

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3617. A bill for the relief of San Jose Manufacturers, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3618. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vannas H. Hicks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of Harry D. Koons; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3620. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Fry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3621. A bill for the relief of the J. M. Jones Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3622. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hazel M. Skaggs; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3623. A bill for the relief of William A. Pixley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of New York:

H. R. 3624. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Apostolos Vasilii Percas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1022. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of C. E. Hildebrand and 325 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1023. Also, petition of Spencer Salisbury and 297 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1024. By Mr. GEELAN: Petition submitted by Thomas J. Reardon of Hartford, Conn., urging the enactment of legislation concerning the extension and maintenance of credit for the purchase and carrying of securities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1025. Also, petition of Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., urging the enactment of legislation to prohibit the United States from joining with other nations of the world for the purpose of political and economic cooperation unless and until the proposition is submitted to the citizens of the United States for a vote thereon and that affirmative action must be by a two-thirds vote by the voters of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1026. Also, resolution submitted by Lawrence P. Spellacy, secretary of Meriden Aerie, No. 720, F. O. E., Meriden, Conn., June 26, 1945, memorializing Congress to designate the birthday of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1027. Also, resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut on June 6, 1945, submitted by Charles J. Prestia, secretary of state, memorializing Congress in favor of the passage of the Bretton Woods bill with the stabilization included; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1028. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Albert S. Conrad and sundry other residents of the Eighth Massachusetts Congressional District, favoring the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1029. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Resolution of eastern Washington public utility district, urging Congress to authorize construction of Foster Creek Dam and hydroelectric plant on the Columbia River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1030. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition signed by approximately 67 owners of automobile repair shops in Sussex County, N. J., protesting RMPR 165, OPA regulations, and recommending that RMPR 165, amendment No. 49, be abolished for the reasons outlined in the petition; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1031. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Hudson County Republican Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling public attention to various laws enacted in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1032. Also, petition of Vergil D. McMillan, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, June 25, 1945)

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

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

O God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels and all just works do proceed, as the torch of a new day lights afresh the path of duty, we bow before Thee in humility and hope. We thank Thee for public servants who, in the darkened valleys of these tragic times, have failed not to lift unto the hills of help the eyes of this stricken generation, messengers of good will who from mountaintops of vision are now heralding a dawning day.

So guide by Thy wisdom the deliberations of this body, entrusted with vast power that awes and solemnizes our hearts, that here, in the fires of a great passion for healing peace, the sacrifices for freedom may be sanctified. Dedicate us anew to the yet unfinished task that we may win the peace for which brave men have died: And Thine shall be the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 28, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

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 the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 511. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 3238. An act readjusting the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and other matter of fourth-class mail, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3579. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years

ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution authorizing the production of petroleum for the national defense from Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the functions, powers, duties, and records of certain corporations, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE FINAL SESSION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I intended yesterday to ask that the address delivered by the President at San Francisco on Tuesday be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Other things intervened, and the request was not made. I now make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the address delivered by the President will be printed in the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, oh, what a great day this can be in history.

I deeply regret that the press of circumstances when this Conference opened made it impossible for me to be here to greet you in person. I have asked for the privilege of coming today to express on behalf of the people of the United States our thanks for what you have done here and to wish you Godspeed on your journeys home.

Somewhere in this broad country, every one of you can find some of our citizens who are sons and daughters, or descendants in some degree, of your own native land. All our people are glad and proud that this historic meeting and its accomplishments have taken place in our country. And that includes the millions of loyal and patriotic Americans who stem from the countries not represented at this Conference.

We are grateful for your coming. We hope you have enjoyed your stay and that you will come again.

You assembled in San Francisco almost 9 weeks ago with the high hope and confidence of peace-loving people the world over.

Their confidence in you has been justified. Their hopes for your success have been fulfilled.

CALLS CHARTER A VICTORY

The Charter of the United Nations which you are now signing is a solid structure upon which we can build for a better world. History will honor you for it. Between the victory in Europe and the final victory in Japan, in this most destructive of all wars, you have won a victory against war itself.

It was the hope of such a charter that helped sustain the courage of stricken peoples through the darkest days of the war. For it is a declaration of great faith by the nations of the earth—faith that war is not inevitable, faith that peace can be maintained.

If we had had this charter a few years ago—and, above all, the will to use it—millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die.

It has already been said by many that this is only a first step to a lasting peace. That is true. The important thing is that all our

thinking and all our actions be based on the realization that it is in fact only a first step. Let us all have it firmly in mind that we start today from a good beginning, and, with our eye always on the final objective, let us march forward.

The Constitution of my own country came from a convention which—like this one—was made up of delegates with many different views. Like this charter, our Constitution came from a free and sometimes bitter exchange of conflicting opinions. When it was adopted, no one regarded it as a perfect document. But it grew and developed and expanded. And upon it there was built a bigger, a better, and a more perfect Union.

This charter, like our own Constitution, will be expanded and improved as time goes on. No one claims that it is now a final or a perfect instrument. It has not been poured into a fixed mold. Changing world conditions will require readjustments—but they will be the readjustments of peace and not of war.

That we now have this charter at all is a great wonder. It is also a cause for profound thanksgiving to Almighty God, who has brought us so far in our search for peace through world organization.

DIFFERENCES IN VIEWS RECALLED

There were many who doubted that agreement could ever be reached by these 50 countries differing so much in race and religion, in language and culture. But these differences were all forgotten in one unshakable unity of determination—to find a way to end wars.

Out of all the arguments and disputes, and different points of view, a way was found to agree. Here in the spotlight of full publicity, in the tradition of liberty-loving people, opinions were expressed openly and freely. The faith and the hope of 50 peaceful nations were laid before this world forum. Differences were overcome. This charter was not the work of any single nation or group of nations, large or small. It was the result of a spirit of give-and-take, of tolerance for the views and interests of others.

It was proof that nations, like men, can state their differences, can face them, and then can find common ground on which to stand. That is the essence of democracy; that is the essence of keeping the peace in the future. By your agreement, the way was shown toward future agreements in the years to come.

This Conference owes its success largely to the fact that you have kept your minds firmly on the main objective. You had the single job of writing a constitution—a charter for peace. And you stayed on that job.

In spite of the many differences and distractions which came to you in the form of daily problems and disputes about such matters as new boundaries, control of Germany, peace settlements, reparations, war criminals, the form of Government of some of the European countries—in spite of all these, you continued in the task of framing this document.

These problems, and scores of others which will arise, are all difficult. They are complicated. They are controversial and dangerous.

SOLUTION OF PROBLEMS IS SEEN

But with a united spirit we met and solved even the more difficult problems during the war. And with the same spirit, if we keep to our principles and never forsake our objectives, the problems we now face, and those to come will also be solved.

We have tested the principle of cooperation in this war and have found that it works. Through the pooling of resources, through joint and combined military command, through constant staff meetings, we have shown what united strength can do in war. That united strength forced Germany to sur-

render. United strength will force Japan to surrender.

