in shaping the instrument of this new policy. The United Nations is new to be sure. But military missions and secret treaties are old. We have everything to gain by using the new agencies available to us.

The representative of our State Department has told the Nation that this is a matter which requires emergency handling. It cannot be delayed. Greece needs immediate financial assistance. Does this tragic dilemma concern no other country in the world than our own? Most certainly it does. It concerns the entire comity of nations. The peace of the world may be jeopardized by the tragedy unfolding there. Every country on earth should be interested in this situation.

I believe that the proper procedure in the present case is something far different from the Government proposal. We should go directly to the United Nations and urge action there. We should present the question of armed insurrection by a minority of the Greek people to the Security Council. We should urge the United Nations to ask for a joint contribution by all the nations of the earth to alleviate Greek suffering. If there are no other countries which can make such a contribution, our Government should then consider the advisability of making it directly to the United Nations instead of to Greece. Let all the countries represented in this global organization underwrite the enterprise. Let them join with us in this humanitarian effort. If the Greek people are restored to solvency, they will purchase the food they need. They will strengthen their own government, and they will manage to solve the internal problem of their military security for themselves.

This is the pattern for an orderly world. It is a policy of world cooperation rather than of intervention. It removes Uncle Sam from the suspicion of attempting world-wide penetration. Food today is international politics. We must not be guilty of utilizing it as a weapon unless we are ready to fight.

I believe that the people of our country expect a new departure in the conduct of our foreign affairs. We are tired unto the death of the Yaltas and the Teherans and the Potsdams through which the world has passed. For the first time in human history, let the nations resolve to deal the cards above the conference table. If we are to extend aid to Greece, let us do it through the United Nations, by the United Nations, for the United Nations. Turkey is not starving. Its 1,000,000 soldiers, the equivalent of an American Army of 7,000,000, are well fed.

Here in America we have major responsibilities to our own people. We have not yet solved our problems. Let us put them in order before we start solving the problems of the whole world.

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

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

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman please tell the House of what possible value the United Nations could be in the solution of the problem to which the gentleman addresses himself, so long as Russia holds the veto power?

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question. The United Nations was effective in the controversy involving Iran. It was 100 percent successful in that problem, in spite of Russia's action, in spite of her disposition not to be friendly or cooperative. The United Nations worked in that instance. What in the world are we subscribing to the United Nations for unless we propose to use that Organization as the instrument in these world controversies?

The Committee on Foreign Relations is considering two propositions. One proposition provides for \$350,000,000 to feed the people in Poland, Austria, Hungary, Greece, China, and Italy. On the other hand, they are considering the Truman proposition to implement

Greece and Turkey to the extent of \$400,000,000. It is proposed that we help the satellite countries of Russia. If we are going to fight communism, if we are going to make a frontal attack, then why feed her satellites?

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

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

Mr. BENDER. Why should we use this vehicle to implement Russia? If we mean to get tough with Russia, why can we not be honest with ourselves and do this directly.

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

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

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman was wondering whether or not it was worth while to take the risk to go into Greece and Turkey with this relief. Will the gentleman answer this question? In the early thirties, when Japan moved into Manchuria, and later on when Mussolini went into Ethiopia, and then when Hitler went into the Rhineland, and the democratic nations sat by and did nothing, how then can we sit back and repeat this time what we did last time?

Mr. BENDER. The democratic nations implemented Japan and Germany. Why, we were shipping material into Japan just a few months before Pearl Harbor, not only scrap iron, but we were sending lathes from my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, to Japan. We were implementing Germany as well. We did not boycott Germany and say, "We are going to stop doing business with you, Mr. Hitler." We were doing business with Hitler long after he became Mr. Big.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I noticed in the headlines a moment ago that Russia has offered to lend England money. It looks like we might as well come home if that kind of procedure is going on.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, we have billions of dollars of equipment all over the world that is available to the satellite countries of Russia. Some Russia is buying herself with American dollars.

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

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REED of New York. There is no reason why Russia should not buy with American dollars. We have turned over all our engraving apparatus to them so that they can turn out our dollars over there.

Mr. BENDER. There is no question about that. You cannot quite understand this crazy, dizzy foreign policy of ours. On the one hand we give them aid, implement and feed them, and on the other we want to fight communism. Overnight everybody in America gets excited about communism. When the Republicans a year or two ago were talking about Communists in the American Government, nobody was excited, but all of a sudden everybody in the administration is all in a dither about the Communists.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The gentleman is not saying he is not in favor of fighting communism?

Mr. BENDER. I have been saying that right along. I am against communism and have been opposed to it all the time. But if we are going to oppose communism let us oppose it directly. Let us do it by not doing business with Russia and her satellite countries, by not implementing Russia and making Russia strong. Mr. Roosevelt turned over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Austria, and all these other satellite countries to Russia. They were turned over at Potsdam, at Yalta, at Tehran. These countries were turned over to Russia by the United States Government and by the British Government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the gentleman think that Russia is trying to take over Greece today?

Mr. BENDER. I do not know what Russia is trying to do. I am not a part of their government. But I do know this, that whatever there is in Europe that she has we gave her, we handed it over to her on a silver platter.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish the gentleman would answer my question. Is it not a fact that from the information we have it appears that Russia is trying to move into Greece?

Mr. BENDER. I do not know about that. The gentleman is better informed about that than I am.

Mr. SMATHERS. The gentleman says he is willing to fight communism. Would not that be the first place to fight it?

Mr. BENDER. No. The first place to fight it is right in our own country. The second place is the State Department. The third place to fight it is in all the satellite countries and in Russia.

What do they say about Greece? There are two or three thousand bandits there raising Ned with the Greek Government and this venal monarch of theirs. It is a set-up that is not popular with the people, this fake election they put on in Greece, this Government that the people do not want. By sustaining that Government we are not doing any good. If they cannot cope with two or three thousand burglars who are operating in Greece, then we have no business going over there and supporting that kind of government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the gentleman admit that the election which took place in Greece was supervised by 637 foreign correspondents from all over the world, and it was certified by them to be

as democratic and free an election as it was possible to get?

Mr. BENDER. Since when did foreign correspondence supervise an election? That is a new one on me. I never heard of that before. My impression about the Greek election is that the Greek election was corrupt. It was a phoney election, and the Greek people protested.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman learn, if he can, from the Members on the other side who seem to be interested in this, whether or not it is their policy that we supervise the elections in these countries, and that if in these countries the ruling power, whether a monarch or whatever it may be, seems inclined to embrace communism, we go in there and tell them what kind of government they shall have? Will the gentleman find out from them?

Mr. BENDER. Is it not amazing that in Poland we permitted the Russian government to get away with the kind of election they conducted over there, yet on the other hand we are talking about this Grecian situation? Is not Poland as important as Greece? Are not the people there as important to us as the Greeks? Are not the Chinese as important to us as the Greeks? We withdraw from China, and we say to the Communists, "Go ahead, this is your happy hunting ground." There are 400,000,000 Chinese, whereas there are only 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 Greeks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about Finland?

Mr. BENDER. Yes, what about Finland, the only country in the world that ever paid its debt to the United States of America. We permit the Russian bear to go in there and just take over, and we say nothing about it at all. In fact, we put blinders on so we cannot see what is going on.