The United Nations have also had experience, even while the fighting was still going on, in reaching economic agreements for times of peace. What was done on the subject of relief at Atlantic City, food at Hot Springs, finance at Bretton Woods, aviation at Chicago, was a fair test of what can be done by nations determined to live cooperatively in a world where they cannot live peacefully any other way.

What you have accomplished in San Francisco shows how well these lessons of military and economic cooperation have been learned. You have created a great instrument for peace and security and human progress in the world.

The world must now use it.

If we fail to use it, we shall betray all those who have died in order that we might meet here in freedom and safety to create it.

If we seek to use it selfishly—for the advantage of any one nation or any small group of nations—we shall be equally guilty of that betrayal.

The successful use of this instrument will require the united will and firm determination of the free peoples who have created it. The job will tax the moral strength and fiber of us all.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES ARE OPPOSED

We all have to recognize—no matter how great our strength—that we must deny ourselves the license to do always as we please. No one nation, no regional group, can, or should expect, any special privilege which harms any other nation. If any nation would keep security for itself, it must be ready and willing to share security with all. That is the price which each nation will have to pay for world peace. Unless we are all willing to pay that price, no organization for world peace can accomplish its purpose.

And what a reasonable price that is.

Out of this conflict have come powerful military nations, now fully trained and equipped for war. But they have no right to dominate the world. It is rather the duty of these powerful nations to assume the responsibility for leadership toward a world of peace. That is why we have here resolved that power and strength shall be used not to wage war, but keep the world at peace, and free from the fear of war.

By their own example the strong nations of the world should lead the way to international justice. That principle of justice is the foundation stone of this charter. That principle is the guiding spirit by which it must be carried out—not by words alone but by continued concrete acts of good will.

The time for action is here now. Let us, therefore, each in his own nation and according to its own way, seek immediate approval of this charter—and make it a living thing.

EXPECTS SPEEDY SENATE APPROVAL

I shall send this charter to the United States Senate at once. I am sure that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of my country and of their representatives in the Senate is in favor of immediate ratification.

A just and lasting peace cannot be attained by diplomatic agreement alone, or by military cooperation alone. Experience has shown how deeply the seeds of war are planted by economic rivalry and by social injustice. The charter recognizes this fact, for it has provided for economic and social cooperation as well. It has provided for this cooperation as a part of the very heart of the entire compact.

It has set up machinery of international cooperation which men and nations of good will can use to help correct the economic and social causes for conflict.

Artificial and uneconomic trade barriers should be removed—to the end that the standard of living of as many people as possible throughout the world may be raised. For freedom from want is one of the basic "four freedoms" toward which we all strive. The large and powerful nations of the world must assume leadership in this economic field as well as in all others.

Under this document we have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights, acceptable to all the nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of international life as our own bill of rights is a part of our Constitution. The charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Unless we can obtain those objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security in the world.

With this charter the world can begin to look forward to the time when all worthy human beings may be permitted to live decently as free people.

The world has learned again that nations, like individuals, must know the truth if they would be free—must read and hear the truth, learn and teach the truth.

SAYS IDEAS STILL LIVE

We must set up an effective agency for constant and thorough interchange of thought and ideas. For there lies the road to a better and more tolerant understanding among nations and among peoples.

All fascism did not die with Mussolini; Hitler is finished—but the seeds spread by his disordered mind have firm root in too many fanatical brains. It is easier to remove tyrants and destroy concentration camps than it is to kill the ideas which gave them birth and strength. Victory on the battlefield was essential, but it was not enough. For a good peace, a lasting peace, the decent peoples of the earth must remain determined to strike down the evil spirit which has hung over the world for the last decade.

The forces of reaction and tyranny all over the world will try to keep the United Nations from remaining united. Even while the military machine of the Axis was being destroyed in Europe—even down to its very end—they still tried to divide us.

They failed. But they will try again.

They are trying even now. To divide and conquer was—and still is—their plan. They still try to make one ally suspect the other, hate the other, desert the other.

But I know I speak for every one of you when I say that the United Nations will remain united. They will not be divided by propaganda, either before the Japanese surrender or after.

This occasion shows again the continuity of history.

By this charter you have given reality to the ideal of that great statesman of a generation ago—Woodrow Wilson.

By this charter you have moved toward the goal for which that gallant leader in this second world struggle worked and fought and gave his life—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

By this charter you have realized the objectives of many men of vision in your own countries who have devoted their lives to the cause of world organization for peace.

Upon all of us, in all our countries, is now laid the duty of transforming into action these words which you have written. Upon our decisive action rests the hope of those who have fallen, those now living, and those yet unborn—the hope for a world of free countries—with decent standards of living—which will work and cooperate in a friendly, civilized community of nations.

This new structure of peace is rising upon strong foundations.

Let us not fail to grasp this supreme chance to establish a world-wide rule of reason—to create an enduring peace under the guidance of God.

PRINTING OF SENATOR CONNALLY'S SPEECH ON UNITED NATIONS' CHARTER (S. DOC. NO. 58)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the following order and ask that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the remarks of Senator TOM CONNALLY, delivered in the Senate on June 28, 1945, on the charter of the United Nations, be printed as a Senate document and that 10,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. VANDENBERG obtained the floor. Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. 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:

Aiken	Gerry	Murdock
Austin	Green	Murray
Bailey	Guffey	Myers
Ball	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hart	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hatch	Overton
Bilbo	Hawkes	Pepper
Brewster	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hill	Revercomb
Brooks	Hoey	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Capelhart	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Langer	Tydings
Chavez	Lucas	Vandenberg
Connally	McClellan	Wagner
Cordon	McFarland	Walsh
Donnell	McKellar	Wheeler
Downey	McMahon	Wherry
Eastland	Mead	White
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Mitchell	Willis
Fulbright	Moore	
George	Morse	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent in Europe visiting battlefields.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent as members of the committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Scrugham.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIP-

STEAD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business by direction of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent on official business of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Scrugham.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I take this immediate opportunity to make this preliminary report to the Senate upon my 2 months official absence as a member of the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference to create an international organization for peace and security. It has been a difficult and burdensome assignment. But it has had its compensations not only in its privilege of association with earnest peace-seeking pilgrims from every corner of the globe, but also in its promise of a better world. I shall not here undertake a discussion of the vast detail of considerations which must be explored in subsequent debate. I am content today to state my general conclusions and the reasons that impel them.

First, Mr. President, I wish to present my compliments to my fellow delegates and our advisers and our staff. We have labored together in good spirit and good will. We have had healthy differences of opinion; but we have ultimately acted in substantial unanimity from start to finish. We have had the generous confidence and helpful cooperation of the President of the United States. We have had the advice of former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, to whose vision and wisdom this institution will stand as an eternal monument. Particularly I wish to commend the Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. He has been an able and inspiring leader. He has been equal to every emergency we faced. Not only as chairman of our delegation but also as Chairman of the Conference and its key committees, he has been as tireless as he has been efficient in driving to our goal. I am particularly happy to testify that he constantly sustained the best American tradition. He has richly earned the grateful good opinion of his country.

I want also to pay my particular tribute of affectionate appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY]. Without the faintest hint of partisanship at any time, he made it constantly possible for each one of us, representing the minority, to play our full role in these deliberations. He carried some of the heaviest burdens of the Conference with patience, fidelity, and eminent success.

He was a tower of strength to this great undertaking in every aspect of its labors. He, too, has put the Nation greatly in his debt.

Mr. President, I have signed the San Francisco Charter. I believe it represents a great, forward step toward the international understanding and cooperation and fellowship which are indispensable to peace, progress, and security. If the spirit of its authors can become the spirit of its evolution I believe it will bless the earth. I believe it serves the intelligent self-interest of our own United States which knows, by bitter experience in the Valley of the Shadow of two wars in a quarter century, that we cannot live entirely unto ourselves alone. I believe it is our only chance to keep faith with those who have borne the heat of battle. I have signed the charter with no illusions regarding its imperfections and with no pretensions that it guarantees its own benign aims; but with no doubts that it proposes an experiment which must be bravely undertaken in behalf of peace with justice in a better, happier, and safer world.

I shall support the ratification of this charter with all the resources at my command. I shall do this in the deep conviction that the alternative is physical and moral chaos in many weary places of the earth. I shall do it because there must be no default in our oft-pledged purpose to outlaw aggression so far as lies within our human power. I shall do it because this plan, regardless of infirmities, holds great promise that the United Nations may collaborate for peace as effectively as they have made common cause for war. I shall do it because peace must not be cheated out of its only collective chance.

I think, Mr. President, that I now know rather intimately what was in Benjamin Franklin's soul when, at the end of the American Constitutional Convention in 1787, he put his signature to that immortal document and said:

I consent, sir, to this Constitution because I expect no better and because I am not sure it is not the best. The opinions I have had of its errors I sacrifice to the public good. On the whole, sir, I cannot help expressing a wish that every member of the Convention who may still have objections to it would, with me, on this occasion doubt a little of his own infallibility and, to make manifest our unity, put his name to this instrument * * * and turn our future thoughts and endeavors to the means of having it well administered.

Franklin never had cause to regret his act of faith. I pretend no authentic parallel in the present instance. But in kindred faith I am prepared to proceed with this great adventure. I see no other way. In the event of its unexpected failure, I should prefer to have been associated with its hopeful trial than with a refusal to permit it to prove its expected success.

I revert briefly to Franklin. He also said:

I doubt whether any other convention we can obtain may be able to make a better Constitution; for, when you assemble a number of men, to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men all their prejudices, their

passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected? It therefore astonishes me, Sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does.

Mr. President, if that was true in a limited area among our relatively close-knit colonial States, how much more true is it when we contemplate the San Francisco Conference, where 50 nations, gathered from the opposite poles and from the seven seas, separated from each other by race, language, and tradition, representing 85 percent of the world's population, and dealing with a problem which spans the globe, sought a meeting of minds and found a common denominator to express their common purpose. Only those who have engaged in such a universal Congress—veritably the parliament of man—can wholly understand the complications and the difficulties. But they must be obvious to any thinking mind. It is no wonder we had many a troublesome day and many a critical night. It is no wonder that none of us can say that he wholly approves the net result. The wonder is that we can all approve so much.

Within the framework of the charter, through its refinement in the light of experience, the future can overtake our errors. But there will be no future for it unless we make this start. I doubt if there could ever be another or a better start. I commend this over-all consideration to all of my colleagues who have any interest in collective security as an instrument of collective peace. I commend it to all who are listening to the prayers for peace which rise from the hearthstones of our land.

You cannot plant an acorn, Mr. President, and expect an oak from it the morning following, but you will never have an oak unless you plant the acorn. In the San Francisco Charter we undertake to plant the roots of peace. No one can say with finality how they will flower, but this I know: Without roots there will be no flowers. I prefer the chance rather than no chance at all.

My own view regarding collective security is well known. I have repeatedly stated it upon this floor. While I want a powerful Army and an invincible Navy to make our national defense as impregnable as possible, pending the time when mutual arms limitations can be made dependably effective, I believe that no nation can hereafter immunize itself by its own exclusive action. I say again, as I said on January 10, that since Pearl Harbor, World War II has put the cruel science of mass murder into new and sinister perspective. I say again that the oceans have ceased to be moats which automatically protect our ramparts. I say again that flesh and blood now compete unequally with winged steel. War has become an all-consuming juggernaut. I say again that if World War III ever unhappily arrives, it will open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate. I say again that I propose to do everything within my power to keep those laboratories closed for keeps; and, Mr. President, they must be kept closed all around the earth because neither time nor space any longer promises to shield

the victims of treacherous attack. We must have collective security to stop the next war, if possible, before it starts; and we must have collective action to crush it swiftly if it starts in spite of our organized precautions.

That vital aspiration, Mr. President, is the object of the San Francisco Charter. The charter is not content merely with this latter sanguinary assignment to meet force with force when there is nothing left to do but fight. It seeks, above all else, to cure the underlying causes of wars; to correct the frictions which lead to wars; to resolve disputes by peaceful means before they take on the suicidal magnitudes of war; in a familiar metaphor, to "lock the barn before the horse is stolen."

You may tell me that I speak of the millennium. I reply, in the words of Holy Writ: "Where there is no vision the people perish." We dare not fail to try. We dare not fail to strive in this direction no matter how far we fall short of the goal.

Here, Mr. President, are 50 sovereign nations each one of which is under the most solemn pledge that can be made under God among the peoples of the earth—under pledge to do what? Listen:

To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which may lead to a breach of the peace.

Under pledge to do what else?

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

Under pledge to do what else?

To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character and promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex.

You may tell me that I have but to scan the present world with realistic eyes in order to see these fine phrases often contemptuously reduced to a contemporary shambles. You may tell me that some of the signatories to this charter practice the precise opposite of what they preach even as they sign. You may tell me that the aftermath of this war seems to threaten the utter disintegration of these ideals at the very moment they are born. I reply that the nearer right you may be in any such gloomy indictment, the greater is the need for the new pattern which promises at least to try to stem these evil tides. The nearer right you are, the greater becomes the importance of this new self-denying ordinance which promises a chastened view in 50 capitals of this earth. The nearer right you are, the greater is the urgency for invoking the emancipations which the San Francisco Charter contemplates. If the effort fails, we can

at least face the consequence with clean hands.

Now, Mr. President, I briefly sketch the charter's working structure. It will function through four major instruments: First, a general assembly in which each signatory nation has one vote—tomorrow's "town meeting of the world"; second, a security council—the executive agency for action—in which Britain, Russia, America, France, and China have permanent seats, together with six other nations chosen periodically by the assembly; third, an international court of justice where all nations will have the option of seeking juridical decisions; fourth, a social and economic council, consisting of 18 nations chosen periodically by the assembly, which will explore those social and economic dislocations, in the family of nations, that too often breed the wars which might otherwise be avoided through voluntary readjustments.