In my remarks last week, I suggested that our President at the behest of the British Government is developing an American policy which fits the needs of a collapsing British Empire. There are several ways of expressing this—we might say that the British have decided to transfer all of their liabilities throughout the world to us and keep the assets for themselves. Another way of expressing the same thing is this—wherever the British have been maintaining a hopeless economic and political situation, they are now asking us to come in and underwrite their mistakes. Still another way of expressing the same thing in financial terms, is this—our President and the British are asking us to pour billions of dollars of taxpayers' money down every international rat hole from Singapore to Constantinople.

Greece today with its corrupt and venal monarchy—Turkey with its military dictatorship, are liabilities to the British—they have cost the British hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. Greece, in particular, represents a British mistake—a mistake because they have insisted on restoring a Greek monarch who does not have the support of

the Greek people. It was also a mistake, Mr. Speaker, because many of the people around the Greek monarch are completely corrupt. The British have discovered that neither the hundreds of millions of dollars nor the flood of UNRRA relief succeeded in achieving a real change for the better in the economic life of the country. The present government is reported to have fattened its own pocket, protecting its own interests, speculating in the black market, and in general making a killing out of the present situation there. Its finances are described as being in complete disorder. Its officials have made no effort to curb the disastrous inflation now rampant in the country. They refuse to share the governmental power with run-of-the-mine, middle-of-the-road political figures; they maintain concentration camps, and general democratic civil liberties exist only on paper.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I call an international rat hole. No matter how much money we pour into such a government, it will do no good because the basic nature of the government itself is corrupt. No matter how much technical advice we furnish, it will do no good because the will to create a democratic government in Greece does not exist in the hearts and minds of the people who decide the policies for this reactionary Greek monarchy. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, for us any more than there was for the British to create a stable political situation in Greece so long as the present monarch is maintained in that nation.

So then, Mr. Speaker, the British are attempting, in my opinion, to give us a half billion dollars a year liability—the accumulated result of their errors in policy. Do we want it? Do we need it? Can we justify it?

Another such endless quagmire is the present Turkish Government which has existed as a venal dictatorship for the past 20 years. The rulers of this Government held a gun to our heads in the recent war. They sold to the Germans; they forced us to pay excessive prices for raw materials; they constantly threatened us with assistance to our enemies; they took several hundreds of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money because they thought it was smart business, and now with a million men under arms, they sit there in Turkey, expecting the American taxpayers to pay with hundreds of millions of dollars every year just to keep them sitting there in happy, little, military dictator-run camp. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, what assurance does our State Department have that after we pay hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to the Turkish Army, because that is exactly what our State Department proposes to do—what assurance does our State Department have that the present Turkish military leaders will not sell out to the Russians, if and when the Russians get into a position to outbid us, or if a real conflict were to develop between us? Does anybody really believe that in the event of a Soviet-American war that Turkey would stand up for 1 week? Would the Turks stand and fight under their present leadership? I do not think

so. I believe they will sell; I believe that in every single situation, the present Turkish Government will look out for its own hide. And in the meantime, it will sell to anybody who will pay the most money. Mr. Speaker, if we begin buying up every international threat, we will have entered a new period in international politics. It will be a period dominated by international blackmail.

Mr. Speaker, does it make sense that whenever anybody stands up anywhere and screams that he is against communism, therefore, automatically we should place him on the pay roll of the American taxpayer at whatever price he says is necessary to keep him screaming?

In short, does our Government intend in this new global policy to hire every dictator or king everywhere throughout the world who will scream "Stop communism!" Mr. Speaker, does it make sense for the British to make our decisions for us, to transfer their liabilities to us? Does it make sense for us to assume every mistake the British have made throughout the world? Does it make sense for us to put on the pay roll of the American Government everywhere in the world any old monarch or miscellaneous political adventurer who says, "Let's all of us boys get together and yell about communism for Uncle Sam at a price?"

If it makes sense to our State Department, I think the time is at hand to change the Department. It does not make sense to the American people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Lait, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of freight rates in California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is well in a great representative body such as this that we have an expression of views such as the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has made and that we have an exchange of views.

One factor contributing to the success of the democratic institutions of government is that in disagreement we respect the views of one another and the right of each other to entertain his or her views.

In taking the floor and characterizing unkindly or sarcastically the views of others, one makes very little contribution toward arriving at what is the right thing to do. My friend from Ohio says he is against communism. I would rather state my position as being that I believe in what my country stands for. I am pro-American, and being pro-American that means I am against any ideology or any institutions which would destroy—or is so aimed—the dignity and the personality of the individual.

My friend says that he is against communism. Yet, he makes a speech which I am not going to characterize because that would not be right, but the effect of his speech would be that we would isolate ourselves from the rest of the world, even if it were contrary to our national interests. I know that he does not mean that. If we follow his argument, however, the result would be the same as if he did mean it.

My views, broadly speaking, on this question have been expressed heretofore on the floor of the House. Twelve years ago I recognized that some day there would be a challenge against the way of life I believe in and another. My way of life has its origin in belief in God. I start with that. That is the basis of our civilization, and every thought I entertain is predicated upon that. The same applies to all of us who believe in God without regard to their religious convictions, whether they are a Catholic or a member of the various Protestant creeds or Jewish. They all believe in one God. The inevitable result of that belief is that the dignity and personality of the individual must always be uppermost in our minds.

That belief is the great truth that forms the firm foundation of the government we believe in. It is all centered around the dignity of the individual and the preservation of that dignity to the fullest measure possible.

Twelve years ago I was chairman of a committee. We recommended legislation against subversive activities and those engaging in them here. The only legislation which has passed this Congress in many years was recommended by the special committee of which I had the honor then to be chairman. One of the most important bills was the Foreign Agents Registration Act, about which you read so much today. I think that has been an effective piece of legislation in meeting subversive activities in America.

We have seen this challenge coming and we have seen country after country taken over. It is very easy to criticize why this was not done or why that was not done. Many of the things to which the gentleman referred were things about which I entertained somewhat similar doubts in my own mind. But we have to view the situation in the light of the world today and in the light of what is

best for the national interests of the United States of America.

I am concerned with the national interest of my own country. As I view it, knowing of the things that do happen when the will of the people in certain countries cannot be expressed and a small minority takes over, with the result that the people become disheartened and tired of fighting for the principles of right and justice, finally the government is taken over by a minority. Then we have seen what ruthlessness follows, illustrated by the case of Yugoslavia which I referred to on July 27 of last year on the floor of the House and again in a speech I made on January 23 of this year, when I said that the Soviet Union was using its ideology to challenge the way of life we believe in, as well as it being a part of its military efforts to encircle America.

Now, I believe that to be a fact. Are we going to sit back and do nothing, or are we going to do something to try to prevent this encircling movement? That is the question. On that question, of course, men may honestly disagree. This is not a party matter. Let me say here that the gentleman from Ohio expressed his own views, and I know that he was not expressing his views as a Republican, but his own honest views as entertained by himself. It may be that between now and when the bill comes up circumstances will develop that may cause the gentleman to change his mind. Knowing the gentleman as I do, if such does happen, I know he would be actuated by what he considers the best interest, the national interest of America.

As I see it, there is a calculated risk if we do something; but there certainly is a calculated risk if we do nothing. The question is, Which is the greater calculated risk? That, as I see it, is the problem which addresses itself to the conscience and the judgment of each Member of the Congress.

The people expect us to know more about this problem than they do, and they are justified, because we are here as their Representatives from the various congressional districts throughout the country. They expect us to know more and they expect us to vote our judgment and our conscience, having always in mind the national interest of the United States of America.