The security council will have at its ultimate potential disposal, when all other recourses have failed to maintain peace and security, an armed force to which the signatory states will be prepared to contribute upon call and in such proportions as shall be determined by collateral agreements made between the Security Council and these states. These agreements will not be negotiated until the new organization is in being. Their detail is not involved in the discussion of this primary treaty. But this treaty guarantees that these agreements shall be "subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes." Hence the Senate need have no fear that this separate obligation will not subsequently be available to its full scrutiny and consent.

There are those, Mr. President, who look upon this final availability of force to keep the peace as the real value of this enterprise. They argue that the aggressor of tomorrow, like the brutal aggressors of yesterday and today, will understand no language except guns and ships and planes. They may be right. Certainly I do not disagree that the United Nations must possess the potential power to fight to keep the peace which they have won by kindred means. I agree that we must "keep our powder dry" and be prepared to "pass the ammunition." But I would not agree that force is the real genius of this new institution. On the contrary, it is my conviction that the great hope which is here held out to humankind stems largely from the solemn formula which the San Francisco Charter creates for the pacific settlement of disputes before they ever reach a fighting stage. It is my profound belief that the pacific contacts and consultations which will constantly be maintained by the powers—and particularly by the great powers—plus the pacific routines which every dispute must hereafter exhaust before it is subject to any sort of sanctions, can and will resolve most, if not all, of the controversies which otherwise might lead once more to war. Mind you, Mr. President, these routines must be consulted, under the solemn pledge of these nations; and I venture the assertion and the hope and the prophecy that they

will be consulted, in view of the nature, character, and extent of this new obligation, which stands in a degree of sacred trust which has never heretofore been approached by an international obligation in the history of humankind. What are these pacific routines to which resort must be made by the large as well as by the small powers before there can be any consideration, thought, or suggestion of resort to force? First, solution by negotiation; second, solution by inquiry; third, solution by mediation; fourth, solution by conciliation; fifth, solution by arbitration; sixth, solution by judicial settlement; seventh, solution by resort to regional arrangements; eighth, other peaceful means chosen by the disputants themselves; ninth, appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment recommended by the Security Council.

This procedure, among other things, will be a "cooling off" process. It will temper and discourage impetuous wrath which too often flames out of sudden national hysteria. It allows time for rules of reason to reendow our sanities. It promises justice as a substitute for force. And all the time it invokes the moral pressures of the organized conscience of the world, functioning through this organization, upon any nation, big or little, which ignores this pacific routine and draws its ruthless sword. You have heard much about a big-power veto to which I shall presently refer. There is no veto—no self-administered immunity bath—which can void this primary obligation which every member of the United Nations takes when it signs the San Francisco Charter. There will be no doubt about the record. The self-confessed criminal of tomorrow will stand condemned. I admit that the Security Council itself cannot go as far against one of the five big powers as it can against the middle and lesser powers. I shall discuss that in a moment. But I assert that there is no escape for any power, however great, from the clear responsibility which it will unavoidably assume before an outraged world if it takes to the warpath before it has exhausted these paths of peace. In my view, the spiritual forces of this earth—when once thus universally aroused and organized and given a mighty oracle for militant expression—will prevail against all enemies. In my view, this is the San Francisco Charter's rendezvous with destiny.

I should like further to illuminate this point, Mr. President. The other day, in a radio quiz, I was asked the following question:

Will you trace the steps of procedure in the event of a problem? Taking the most unlikely case I can think of, supposing we and Canada were to become involved in a boundary dispute?

This certainly would be "the most unlikely case," because the unfortified 3,000 miles of Canadian-American boundary has been an area of total peace for more than a century. I wish that were all we and the world have to worry about. Nevertheless, let me answer the question. Canada and America have their own treaties, plus a permanent Boundary Commission, to settle such disputes.

This would continue to be the first recourse. If it failed, Canada and America would be further obligated under the United Nations Charter to seek a settlement by (1) negotiation, (2) inquiry, (3) mediation, (4) conciliation, (5) judicial settlement, (6) other means either on their own initiative or on the suggestion of the Security Council. It is inconceivable that this routine would not succeed. But if it failed, the Security Council would call on the other United Nations to use sanctions against the designated offender—such sanctions as complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraph, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. If, finally, even this procedure should fail, the Security Council could call upon the United Nations for armed force against the aggressor. It is, of course, unthinkable that any possible dispute between Canada and the United States could reach such an extreme. Further, considerations of the famous "veto" also enter this particular equation. But it nonetheless illustrates the general routine. You can apply the same routine to any other dispute. In my opinion, it is a routine which will stop almost every dispute short of the necessity for the consideration either of sanctions or of force. Here, I repeat, in my opinion, is the great practical value of the formula which we propose.

As a result of the San Francisco Conference, Dumbarton Oaks has been given a new soul. As originally drawn, it avoided any reference to justice—without which there can be no stable peace. San Francisco's Charter fills that void. The charter names justice as the prime criterion of peace. It repeatedly dedicates itself to human rights and fundamental freedoms. It declines to accept a static world in which yesterday's inequities are frozen in a strait-jacket. It tells the general assembly that it is empowered—and I beg of you, Senators, to listen to these words. Here is the heart and core of humanity's hope for tomorrow. The general assembly is empowered—to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situations, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, and of situations resulting from a violation of the purposes and principles set forth in this charter.

Mr. President, this can be a new emancipation proclamation for the world. You may tell me that it is calculated to "keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope." I reply that I know no better hope. I reply that it certainly will be broken if you insist upon denying it a chance, or if you cripple it at birth.

I have had great sympathy, Mr. President, with those among my colleagues who have earnestly argued that we should know the pattern of the final peace before we undertake to create the mechanism that shall sustain it. As the Dumbarton Oaks proposal was originally drawn, this viewpoint was particularly persuasive because the proposal failed to envision any subsequent possibility of peaceful change to overtake error or injustice, in the vast and ramifying deci-

sions and settlements affecting our allies and our friends, which may creep into the liquidation of this war. But I submit that the San Francisco Charter completely alters this conception. I speak with great feeling on this phase of the subject because it is one to which, if I may be allowed to say so, I devoted my persistent efforts. Frankly, I am one of those who look with anxiety upon many of these settlements and decisions, past, present, and prospective. But my anxiety, Mr. President, will be less acute, if I know that the United Nations, meeting periodically in a free and untrammelled general assembly can "recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situations, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare."

That is indeed a glorious assignment for tomorrow's "Town meeting of the world."