We know that Greece with 7,500,000 people is a pivotal spot in the world today. There is a lot in what the gentleman had to say about China, but our country is not letting China down, our country is interested over there, and it is a national interest. I agree with the gentleman about China, not only for America of today, but because I am looking ahead several generations from now when we shall be dead and gone. I want friendship between the people of China and the people of America to extend to future generations. We, by our actions in the next few years to come, can crystallize and cement it so that Americans for generations to come will be the beneficiaries of our wise actions.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. I should like to ask the gentleman's opinion on this matter which is involved in this whole question: The crisis in Greece came about as a result of Britain's informing us that she was withdrawing her support of the existing government. Is not that true? That is not my question, it is merely a preface to it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think that brought the crisis; it brought the necessity for immediate action on our part.

Mr. McDONOUGH. All right. Then, whatever we may do to aid the Greek Government to establish a stabilized government in that country, we do to stop the spread of communism, but we also do something that will aid the British lifeline.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will go along with the gentleman in his first observation, but I cannot concede his last statement. I will go along with the gentleman in the first portion of his statement, although I probably would have expressed it somewhat differently.

Mr. McDONOUGH. My question is: If the crisis in Greece is of such importance to the democracies of the world, why should not Great Britain aid us in establishing stable conditions in Greece instead of asking us to do it alone?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that question; and yet, it is a proper question for anyone to entertain. I cannot answer it except to say that the evidence we have so far as I know is that Britain is unable to carry on her commitments. Now, with Britain withdrawing, the question is: What is the proper thing for us to do for our own national interest?

I think it is unwise for our country to remain inactive and by default allow nation after nation to be taken over by a vigorous communistic minority to be followed by the people's being subjected to ruthless force and then ultimately to be taken within the orbit—I will say this frankly—within the orbit of the Soviet Union.

The country that controls the Mediterranean controls Europe, and the country that controls Europe controls Africa and is a very dominating influence in Asia. I recognize the right of others to believe differently, but what is in our own national interest? Can we sit back and see Europe succumb country by country? Is that in the national interest of the United States? We know what happens, we know what has happened in the various countries over there. Let us assume that a month from now we pick up the papers and find that a small group has taken over Greece. Let us be frank with each other. We know that the Soviet Union directly or indirectly is working in there. In Albania, in Yugoslavia, probably in Rumania, certain elements are working, but back of that is the force and power and spirit of the Soviet Union. Suppose we wake up some day in the near future and find that Greece has been taken over by the Communists. Would we feel that that was for the national interest of our country? Other things are involved if Greece is taken over, a lot of

other things. It is the pipe line to the Middle East, then to the Far East; it is the pipe line right down through that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, suppose 2 or 3 months from now we find Italy has been taken over by the same group. How would we feel? Would we think that would be in the national interest of our country? Suppose, then, we woke up and found 2 or 3 months later that France has been taken over by the minority group. Then, of course, where would Belgium and Denmark be? We know that Sweden, Denmark, and Norway are now under pressure. There is a demand for islands up there. They are under economic pressure. Sweden is under economic pressure. We know that. We know that the Communists in the coalition government in Belgium have withdrawn from the cabinet so they can attack the government in Belgium in the open. What does that mean? Yes; we are vitally interested in China, too, not only because of our affection for the people of China, although we cannot be interested alone because of affection or sentiment, we are vitally interested, as I see it, because the national interest of our country prompts it.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Do we not also have a selfish interest in keeping communism from the other countries of the world because unless we have a free world we cannot sell American goods. The manufacturers, the farmers, the American farmers and laborers, cannot do business in a Communist-dominated country. Is it not, therefore, to our selfish interest to take steps to prevent the spread of communism?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is correct, but there is something bigger, too. There is a moral objective. There is something over and beyond material things, although some of them are very important. There is something we have had for 2,000 years or longer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman who raised the question of the United Nations raises a proper one. I came to this Chamber today not intending to make any remarks. I heard the gentleman from Ohio make his remarks. I am glad he has made his remarks because it is only through discussion that we arrive at a judgment; it is only through discussion we can arrive at the truth where truth is involved or where judgment in reference to a matter of policy concerning the national interest is involved.

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

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

Mr. BELL. May I ask about this situation: I notice a headline in the morning paper that Stalin has offered a loan to Great Britain. Suppose that Great

Britain were to accept that loan and join the ideological group that Stalin represents, would that have a bearing on the question of the Greek loan from America, in the opinion of the gentleman?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if England accepted the loan and joined that ideological group, it would certainly have a serious repercussion throughout the world. I do not know anything about the loan. All I know is what I see in the papers. Whether it is a tactical move by Stalin for world politics or not, I do not know; but if England were to accept the loan, and by reason of that come within the orbit of the Soviet Union, it would have serious repercussions throughout the world and certainly it would be a matter of grave concern to the people of the United States. Now, that is my opinion.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. A good many of our prominent citizens have suggested this problem be taken before the UN. May I ask the gentleman what he thinks Russia would do about the veto if we should take that question to the UN?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will come to that.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are two points with respect to the British position.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am trying to speak from the broader angle, and I know my friend has interpreted my statement in that way. I think out of this there is an opportunity for an awful lot of good to come. I do not know whether I will make any contribution or not, but I am attempting to, following the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is making a constructive contribution. I think there is a complete answer to the question raised by our friend on this side with respect to Britain's ability at this moment, an official answer, in the 1947 economic survey issued by the Prime Minister to the people of Britain. I think that is a complete answer to Britain's inability to pay and also a complete warning to the people of the United States that unless Britain receives additional substantial credit from the United States Britain must necessarily accept credit from Russia or from some other country. There is no escape from it, because Great Britain's 1947 program calls for certain accomplishments. Three months have passed, and they have not even started on those accomplishments, and in the absence of those accomplishments the \$3,750,000,000 loan extended to Britain by the United States will have failed to suffice, and it is our next move to meet the situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, coming from one of the best versed Members of the Congress.

Now, coming to the United Nations. That is a very pertinent question; a very relevant thought. The United Nations, of course, is not even in its infant stage. This is a situation where we have been requested by the Greek Government and the Turkish Government to act. We have been requested to act in connection with the internal affairs of those Governments. The United Nations does not have the money, it does not have the equipment, and it does not have an international police force. It is doubtful whether it has the authority to go into the internal affairs of a country, as such, for the purpose of trying to stabilize it.

Furthermore, this question, if presented to the United Nations, would come before the Security Council, and already, on either 9 or 10 occasions, the representative of the Soviet Union has exercised the veto power. Furthermore, we only had that situation arise a few days ago when the question of the Albanian sinking of a British ship came before the Security Council, and the Council voted 7 to 2 to take some kind of action in connection with that sinking. And who was it that vetoed it? It was the representative of the Soviet Union. Of course, the purpose of communism in its international aspect and its march onward is to try and create uncertainty and confusion and chaos wherever it can among the peoples of a nation that are not directly or indirectly under its domination or control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. One nation, for instance, can resist here and there and then the Soviet Union will probe elsewhere. It and its satellites play upon uncertainty and do all they can to create uncertainty and fear into chaos with the minority then stepping in to wrest the control of government. The Soviet Union, with its international ideology of "Red fascism," is challenging our way of life, and spreading itself wherever it can. It wins by default of the strong democratic nations doing nothing. Now, the question is, can we continue to sit on the side lines and see this done to country after country?