In this and other aspects, I repeat, the San Francisco Charter proposes to avoid a static world. In this and other aspects, the Dumbarton Oaks plan has been greatly liberalized by the progressive labors of this Conference. I submit that justice is thus guaranteed its hearing under the healthiest possible auspices available to this distraught and tangled world. I submit that justice is infinitely better off with such a forum than it would be if such a forum were refused. I suggest that the more one fears the nature of the final peace, speaking not of our enemies but of our friends, the warmer should be one's welcome to an institution which can promise some element of orderly correction. Under such circumstances, the quicker this institution begins to function the quicker justice may hope to find its voice and mobilize its friends.

I am definitely not saying, Mr. President, that a good league can compensate for a bad peace. I am not diluting for a single instant the dreadful responsibility which will rest upon those who chart the final peace. But I am saying that, whatever the final peace may be, the protections for human rights and fundamental freedoms inherent in the San Francisco Charter will inevitably make a better, a wiser, and a safer job of it in its ultimate impacts upon humankind. We could wish for more assurance than this charter gives, but we would desert our own ideals if we should permit our desire for the unattainable to blind us to the wisdom of embracing the boon which is at hand.

It is said, by way of assault upon this scheme of things, that the San Francisco Charter virtually delivers the world to the domination of a five-power alliance—America, Russia, Britain, France, and China—since these nations permanently exercise major authority in the Security Council which we here create. It is said that this arrangement, in stark reality, becomes a three-power military alliance between Russia, Britain, and the United States, since they will become its chief instruments of peace enforcement when the need for force arises. So far as peace enforcement is concerned, I agree that there is substance to this contention. But I hasten to assert that so far as force is

concerned, the world is at the mercy of Russia, Britain, and the United States, regardless of whether we form this league or not. Those happen to be the facts of life. But I submit that the world is even more at their mercy without the San Francisco Charter than with it. Without the charter there is no curb upon these great military powers except the rivalry between them—and military rivalry has never yet been the harbinger of peace. With the charter there is at least the restraint of a peaceful contract, for whatever that may be worth, and the grim assurance, Mr. President, that the aggressor of tomorrow who breaks this contract will stand in naked infamy before the embattled conscience of an outraged world.

I wish we might have a different plan in which there could be more decentralization of enforcement power. But that is simply equivalent to saying that I wish we might have a different kind of world. The truth of the matter is that we confront a condition, not a theory. The San Francisco Charter deals with this condition. If it did not deal with the condition it would not be worth the paper it is written on. The "condition" is that Britain, Russia, and America control the dominating force-factors of the earth, and are calculated to thus continue for the foreseeable years ahead. To ignore this realism in our peace plans would be to wander in a wishful dream. To accept this realism and then to seek to harness it—to thus make a virtue of necessity—is to embrace the only concrete hope which logic can defend. Never forget, furthermore, my thesis that the use of force is wholly secondary to the use of the pacific tools which this charter primarily provides. That is the vital point at which all the United Nations stand at par. Force is only the last resort. If needed, it obviously must be found where it exists.

You may say this will not work. I answer that I do not know; but I think it will, at least so long as this charter holds the major powers in harmony. I answer that I propose to try the only chance.

You may say that 2,000 years of history deny this military theme. I answer, Mr. President, that there was no precedent for World War II. There is no precedent for the peace-challenge we confront. We must make our own precedents in seeking to stop World War III.

The so-called Yalta voting formula is part and parcel of this same contemplation. I can understand the critic who, in ethical and moral grounds, condemns a voting system which permits each of these five Great Powers to enjoy the special privilege of a "veto" in the Security Council to protect itself against condemnation and collective restraint if it threatens aggression. I can sympathize with the critic who protests this discrimination. But I cannot understand the critic who permits his disappointment upon this one score to sweep him into total opposition to this entire enterprise and into total abandonment of all its precious values. I cannot understand it because, upon examination, we must admit; first, that this

veto formula substantially reflects the world's realities; second, that the so-called special privilege of the Great Powers is matched by its equivalent in special responsibilities; third, that there is no alternative basis upon which to launch this great adventure; and, last but far from least, Mr. President, because this veto, which we share with others and which we could not enjoy alone is a protection against American involvements which many millions of our citizens would require as the indispensable price of our adherence to this treaty.

I say this system reflects the world's realities because if these Great Powers ever face a war with each other, the world's dream of peace is shattered, regardless of any league the wit of man might devise. It will not be shattered because of the veto. It will be shattered because of the facts. It would be idle to cherish any illusions upon this score. Peace depends, in the final analysis, upon the attitudes of these Great Powers and upon their mutual relationships. But I assert, beyond any shadow of a doubt that this United Nations organization can minimize the frictions and stabilize the international friendships and channel the orderly contacts which can go infinitely far in saving all of us from any such disaster. If, in spite of everything, the disaster comes upon us, the veto will simply have been the next war's first casualty. At least, the rest of us will have the incalculable advantage of our own collective unity in moving swiftly to our own and the world's collective defense.

I said, secondly, that there is no alternative opportunity to launch this great adventure. There is no other plan available. There was no other basis available to the American delegation at San Francisco. The late President Roosevelt pledged his country to this formula at Yalta. We Americans have a habit of keeping our country's word—a habit, by the way, which needs to become contagious if any sort of world order shall survive. The late President exempted from the formula the right of a great power to veto an inquiry by the Security Council into its own dereliction; and we, at San Francisco, successfully resisted an extreme interpretation which would have permitted the use of the veto against full hearing and discussion of any other threats to peace and security. Otherwise, the Yalta formula was clear. To have denied it at San Francisco would have been to kill the Conference before it ever got under way. I doubt whether there ever would have been another Conference. The hope for organized peace would have died—what irony—at the Golden Gate. The vast advantage which the San Francisco Charter—regardless of its infirmities—holds for the hopes of humankind would have perished in the wreckage of a broken pledge. I would not have been able to square that tragedy with our promises to our fighting sons and to their mothers. And that, Mr. President, is the choice which, in my humble opinion, Congress and the country now confronts.

I have also said, Mr. President, that there is a strong substantive argument to be made for this Yalta formula. In

any effective organization for peace and security in the world as it is and as it is going to be for some time to come—whether we like it or not—the Great Powers must assume special and particular responsibilities. There is no other way. To meet these special and particular responsibilities the Great Powers obviously must have special and particular authority. Without the latter, the former are impossible. This special and particular authority may be looked upon as special and particular privilege. But, in the last analysis, it is the privilege of serving the world. If it ever becomes a selfish privilege, an exploited privilege, this organization will die of cancer. For myself, I decline to write any such obituary in anticipation of a funeral which never need occur. But I do not for an instant blind myself to the overriding fact that these responsibilities, these authorities, these privileges which the Great Powers thus accept are the most sacred public trust ever created in the affairs of men. It is indispensable that this obligation be accepted in this spirit by all concerned.

If you tell me that I have no warrant in today's status of the world, for optimism upon this score, I answer that unless you develop this, or a better peace prospectus, the drums of another war may thunder in your ears as a consequence of our cynical failure at least to try to silence them.