I respect the right of any member who forms an opinion the other way, but my opinion is that we have to take action. The result of this action will help other people, but the motive for the action, as far as I am concerned, is that the national interest of the United States prompts it and requires it.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Would it not have put the United States and the United Nations in a better position, granting that they might have failed, had they joined with Great Britain and taken this matter first to the United Nations, so that

they would not have put the power of propaganda into the hands of the officials of Russia, as we have done, with which they can inflame the minds of the people that we are an imperialistic nation, that we are encircling them, and make them believe that probably we intend to invade their country? Can anyone say that with the power of the peace-loving nations, if it had been taken to UNO, it would have failed?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot agree with the gentleman on that, because no matter what we would have done the Soviet Union would not have been satisfied from the angle of propaganda. If they did not have one thing, they would have another to say about us. Furthermore, we are stepping in there because England is unable to carry on. Furthermore, if we had stepped in with England, then I am inclined to think that many of my friends in this House would have accused our Government of being dominated by British foreign policy, so far as any effort on our part is concerned.

My purpose in taking the floor today is to welcome the opportunity to reply to, and to also welcome the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio. Let us have more of this, and let us have a discussion on both sides, without unnecessary charges and recriminations, but on the broad plane of what is best for the national interest of the United States of America. As I view it, the national interest of our country, today and tomorrow, calls for the issue being joined, such as President Truman, in no unmistakable words and manner, joined it in his historic message to this body and to the Senate only a few weeks ago.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that it is time for us to make up our minds as to whether we intend to become involved in the Greek situation. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts would be the last one to say that we should make up our minds and enter upon a change of foreign policy which may involve us in perpetual warfare without knowing what we intend to do, how far we intend to go. The gentleman says he is pro-American. Of course he is pro-American; so are the rest of us pro-American. The only place we differ, I take it, is as to how we should proceed to best serve the country to which we owe allegiance.

Let me ask this of the gentleman. He believes in the Atlantic Charter, does he not, in carrying the four freedoms to the uttermost corners of the world? I ask for an answer. The gentleman is here. Did he believe in that principle?

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the gentleman's question? He asks the broad question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask the gentleman the broad question whether he believes in

the Atlantic Charter and in particular that portion of it which outlined our duty to carry the four freedoms to the uttermost corners of the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. All of us agree on that. Everybody agrees on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all I want.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman that I was not by implication impugning the motives of anyone. I said my approach is pro-American rather than anti-Communist.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has answered my question, and I thank him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Any time the gentleman asks me to yield I yield, and I do not make any smart answer, either.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Nobody was questioning anyone's motive. What I said was that the gentleman said he was pro-American. I believe him. All I was saying was that the rest of us are pro-American, too; we just differ as to our methods of expressing our desires.

The gentleman answered my question and said that he believed in the principle enunciated in the Atlantic Charter that we were to carry and maintain the four freedoms throughout the world. Then he went on to state that he believed—and I think we all do—in Christianity, and that he was opposed, and I think we all are, to communism. But if the people of Russia want to believe in communism, if the people of India want their form of religion, and the people of a dozen other countries in the world each have their form of religion, how under the Atlantic Charter, I ask you, can we justify ourselves in taking our dollars, our munitions of war, our armed forces, going into those countries and saying, for example, to Russia or Greece or India or China, that they must become Christians, that they must accept our political philosophy? Is that consistent? Is it consistent if we say, as we have said over the years to every nation in Europe and everywhere else except in the Western Hemisphere, that we will tolerate none of their interference with South America or Mexico, but we will cross the sea and stop Russia or any other nation at a designated boundary line? Is it consistent then for us to send our dollars and our armies across the seas to tell Russia or some other country what form of government it shall have?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very briefly.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to ask the gentleman a question that I think is fundamental, that is at the base of all of this. In view of the fact that France has fought two world wars and wrecked herself financially, and that England has fought two world wars and wrecked herself financially, even though we want to do what the President would like to have us do, can we do it and finance it without wrecking this country?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a very pertinent question. As far as I know, no one from the moment of the President's message down to the present time has ever stopped either to count the cost or even to give the people of our land an estimate of what the cost of the proposed policy

in dollars and munitions of war, in materials, and in men may be.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I think that is the very heart of the whole thing. If somebody could come up with the answer as to how much it is going to cost and where it is going to lead, I think some of us then could make up our minds on what we want to do about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. To my mind he states the point accurately.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Should we not have full particulars as to how much it is going to cost before we embark upon this uncharted journey?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; that is what I understood the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] to be suggesting; especially do we want to know the cost in suffering and cost in lives, possibly an estimate of the number of veterans and the number of dependents of veterans of World War III, and an estimate of how many billions or trillions of dollars would be required to be raised by this country to keep those veterans and their dependents from want and to, as we call it, rehabilitate them.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am reminded of an incident that is recorded in the history of Washington. A former President and his friends way back in the early days of the Republic were sauntering along the bank of the old Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. They had been imbibing a little. One of them slipped into the canal, and the President reached down and tried to pull him out. He could not do it and finally said, "If I cannot pull you out, at least I can get in there and join you."

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. My fear is that we may get in, and with those we seek to aid drown in the sea of want and famine and disease that follows war.

Sometimes I wonder whether in this particular issue we are intellectually honest with ourselves. This thing of communism is nothing new in this country nor to this Congress.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] years ago served on a committee which did a most admirable job in exposing and rooting out the Communists who were in this country. We knew we had them then.

During the 12 short years I have been here, until the time the statement recently made by the administration was given us, nothing was said by those in authority about exposing or eradicating communism or ousting Communists. This has been mentioned here before by me. But we recall how the First Lady of the land went with the Communists and lent them support when they were ordered to appear before the Dies committee. We remember she entertained them at the White House. We remember how the Dies committee attempted over the years to expose and get Communists out of America and out of the Government and how for 10 years, or perhaps more accurately ever since that committee was

created until the time Martin Dies left this Chamber, he was fought on every step of the road. Now, they come along and say, "Yes, our country is going to be overwhelmed by the Communists if we do not help Greece."

When Russia went into Finland, did we help Finland? Did we do anything to help the Finns from being forced to accept and live under communism? To pay tribute to Russia?

As the gentleman from Ohio said, what about Poland and those other countries which Russia took over—some of them with the aid we gave her?

Then, I will come to this question; and this is a practical question. The gentleman says: Do something. Do what? And where? And how much? How many dollars? How many men? How far are we to travel? Under the argument of the gentleman, being Christians and believing in Christianity, are we going to send our forces everywhere in the world to fight every nation which does not believe as we do and which does not accept our theories of government? That gets us back to what—to being an aggressor nation, a nation determined to destroy the choice of other people to live under the form of government they want to live under.

That policy is the opposite of the one set out in the Atlantic Charter; of the reasons given for fighting World War II. If we are to fight another world-wide war let the people know the objectives, in what countries we are to decide who shall be ruler and what is the form of government we are to prescribe. If Communist Russia's \$25,000,000 loan to socialize England brings a communistic England, are we to make war on Britain to oust the Communists? Where, once started, are we to stop?

DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard, respect, and admiration for the gentleman from Massachusetts. Not only do I have such high regard, respect, and admiration for him, but in the short while I have been here I have learned to have a deep affection for him, and so far, I believe we have agreed on most every matter that has come before this House. But I cannot agree with him on this question of Greece and Turkey.