I have also said that this veto problem invites many deeply devoted Americans to inspect our own American position before they attack this formula. Let it never for an instant be forgotten that this veto granted to the five great powers includes a veto for our own United States. It is our protection against our involvement in any use of our forces against our will. It is our defense against what I venture to believe would be bitterly condemned in many quarters as our "involuntary servitude" if our veto power did not exist. It is the complete answer to any rational fears that we may be subordinating our destiny to alien commands. It is the warrant that, though we cooperate wholeheartedly with the United Nations for peace and security, we remain the captains of our own souls. It guarantees our perpetuated independence of international dictation. If the veto is viewed by some of our citizens as a cloud upon the idealism of the San Francisco Charter, let us recognize the vivid fact that for others of our citizens the cloud has a silver lining. Indeed, for millions of our people it will be all "silver lining" and no cloud at all.

In my view, Mr. President, we sacrifice none of our essential American sovereignty and none of our essential American rights when, exercising intelligent self-interest, we join ourselves in this international enterprise to seek a peace and a security which are as essential to our welfare as the air we breathe. For example, the San Francisco Charter has found a practical way to integrate regional arrangements with the over-all authority of the United Nations League, and thus to put the international organization in gear with the great inter-American system—once symbolized by

the Monroe Doctrine and recently endowed with new vitality at Chapultepec. For 50 years this inter-American Union has been the most successful instrument for peace and security the world has ever seen. We do not surrender its mutual advantages. We build them into the new foundations of the larger system. We integrate them with the larger plan.

Another example—we preserve the right of individual and collective self-defense, inherent in every sovereign state, in the event of summary attack. Another example—we exempt all essentially domestic matters from the jurisdiction of the new international authority. Another example—commended to those who want American freedom of postwar action in respect to far Pacific island bases—we have written a trusteeship chapter in the San Francisco Charter which sets up a splendid optional program that shall lift mandates to new levels of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; but—and I quote from the Charter—"It would be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which territories would be brought under a trusteeship system and upon what terms." Here again that which falls short of the compulsory idealism which some of our citizens desire, is an assurance to others of our citizens that America reserves complete freedom of action to herself in this regard.

In a word, we have not created a super-state. We have not organized a "world government." We have not hauled down the stars and stripes from the dome of the Capitol. We have simply agreed to cooperate effectively with 49 other sovereign states in the mutual pursuit of peace and security. Our own American self-interest in that objective, as demonstrated by two world wars in a quarter century, is as keen and as intimate and as universal as that of any other nation on this globe. Indeed, I know of no land on earth which has a greater stake in this world peace than our own United States of America.

Mr. President, in this brief report I have touched only the rim of this tremendous subject. I have presented only a sketchy outline. It fails any sort of adequate attention to many of the useful functions which the United Nations League will serve. I particularly have in mind the enormous potentialities of the proposed Social and Economic Council which will persistently facilitate "the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples." This is one of the most significant and most promising improvements on the old Geneva Covenant. I also particularly have in mind the new emphasis which is put upon international law as an institution for human service, substituting orderly justice for the jungle-creed that might makes right. I also have in mind the certainty that, with this organized vigilance, which we here mobilize, no Axis Powers nor any counterpart thereof shall ever rise again.

These and many other considerations will be the appropriate subjects of full

investigation by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of full debate on the Senate floor. I am proud to say that I believe the San Francisco Charter can withstand such scrutiny. I have no disposition to urge precipitous haste in this consideration. I want Congress and the country to know all there is to know about this mighty enterprise. On the other hand, I should deeply regret any needless or undue delay in proceeding with reasonable expedition to register the Senate's will. None of us can be unaware of the importance which will attach to our decision, nor of the impact which our attitudes will have upon the life of the world in this moment of its greatest flux. History is writing with a rushing pen and we, Mr. President, must accommodate its pace. If America is to assume the moral leadership of a better world in which we have fought our way to glorious eminence, we can scarcely be content to be among the last who care or dare to speak when this United Nations' roll is called.

Mr. President, I was still at my Conference tasks in San Francisco when Washington had the great privilege of pouring out its tumultuous welcome to General Eisenhower a few days ago. It was a source of deep regret to me that I could not be here with you to join the grateful throng which greeted him up and down our avenues and yonder in the Chamber of the House. When I read the text of his modest, moving speech and came upon his devoted tribute to the precious memory of those brave, young martyrs who have given up the last full measure of devotion, and when I found he had said that "the blackness of the grief of those who mourn can be relieved only by the faith that all this shall not happen again," it seemed to me that the San Francisco Charter has a responsive mission which this great commander must have had in mind as he went on to say:

The soldier knows that in war the threat of separate annihilation tends to hold allies together; he hopes we can find peace a nobler incentive to produce the same unity. He passionately believes that, with the same determination, the same optimistic resolution and the same mutual consideration among the Allies that marshalled in Europe forces capable of crushing what had been the greatest war machine of history, the problems of peace can and must be met. He sees the United Nations strong but considerate; humane and understanding leaders in the world to preserve the peace that he is winning.

That, Mr. President, is the aspiration and the dedication of the San Francisco Charter. None of its authors will certify to its perfection. But all of its authors will certify to its preponderant advantages. It is the only plan available for international cooperation in the pursuit of peace and justice. It is laden with promise and with hope. It deserves a faithful trial. America has everything to gain and nothing to lose by giving it support; everything to lose and nothing to gain by declining this continued fraternity with the United Nations in behalf of the dearest dream of humankind. I recommend the San Francisco Charter to

Congress and the country. [Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

ORDER FOR PRINTING OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG ON UNITED NATIONS CHARTER (S. DOC. 59)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the remarks of Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, delivered in the Senate on June 29, 1945, on the Charter of the United Nations, be printed as a Senate document and that 10,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

WESTERN STEEL PLANTS AND THE TIN PLATE INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his fourth report dealing with western steel plants and the tin-plate industry (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION—THE ROAD TO TOKYO AND BEYOND

A letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, transmitting, pursuant to law, his quarterly report entitled "The Road to Tokyo and Beyond" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

Resolutions adopted by the Hudson County (N. J.) Republican Committee, commending Hon. Walter E. Edge, Governor of New Jersey, and former United States Senator, for his efforts in sponsoring legislation beneficial to veterans, liberalizing the workmen's compensation laws, reorganization of the various State departments and agencies, and postwar planning in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Earl McCracken, of New York City, N. Y., praying that he be discharged from the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the chairman and several members of certain committees of the Filipino Territorial Council Delegation, and the Washington representative of the Filipino Inter-Community Organization of the Western States, Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation for the security of certain Filipino seamen during the postwar period; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the interim committee of the American Jewish Conference, New York City, N. Y., favoring prompt ratification of the San Francisco Charter for Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of F. M. Eugene Blass, of Long Valley, N. J., and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to the patent case of F. M. Eugene Blass (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Patents.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1117. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda Estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss; with amendments (Rept. No. 448).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2995. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to create a revenue in the District of Columbia by levying a tax upon all dogs therein, to make such dogs personal property, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1878, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 449).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 28, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 937) to amend the act suspending until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws, so as to continue such suspension until June 30, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1209. A bill to amend sections 44 and 38 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1210. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Craig; and

S. 1211. A bill to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army without administration of estates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 511. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 3238. An act readjusting the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and other matter of fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 3579. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution authorizing the production of petroleum for the national defense from Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO HON. FRANCES PERKINS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him at a testimonial dinner in tribute to Hon. Frances Perkins, at Washington, D. C., on June 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

POEMS BY NICK KENNY ON THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND PRESIDENT TRUMAN

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two poems by Nick Kenny, one on the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the other on President Truman, which appear in the Appendix.]

POLAND'S SUN FADES AGAIN—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Poland's Sun Fades Again," written by William Philip Simms and published in the Washington Daily News of June 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor. Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. With the understanding I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely wish to ask for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation conference report. I send the report to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Chief Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, 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 amendments numbered 2, 4, 26, 33, 35, 36, 37, 41, 51, 58½, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 105, 106, 108, 131, 136, 138, 148, 149, 150, 152, 167, 168, 170, 173, 186, 188, 193, 194, 195, 197, 200, 201, 202, 212, 213, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 246, 249, 252, 262, 266, 269, 282, 285, 302, 307, 309, 310, 312, 314, 318, and 319.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 12, 13, 23, 30, 32, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 62, 63, 112, 117, 122, 124, 127, 128, 137, 161, 166, 179, 184, 199, 208, 209, 210, 218, 254, 271, 281, 284, 292½, 299, 301, 308, 315, 316, and 317, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,079,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$118,980"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$86,626"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In

lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$12,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$208,860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$212,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert the following: "twelve"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$105,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Appropriations herein made for the Grazing Service for 'Salaries and expenses,' 'Range improvements,' and 'Fire fighting' shall be available for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreements to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "fifteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$354,695"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$310,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "one hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$142,885"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 292: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 292, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$625,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 293: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 293, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$55,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 294: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 294, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,219,325"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 295: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 295, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 296: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 296, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,219,325"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 297: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 297, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$704,828"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 298: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 298, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "seventy-two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 303: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 303, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,038,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 304: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 304, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The following appropriations herein made shall be available for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft: 'Salaries and expenses, Governor and secretary, Territory of Alaska'; 'Construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska'; 'Reconstruction and improvement of Richardson Highway, Alaska'; and 'Alaska Railroad appropriated fund'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 305: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 305, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$196,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 313: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 313, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "\$300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 11, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 50, 57, 61, 64, 65, 103, 107, 114, 115, 121, 123, 125, 129, 134, 135, 140, 145,

147½, 154, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 164, 165, 176, 177, 178½, 181, 214, 217, 219, 221½, 222, 228, 229, 232, 233, 236, 237, 238, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248, 250, 251, 253, 257, 258, 260, 264, 265, 268, 270, 275, 278, 279, 280, 287, 300, 306, 311, 320, and 321.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHOONEY,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
CHAN GURNEY,
HAROLD H. BURTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
ROBERT F. JONES,
BEN F. JENSEN,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this a complete agreement?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a complete agreement.

Mr. WHITE. Is it signed by all the members of the conference, both on the part of the House and the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. All the conferees signed the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3024, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 28, 1945.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 57, 61, 103, 107, 114, 115, 121, 125, 134, 135, 140, 147½, 158, 159, 164, 214, 217, 219, 221½, 222, 228, 229, 232, 233, 236, 237, 238, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248, 250, 251, 253, 257, 260, 265, 268, 270, 275, 278, 279, 287, 300, 306, 311, and 321 to the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"DIVISION OF GEOGRAPHY

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Division of Geography, during the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and for a period not exceeding 30 days thereafter, in performing the duties imposed upon the Secretary by Executive Order 6680, dated April 17, 1934, relating to uniform usage in regard to geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government, including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery and office supplies, and printing and binding, \$25,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"Not to exceed \$3,487,110 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation 'Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system,' shall be available under the account for said appropriation in the fiscal year 1944 for ex-

penses of marketing and operation of transmission facilities, and administrative costs in connection therewith, including \$20,850 for personal services in the District of Columbia, the purchase (not exceeding 30), maintenance, and operation of passenger automobiles, and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft: *Provided*, That funds available for construction of transmission lines shall be available only for the construction of such lines as have been previously authorized by Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "and the appropriations contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945, for the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands are hereby continued available for the same objects until June 30, 1946."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in line 6 of said Senate engrossed amendment insert "\$750,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "not exceeding \$25,000 for cooperation with the State of Oklahoma for the construction and equipment of an Indian arts and crafts building at Anadarko, Okla."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert: "\$5,417,190."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "under a contract to be entered into between said tribal attorney and the Osage Tribal Council, which contract shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "\$900,000, to remain available until expended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "to remain available until expended for carrying out projects (including the construction of transmission lines) or investigations previously or herein authorized by Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows:

In line 10 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, strike out "\$5,500,000" and insert "\$2,250,000."

In line 11, after "surveys", insert: "and."

In lines 12 and 13, strike out ", and to perform work preliminary to construction of authorized projects."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 155 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert: "\$9,783,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 156 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum

inserted by said amendment insert: "\$10,-620,550."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 160 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "and to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River dam fund, \$3,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 165 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "to remain available until expended for carrying out projects (including the construction of transmission lines) previously or herein authorized by Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 176 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "June 30, 1947."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 177 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "Fort Peck project, Montana: For construction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1938 (16 U. S. C. 833), \$155,800, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1947."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 178½ to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "to remain available until June 30, 1947."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 181 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "June 30, 1947."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 258 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "\$1,925,675, including \$30,000 for the acquisition of the Ovington properties within the Olympic National Park."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 264 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "\$44,800" and insert: "\$40,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 280 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert: "328,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 320 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 11. During the fiscal year 1946, the Secretary may delegate to the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries the power to authorize changes in official stations of officers and employees and the payment of expenses of travel and transportation of household goods in connection with such change of official stations."

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 11, 14, 50, 64, 65, 123, 129, 145, 154, 155, 156, 160, 165, 176, 177, 178½, 181, 258, 264, 280, and 320.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to have two resolutions agreed to, with the understanding that the Senator from Mississippi shall not lose the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. With unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor, I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed with that understanding.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 139, reported on June 19, 1945, by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois, what is the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. This is a resolution which came from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and merely continues authority to that committee, without requesting any additional funds.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 139) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and Senate Resolution 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 8, 1941, and Senate Resolution 39, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 23, 1944, and Senate Resolution 18, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1945 (relating to the investigation of the use of public lands), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

INVESTIGATION OF DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND RELATED SUBJECTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday we discussed Senate resolution 129, which was offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and sent to the calendar. I move that the Senate proceed to consider the resolution. It relates to the disposal of surplus Government property and related problems.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will require unanimous consent.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. This is resolution 129, now on the calendar, is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. It is.