I believe the gentleman from Ohio is much more nearly correct than the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have not had time to analyze in my mind all of what the gentleman from Ohio has said, but I agree with the substance of what he has said.

I am not fully convinced at this time, as to all the details of the President's proposal, and I will hold my mind open to receive further light and information, because I do want to be right, regardless of what happens to me, on this most important matter.

At this time, however, I believe as firmly as I ever believed anything in my life, that to follow the President of the

United States, fully, on his request, would be an absolute departure from, and a violation of, the spirit, and very probably the letter itself, of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. In addition I am persuaded that to follow his request would be a violation of the spirit and letter of the Monroe Doctrine. It has been said in the press and over the radio that it would be an extension of the Monroe Doctrine. I do not see how you can so extend the Monroe Doctrine without breaking it. I think it would be, not an extension, but a violation of the Monroe Doctrine; and unless I can see further light I cannot and will not go along with the program because I believe that it is a step toward war and I believe we are about to junk the United Nations as we did the League of Nations; and I am opposed to it unless I can see further light.

In my judgment we can and we will stop Russia, or any nation or any group of nations that might come against us, by force; but Mr. Speaker, we cannot, by force, stop communism nor any false religious or political belief in the minds of people. The use of force will only spread it. We can use force to stop any physical enemy that might come against us, but we cannot stop beliefs in the minds or hearts of men by force. No one is more opposed to communism than I am. My whole background in life will show that. In my opinion the only way to stop communism is to make democracy work well in this country. If we do that, we will stop communism in its tracks.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and one with which I agree thoroughly. Does not the gentleman believe that if we impoverish ourselves at home by spreading largesse all over the world we will in effect open the door to communism in this country and be taken over ultimately?

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and observations, and I agree with him fully.

Can we not realize that our old-age pension system is in a deplorable condition and our school system is all but breaking down, that our public debt is almost too heavy for us to bear? Unless we watch our step, we are going to ruin ourselves at home, Mr. Speaker; and if we do, communism will take the world.

THE COPPER SITUATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the other day this House approved a bill that had to do with removing the excise tax on copper. We did not have too much debate on that bill, but it has been established that the Federal Government has disposed of most of its copper stock pile consisting of about 600,000 tons.

Where do we find ourselves today? Right flat on our pants with one of the

most terrible copper shortages in the history of the world.

What can you do in carrying on an international program such as has been discussed here this afternoon without copper? What can you do with respect to carrying on a national program to say nothing about the international operations in which we are engaged without a substantial supply of copper?

I think the House did the proper thing the other day.

I attended some hearings in the other body this morning and picked up some additional information.

We cannot work too fast on this copper proposition. There are some reasons why there is a shortage of copper today and the American people are entitled to be told by the Congress of the United States why the present inadequate supply of copper for our industry exists with three copper producing companies practically controlling over 80 percent of the product. We now hold the hot spot on copper. How can industries carry on their fabrications? What is going to happen to the automobile industry in Michigan and other States? What is going to happen to the General Electric Co., Allis-Chalmers, and all the others who produce industrial supplies carrying great quantities of copper to be shipped to the other parts of the world and to our own people here in the United States? That is the question with which this Congress has not yet dealt.

It will be well for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of this House to pay some attention to the 600-page report which has just been released in the last few days by the Federal Trade Commission pointing out some of the troubles in the copper kettle of this country today. We can well afford to have that committee take action and take action promptly in connection with the facts pointed out in the Federal Trade Commission report so that the Congress can thus answer to the people of this country why there is an inadequate supply of copper today with which to carry on our industries and why the Federal Government's supply of copper has been reduced from about 600,000 tons down to about 55,000 tons in the Federal Government's effort to supply those fabricators of copper a few tons to operate in competition with the big three that controls about 80 percent or more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to break into the continuity of the discussion on the Greek and Turkey situation, but I do want to continue some of the remarks I started a while ago when I spoke under the 1-minute rule on the veterans' hospital situation. For the benefit of some of you who came in late, I pointed out and inserted in the RECORD two newspaper articles, one of them from the Seminole Producer, Seminole, Okla., telling about the crowded situation that we have in the veterans' hospitals in Oklahoma and pointing out that as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I have talked to General Bradley of the Veterans' Administration and Major General Hawley, the medical director, many times, giving them statistics from the American Legion's State service officer and the Veterans of Foreign Wars' State service officer, showing that in Oklahoma we have something like 677 cases awaiting hospitalization. Their answer always is that there are no emergency cases turned away.

Recently the entire Oklahoma delegation called on Major General Hawley and discussed this situation with him in an effort to get opened up the McAlester Hospital, the Bordon Hospital at Chickasha and the hospital at Norman which belonged to the Army and Navy. We did not get anywhere. This article I am inserting tells about an Oklahoma veteran from Gore, Okla., who went to the Muskogee veterans' hospital seeking admission. They said he was not an emergency case. The only reason I doubt that is that he died 3 days later. They did tell us the morning the entire Oklahoma delegation called on them that they were going to construct a new hospital in Oklahoma City. I picked up the noon paper today, the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., and there I note an article that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, had contacted General Bradley and prevailed upon him to delay the awarding of any contracts for veterans' hospitals for a period of 2 or 3 weeks on the ground there were some excessive expenditures or something of that nature in the contracts.

Mr. Speaker, a period of 2 weeks may seem unimportant to many of us, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and General Bradley, but, certainly to the parents of this boy who died down there on March 20 it would be pretty hard to explain.

For the life of me, when the Congress has awarded money which will enable General Bradley to go ahead and award contracts, I cannot see why, just to save a few lousy dollars, we delay this thing for 2 or 3 weeks when down in Oklahoma and all through the Nation we have these veterans waiting to get into the hospitals. Before we start talking about Greece and Turkey and those other places, let us take care of the veterans who fought in the last war. We have down in Oklahoma 677 on the waiting list. If General Bradley gets sick

he can go out to the Army hospital at Fort Myer but what about the 677 in Oklahoma and the 3,500 throughout the Nation; they have nowhere to go unless the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and General Bradley cease frustrating the hospital-construction program. I say to you, before we start anything else, let us do something about veterans' hospitalization in this country. You know you cannot tell the veterans in Oklahoma and the Nation on the waiting list that we will have a hospital for them in 2 years from now when down in McAlester, Chickasha, and at Norman, Okla., we have these Army and Navy hospitals lying idle.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say there were three unused hospitals in Oklahoma?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; two naval hospitals and one Army hospital, sir, which could be utilized. It is the feeling of the Oklahoma congressional delegation these could be used for veterans, at least temporarily, until they can get their new program started, and they are not going to be started unless the gentleman from New York and General Bradley realize the seriousness of the situation and start building hospitals.

Mr. ELLIS. Would not that be a worth-while effort?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It would be. The trouble is that when you go down and talk to Major General Hawley and General Bradley they quote statistics showing that there is no waiting list. The only thing that we can do, the only thing the Members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation can do, is to cite statistics which are furnished by State service officers of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, showing that there are cases and they are emergency cases. I just know the sense of this Congress well enough to know that something will be done about this.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to no man in my insistence that the disabled of World War II be cared for, but I want to be fair to General Bradley. Is it not true that under the law General Bradley or the Veterans' Administration cannot build for the needs of the so-called non-service-connected cases? They tell me further that there is no delay in getting the veteran hospitalized if he has a service-connected disability.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say this to the gentleman from Connecticut, that they tell us the same thing. The only answer is that many of these cases are service-connected, surely this veteran who died 2 days after being refused admittance was an emergency case.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They are service-connected?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes. I do not know what you are going to do

when you go over there to the Veterans' Administration and get statistics, when they tell you that these cases are not service-connected and that they are not emergency cases, when right here in this newspaper was the case of an emergency case veteran that they said was not an emergency case, who died 2 days later. He is bound to have been an emergency case.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is what I wanted to know, whether the disability was service-connected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am so informed.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STIGLER. I want to congratulate the gentleman on making such a timely statement informing the Members of the House with reference to the hospital program in Oklahoma. I am just wondering whether the gentleman knows that recently an order was issued by the medical officer in charge of the Veterans' Hospital at Muskogee, calling upon all medical officers not to call him and ask for the admission of any veteran who was not service-connected and not an emergency case. That order was recently issued.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I did not know about that, but I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

As I stated in my speech earlier today Mr. Speaker, I feel very deeply about this matter. I, for one, do not feel that General Bradley is any sacred cow. When incidents occur such as the one I have related, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I am going to call them to his attention and ask that he do something about it. I cannot see why the hospital construction program should be delayed for even 1 day, and I predict that unless some of these Army and Navy hospitals are utilized temporarily and the construction program pushed with all possible speed, we will learn of other incidents such as this one and we will discover that the boys who fought on the world-wide battlefronts come home to die on the battlefields of Republican economy and Veterans' Administration bungling and red tape.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed a bill which will give substantial relief to the overburdened taxpayers of this country and increase their take-home pay. I am sure they will appreciate this legislation, representing as it does a reversal of a trend. I hope we shall be able to cut governmental ex-

penses further so that additional relief may be extended.

Although I voted for this bill, my position in this House is well known to the Members. I am still of the opinion that we have not yet sufficiently recognized the need of the lower-income groups in which I include not only those with net incomes up to \$1,400, after exemptions, who have justifiably received special consideration in the bill just passed, but also those between that figure and up to \$5,000 or even \$10,000. None of us enjoys the day our income tax falls due, but it cannot, in all fairness, it seems to me, be called a real hardship to pay even the existing high taxes for those above the \$10,000 mark, in the sense that they are required to deny themselves some of the real necessities of life in order to help pay the expenses of running the Government.

Entertaining as I do the firm conviction that in our overhauling of the entire tax structure which I trust may be undertaken at an early date, we should give further thought and favorable consideration to additional tax relief for those who need it most, I have today introduced a bill entitled "A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income."

The purpose of this measure is to permit of five additional deductions for what seem to me to be necessary living expenses. This bill would amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code in two respects and would add three new subsections.

In the first place, under existing law, a person is permitted to deduct medical or dental expenses which have been incurred during the taxable year, only when they exceed 5 percent of gross income. That is all right for us here in this body, or for anyone who has an income such that the incurrence of unusual medical expenses, while a tough break, is not actually going to work a true financial hardship. The place where this provision pinches is, let us say, with the \$2,000 a year fellow, who is not permitted to deduct such expenses except those above \$100, or the \$5,000 a year white-collar man who can only deduct his expenses above \$250. These people really feel the pinch acutely when a long sickness strikes, or a major operation becomes a matter of life or death.

My bill would provide for an amendment to section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code so that all such necessary medical and dental expenses would be deductible for income-tax purposes in the case of a man with an adjusted gross income under \$2,000; all such expenses over 1 percent if his gross income is between \$2,001 and \$4,000; all such expenses over 2 percent if his gross income is between \$4,001 and \$6,000; all such expenses over 3 percent if his gross income is between \$6,001 and \$8,000; all such expenses over 4 percent if his gross income is between \$8,001 and \$10,000; and, as under the present law, all such expenses over 5 percent if his gross income is over \$10,000.

This bill, it strikes me, simply gives effect to the increasing ability of a man to meet heavy and unusual medical expenses as his income increases and is a

recognition of the further fact that the lower income groups suffer an unfair discrimination under the existing law, which takes no cognizance of financial ability to meet the cost of medical and dental care.

Secondly, under the present law, interest paid on obligations is, of course, a deductible expense. This is all right for the man who goes to the bank and borrows money, agreeing to pay a certain interest on his note. The trouble is that the little fellow who often cannot get credit at a bank, but who so frequently buys an automobile, a refrigerator, a cook stove, or his household furniture on time, and is, in fact, paying interest on the purchase price is not allowed to deduct that interest because it is said to be unascertainable or not distinguishable. He buys a car on time and agrees to pay for it out of his wages weekly or monthly. Part of the cost of that car is interest, and sometimes abnormally high interest, on the amount of his original obligation. Yet when the tax agent comes along he strikes out of his income-tax return and refuses to allow as a deduction any item for interest. This bill would define the word "interest" as it is used in section 23 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, so as to include either 6 percent of the purchase price, or the interest designated, whichever is greater, on installment purchases.

Again the essential purpose of this bill is only to bring the lower income groups into line with those in the higher brackets who already have the advantage of such a deduction.

Thirdly, a new subsection is added to permit as a deduction all necessary expenses of transportation to and from work. A man, by working, increases his ability to pay income tax and thereby add to the Government revenue. It seems to me only fair that the bus fare or street car fare, which is an absolute necessity to take him to and from his work or to take the girl who works in an office to and from her job, should be a deductible expense item. A business executive can deduct expenses which he incurs for lavish entertainment in order to increase his business. I do not object to that, because undoubtedly the result of it is to enable him to do more business, thereby adding to his income and resulting in higher taxes for him and greater revenue for the Government. But it does seem to me that the cost of getting to and from his job is just as truly a part of a man's or woman's necessary expenses, as some of the deductions which are already allowed.

Fourthly, in these times there are many cases where both husband and wife are working. This becomes even more necessary in times of high prices. It is often highly desirable because the wife has some special skill, such as a nurse's training, or secretarial background which can make a real contribution to our economy. The trouble is that she may have to hire someone to do her housework while she is on the job, or if she has children she may have to pay someone to stay with the children. It seems to me that it is only fair and would be a desirable thing from every point of view if she could deduct these

necessary expenses in computing her income tax.

Finally, my bill would provide that a person who is required to take special instruction or training in connection with his work could deduct such expenses in computing his tax. This would apply particularly to young professional people like teachers, doctors, accountants, nurses, clergymen, and the like. By taking such courses, these taxpayers enable themselves to earn more money and pay more taxes. It would be helpful to our economy generally, as well as a great boon to them to permit them to take such a deduction.

It is my earnest hope that this bill will have favorable consideration before the Committee on Ways and Means and before this House.

TAMING WILD HORSES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, a great "Arkansawyer," Tom Shiras, the editor of a country newspaper in our district, stood at a point in the rugged Ozark Mountains and looked down upon the winding White River below him and made this remark: "A million horses are running wild down there." Tom Shiras was right; and, while he died in the early part of this year, he lived long enough to see part of those horses tamed. He loved northwest Arkansas. I wish he could have lived to see his dream fully realized.

Studies and surveys, made by the Army engineers, have proved that a million horsepower of hydroelectric energy is economically feasible in that majestic river. The tragedy of it is that most of those million horses are still running wild. However, due to the inspired work of men in the Congress, and to the untiring efforts of the people of the watershed of the great White River Basin, we are now at the threshold of a new day. A day when those wild horses will not only be tamed but they will be harnessed and put to work.

There are millions of other horses, still untamed and unharnessed, running wild down the Arkansas, the Red, the Ouachita, the Brazos, the Guadalupe, the Canadian, the Verdigris, the Cimarron, the Neosho, and many other streams in the Southwest. I am sure that the people in these river valleys, like the people who live in our own district, have been working for years to encourage the Federal Government to tame these wild horses and put them to work for progress.

The people have seen these uncontrolled streams year after year carry away the top soil from the farms; a soil which constitutes their line of defense against poverty and distress. You and I have seen the fertility of our soil decrease year by year. It is axiomatic that the welfare of our people is limited by the productivity of the soil. With the loss of our soil goes our hope. Thousands of our farms have literally floated

down our streams and more are following. To be sure, this soil has gone, and is going, down stream to our neighbors in the plains below, where it is not particularly needed. In thus going down stream, it has filled and clogged the beds of the rivers to hamstring navigation and to cause devastating floods which inevitably result in distress, famine, and disease. Indeed, there is great loss in the displacement of soil fertility, in river commerce, and in human welfare. Such waste and suffering in our country are matters of common knowledge.

The people in the hills of northwest Arkansas have joined hands with their neighbors in the valleys; and for 15 years have been fighting side by side for dams, power plants, transmission lines, and other public works which are necessary to make these rivers a blessing instead of a curse. The people in your districts, where they are confronted with the same problems, doubtless have likewise been at work.

The people in the district which I represent have cooperated wholeheartedly with the Corps of Engineers and with all public and private agencies that could aid them. They have appeared at public hearings and have testified to their willingness to have their bottom lands submerged by the reservoirs, if they could, in turn, get: First, flood control for their neighbors below; second, power at reasonable rates for their farms and industry; third, the benefit of the recreational facilities such development would afford; and, fourth, the advantage of the tourist trade which would come with each development. They have cooperated with the private utility companies, and for years have urged them to make these developments.

However, because the local utility companies were more scared than hurt, the cooperation on the part of the companies has not always been what it should have been. They believed that the building of the dams would be to their disadvantage. And all too often, they went into the valleys and tried to persuade the people against power dams by telling them that if power dams were built above them the water would be held at high head levels for power purposes, and that when the rains came the reservoirs would be full and water would be spilled down on the farms; that they would be worse off than before. They told the people in the hills sometimes that if power dams were built that water levels would vary so greatly that the reservoirs would be ruined for recreational purposes. They sometimes told the sportsmen that the fluctuating water level would destroy all of the fish and wild life; and that the building of the dams would ruin the fishing streams in our section.

Fortunately, our people were a little stubborn and plowed a straight row ahead toward the goal of getting these dams built. Some dams have been built; and to show that the utility companies were more scared than hurt, floods are being controlled, recreational facilities are being improved, and the fishing and other recreational activities are better than ever; and, to top it all, the utility companies are making more money than they ever made before—a

proof of the fact that whatever develops the country helps everybody in it.

Another thing I would like to mention, which shows that the utility companies were just scared, was their attitude on rural electrification. Anybody in our district who tried it knows that before the rural-electrification law was passed that the utility companies most generally would not run lines out into the country from the towns which they served, on the theory that it would not pay. I had that personal experience myself; and I know of my neighbors who had the same experience. We did not press the companies for such service. We thought they knew their business; and, if it did not pay, we certainly did not want them to lose money. What distressed us, however, was that when rural electrification finally became a fact, and the Federal Government provided funds to lend to the farmers of the country to build rural electrification lines for themselves, the utility companies, thinking they would be hurt, got busy and built "cream" lines. That is, they picked out the finest territory and built lines and began to serve. The farmers organized their own little co-ops in other sections and asked the local utility companies to give them wholesale rates so that they could serve themselves; but the utility companies, not recognizing the general advantage of this type of service, refused to do it. The Rural Electrification Administration, of course, would not loan the funds to the farmers unless they could get a reasonable wholesale rate. The money lent to the local co-ops had to be repaid to the Government with interest; and, of course, if a co-op had to pay too high for its power, it could not make enough profit to repay the loan.

This situation obtained for some years. The local utility companies, still too short-sighted to see the business advantages, devised a plan which they called the 75-25 or Arkansas plan. This proposal was that if the Rural Electrification Administration would turn the money which was allocated for loan to Arkansas co-ops over to the utility companies, they, in turn, would build the rural lines, tie them on to their own system, collect the bills, and keep 75 percent of the gross receipts and give the Government the 25 percent remaining. Of course, the farmers in our section rejected this proposition as being noncompetitive and leaving them impaled on the same old hook.

In 1937, through the efforts of the State utility commission, which had been appointed in 1936, the utility companies were required to file wholesale rates. Still blind to the advantages of free competitive enterprise, the utility companies offered an unthinkable 18 mill wholesale rate. The State utility commission refused to accept that rate, and the companies finally reduced the rate to 10 mills. Later, when an effort was made through the Tennessee Valley Authority to get power across into Arkansas, the rate was reduced to 8 mills. Later, when the Southwest Power Administration was created, they reduced the rate to 6 mills, and just recently the rate has been reduced to 5½ mills to match the Southwest Power Administration rate. In

these reductions in rates is the proof of the advantage of free competitive enterprise.

Still insisting that competition is a disadvantage, the utility companies do not want the people to tie together the dams which are being built in the streams of the Southwest. They think that to integrate these dams will limit their opportunity to serve the people. But, to show that their real interest has not and will not suffer, the utility companies are making more money than they ever made in the history of their service—indeed, making so much money that they can refund 1 month's light bill out of 12, thereby relieving their own tax burden at the same time. Surely, the little competition afforded by the Southwest Power Administration is and will be only to the general advantage of all concerned. It certainly could not hurt for this reason: At one of the dams in my district, which is representative, the utility companies pay 2.8 mills per kilowatt-hour for the power generated there. In 1945, they sold it through their system right back to the people at these prices: farmers, 46 mills per kilowatt-hour; homes inside city limits, 39 mills per kilowatt-hour; stores, 30 mills per kilowatt-hour; small industries, 18 mills per kilowatt-hour; and both large and small industries on the average, 11 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Now, back to our river projects: As I said, the people in my district believe that we are on the threshold of a new day. The Norfolk Dam located on the North Fork of White River in our district is completed. It has created one of the most beautiful lakes in the country, and many thousands of people visit it each year. The dam has a power plant with one unit of 35,000 kilowatt capacity, which produced 221,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year. This plant has room for three more 35,000 kilowatt units. The second unit will be installed next year. Less than 35 miles away is the site of the great Bull Shoals project which will, when completed, add 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

In the Southwest area, 3 projects have already been completed; 5 more are ready to be started; and 22 others are either authorized or recommended for future construction. All of these projects are to be built and operated by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. These developments belong to the people, and the power generated will be marketed by the people. I feel certain that future study will establish many more such projects needed to completely harness our streams.

Now that our people are beginning to see the fruits of their labor and of their money, which they have invested in these dams, the private utility companies have come forward with an offer to buy the advantage of the power developments. They have seen the error they made when they argued against the dams in the first place and are now for them. They have seen the advantage of rural electrification, and they are now for rural electrification. However, still insisting on the general advantage of business without competition, the utility companies have entered into an agreement

among themselves to purchase the power that will be generated by all of these dams and resell it to the very same people who own it—and at rates based upon what the traffic will bear.

Our people, I am certain, want a free competitive enterprise system. They want the public utilities to prosper and make a fine profit, but I am convinced that they are unwilling to permit a group of utility companies to have control over the power generated by these dams. I am certain the people want all these dams to be tied together under an organization to market this power, supplying it to the utility companies, if they want it and need it for distribution at reasonable rates; to the co-ops if they need it for distribution at reasonable rates; to anybody else who needs it for distribution at reasonable rates. This is just plain, simple competition furnished by the owners of the dams, namely, the people themselves.

Competition for the utility companies, such as that supplied by the river projects under the Southwest Power Administration, not only makes power available at more reasonable rates but also makes power available for a wider range of uses in larger and larger areas. Actually, it affords the private utility companies an opportunity to extend their services far beyond what they originally considered would pay a return on the investment so that they may prosper as the people prosper. Within the last few years, while the utility companies have been reducing their rates under the influence of competition, the distribution of power has been greatly extended both as to particular use and as to the geographical area served. But even so, not more than 50 percent—I would say not over 25 percent—of the potential for service is being supplied in my section of Arkansas; and I am satisfied that the same condition obtains in every other part of the State. Thus it is evident that the utility companies need have no fear that the river projects under the Southwest Power Administration will displace them. Rather these projects make it possible and profitable for them to extend their services to still larger and larger sections. As a matter of fact, there is a shortage of power; and it will require the services of all concerned to supply the need.

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 places the responsibility of marketing all the surplus power from projects developed by the War Department in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior. For our section, the Secretary has delegated that responsibility to the Southwest Power Administration. Last year, the Congress appropriated \$7,500,000 to that administration for construction purposes. Provision was made to construct and acquire a high-voltage transmission line to interconnect the three completed dams, Norfolk, Pensacola, and Dennison; and also for construction of some feeder lines to carry certain power to communities where power was not available. These facilities are now under construction and will be completed as rapidly as possible. When this appropriation was asked for, again the 12 large private utilities in the area, still

unwilling to accept the opportunity to extend their services under competition, came to Washington and fought the appropriation, as they had formerly fought the dams and have fought the Rural Electrification Administration.

This year, the Southwest Power Administration has reduced its budget request and is asking only for essentials for continuance of its services. The appropriation requested is \$3,725,000. These funds will provide three substations on the lines now being built. They will also provide for some additional feeder lines in areas which are not now served. They will provide for general plans and general equipment necessary to maintain lines already under construction.

And again, the power companies offer resistance to this effort to establish free competitive enterprise for public service. Their general arguments are the same. None of the lines which the Southwest Power Administration is now building or proposes to build will in any way duplicate the lines of private companies or take any of their business away from them as I understand the picture. The Southwest Power Administration has done its utmost to cooperate fully with the private companies, yet nine of the companies propose now to take over the contracts of the Southwest Power Administration and purchase all the power of the existing dams in the area. As the Tulsa Tribune said in an editorial of February 24, 1947:

This offer is a campaign to grind up the Southwest Power Administration and feed it as hamburger meat to the private utilities.

The same paper in an editorial on March 1, 1947, says:

There is no need for public ownership of an enterprise in which rates and prices are regulated by competition. That is socialism; but it is not socialism for a people to control an essential need of which there can be but one source of supply.

The fact is that the utility companies now recognize that the Southwest Power Administration is a real success, because the people have achieved the advantages of free competitive enterprise. They speak of interference with free enterprise, but they never speak of free competitive enterprise. It appears that they just do not want competition, which is very inconsistent in the American system, to say the least. Could it be that while the "wild horses" in the rivers are being tamed, the utility companies also need to be tamed?

It is my considered judgment that the power projects under the Southwest Power Administration offer only advantages to the people, including the private power companies. I know that the people I represent want the Federal Government to build the dams and to tie them together with a high-voltage grid system with necessary feeder lines to take this power to the people and at rates that are reasonable and at least competitive. We believe that such a policy will encourage the private companies to continue to grow and prosper. The program of the Federal Government will supplement the power of the private companies and aid in the rapid development of our

region. Our region abounds in an abundant supply of cheap fuel in the form of gas, oil, and coal. Private companies will have developed steam-generating plants using these cheap fuels. The Government will develop hydroelectric plants, it being unreasonable to expect the private utility companies to build all the dams necessary to harness all the potential power along these streams. A proper balance and coordination of the hydro and the steam plants will produce the cheapest power and extend its uses to every farm home and to the smallest industry.

The Government's program could materially aid private companies by supplying them capacity for peaking purposes. Private companies could aid the Government by selling them energy to firm up its capacities in the hydro plants. Teamwork could produce the best results in our region; and teamwork is what we are desirous of obtaining. Plain, simple, unadulterated justice and fairness to both the people as a whole and to the utility companies is all that we ask, in order that progress can lift up her head, and ultimately return to the people the money that they have invested in all these projects, at the same time retaining the advantages of these projects for posterity.

Yes; we are taming wild horses—the wild horses running down our streams.

Horses, which, when harnessed, will furnish heat and light to homes and power for industries all over northwest Arkansas, over the great Southwest, and throughout the whole country according to the need, and at rates that can be afforded. These horses belong to the people and when they are harnessed they should and must work side by side with free competitive enterprise—a system that made this country what it is, and will keep it strong and vibrant.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

499. A letter from the Chairman, National Archives, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

500. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting a copy of the Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1946 (H. Doc. No. 185); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

501. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

502. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1948 in the form of an amendment to the

budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 186); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

503. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the 1948 budget as it pertains to the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 187); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 152. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of Virginia sun-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2849. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2838. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 2839. A bill to amend title V of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, so as to provide that the transferee of any property transferred thereunder shall be entitled to all revenue derived from such property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2840. A bill relating to the assumption of contractual obligations by the Federal Government to make grants-in-aid with respect to Federal-aid highways and roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2841. A bill to authorize the construction of certain Federal reclamation works in the upper basin of the Colorado River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2842. A bill to provide that retired enlisted personnel of the Army who served as commissioned officers during World War II shall receive the pay of retired warrant officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 2843. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain property to the Navy Department for the purpose of establishing a naval postgraduate school at Fort Stevens, Oreg.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2844. A bill to amend the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 by removing therefrom certain inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROHRBOUGH:

H. R. 2845. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with the national defense, and

for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 2846. A bill authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 2847. A bill to provide for examination and investigation of inventories of Government-owned property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2848. A bill to suppress the evil of anti-Semitism and the hatred of members of any race because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 2849. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2850. A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 2851. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 2852. A bill to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek Recreational Demonstration Area, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2853. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2854. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. REEVES introduced a bill (H. R. 2855) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Naka Matsukata Rawsthorne, which was referred 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:

283. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco, that the budget of the Customs Bureau be not curtailed so as to render its operations ineffective; to the Committee on Appropriations.

284. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition signed by 54 citizens of East Liverpool, Ohio, favoring the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews from Europe into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

285. Also, petition signed by 65 citizens of Freeport, Ohio, favoring Senate bill 265, by Senator CAPPER, to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, radio broadcasts, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.