Mr. WHITE. The one which was discussed somewhat yesterday?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. At this time I know of no objection to the resolution.

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

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 129), which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment. On page 3, line 1, after the words "not exceed", it is proposed to strike out "\$25,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to continue the study and investigation with respect to war contracts, the termination of war contracts, and related problems authorized by Senate Resolution 198 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, as heretofore supplemented and extended, to be conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the disposal of surplus Government property and related problems. The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its studies and investigations under this resolution, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The powers and duties conferred or imposed by Senate Resolution 198 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, with respect to the study and investigation under that resolution shall also be applicable with respect to the studies and investigations under this resolution. The subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs heretofore authorized to make the study and investigation under Senate Resolution 198 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, shall be deemed to have been continued as a subcommittee duly authorized to make the studies and investigations under this resolution, until the Committee on Military Affairs shall otherwise direct.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make comment with reference to the resolution which the Senate has just approved, providing funds for a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs dealing with surplus property.

A few moments ago the Senate approved a resolution reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, making an appropriation of funds so that a subcommittee of the Senate Commit-

tee on Military Affairs might carry on its survey and investigation of the disposal of surplus property.

A few days ago this subcommittee, which is headed by the distinguished and able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], made a report to the Senate, Senate Report 199. Part III of that report dealt particularly with the subject of iron and steel. That report contains so much valuable information, so much that is striking and challenging, and that throws light on our postwar situation, particularly with reference to iron and steel, that the Iron Age, which we know is perhaps the most authentic leading publication of the country on the subject of iron and steel, has devoted 14 pages to the report of the subcommittee in the issue of June 21, 1945.

In view of the action of the Senate in providing additional funds for the subcommittee, I felt that the Senate would be gratified to know just how the report of the Subcommittee on Iron and Steel had been received, particularly by the Iron Age. As one member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I wish to extend my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and his colleagues for the very fine work which the subcommittee has been doing, and for its very able and challenging report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate what the Senator has said. I should like to add that the staff of the committee, together with Mr. H. B. McCoy, Chief of the Division of Industrial Economy of the Department of Commerce, played a major role in collecting and preparing this material. Mr. Kurt Borchardt was in charge of collecting the material.

Mr. HILL. As usual, the Senator from Wyoming is generous, and appreciative of the services and good work of his staff and those who helped him in connection with this report.

WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3368) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am not engaging in a filibuster. It was my earnest desire that a fair and reasonable compromise could be reached upon the question which is now before the Senate. I must confess that I believe in filibusters when we have the votes, and I think we will have the votes when the filibuster on FEPC starts in the next few days.

Mr. President, for the past few years this country has been torn by agitators, by Communists, by fellow travelers, who have incited racial hatreds, who have made classes in this country racially conscious, who have made them class conscious, in order to divide our country and in order to weaken American democracy.

The Communist Party is behind this agitation. The Negro group in the United States is the greatest minority, the largest minority, the most powerful minority politically, that we have. The Communist Party has been behind and has promoted legislative measures such as the one now pending, and I submit the

Communist Party is behind the present FEPC, for two reasons, and I shall give the reasons in a moment. It is all a part of the Communist program to destroy America, to destroy the American system of economy, to destroy the American system of government, which we love, in order to sovietize our country.

Mr. President, I shall read from a book entitled "I Confess," by a former Communist named Benjamin Gitlow. Gitlow at one time was a high official in the Communist Party; in fact, he was Communist candidate for Vice President of the United States in 1924 and 1928. He was formerly a member of the ruling political committee of the American Communist Party and of the executive committee, and president of the Communist International. This man Gitlow wrote a book in which he gave the Communist plans to dominate America, and in which he stated that the racial program of the Communist Party in this country was one of their leading programs to take over America. I read from Mr. Gitlow's book:

The same story was repeated with the instruction by the Communist International to organize and lead the Negro masses of the United States, for which the Comintern provided a lot of money.

Mr. President, the Comintern provided a lot of money. I have noticed organizations, Communist-front organizations, organizations, which have been condemned by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive, spending huge sums of money for FEPC, for measures which will make the Negro race in the United States race conscious, in an attempt to divide our country. I wonder if these organizations are spending money received from Russia.

Let me say now that the facts about Russia have not come out. The American people—and God knows they should know the facts—do not know what is happening abroad. They do not know the plans of Communist Russia. If this debate shall proceed long enough I shall discuss in detail the Communist program for world supremacy.

I read further from Mr. Gitlow's book:

The attitude of the Communists was based upon the belief that the Negroes constituting * * * a section of our population, a section which has special * * * grievances and if once properly organized and led, would be the front-rank fighters in a revolution to replace our present Republic with a Soviet form of government.

Hence the party created a special Negro department, built special Negro organizations, issued Negro papers and periodicals, made every inducement for Negroes to join the party, took advantage of every opportunity to penetrate existing Negro organizations, and to participate in Negro movements, for the purpose of bringing its program before the Negro masses. The party membership was impressed with the importance of Negro work. Every new Negro member brought into the party was looked upon as a Communist achievement, and the Negro Communists were actually accorded special privileges.

Mr. President, there is the proof from one of the leading Communists in America, from one of the high officials of the Communist Party, that this organ-

ization is behind the Negro movement in this country and that the party is exploiting the Negroes by making special promises such as FEPC, such as social equality, such as racial amalgamation, in an attempt to line the Negroes up under the red banner of Communism and to destroy the United States.

I read further from the same book by Mr. Gitlow:

The Negro question was injected into every situation, in every campaign.

Was not Gitlow right about that, Mr. President? Is it not true that in every situation and in every campaign the Negro question is injected? Just as Gitlow says, the injection of the question comes from the Communist Party.

The Negroes were looked upon as the chosen people who were to be the vanguard of the Communist revolution. Party members were urged to make every effort to establish personal as well as social relations with the Negroes. Negroes were brought into the party, not on the basis of their Communist convictions, but on the promise that in the party they could enjoy a sociable evening together with whites on the basis of equality. Negroes who had recently joined the party were pushed into places of leadership simply because they were Negroes and as a demonstration that the Negroes enjoyed preferred treatment in the party. This was done not out of sympathy or consideration for the Negro masses, but for purely political reasons.

Behind the Negro agitation and the stress laid on exploiting the Negro issue was the desire—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

to comply with the orders from Moscow.

I wonder if those in the Senate who support legislation such as this realize that in the last analysis they are following orders from Moscow, because, as Gitlow says, the Communist Party is behind these measures. I read further:

It was hoped through a Negro minorities movement in the United States to give leadership to a colored nationalist movement of world proportions in the countries of South and Central America, Africa, Asia, and the Antipodes. The American nationalist Negro movement, Moscow believed, would provide the leadership for such a world movement. Besides, the Communist Party could dominate the American Negro movement, because it was believed possible for a small handful of American Communists to organize and control the 2,000,000 Negro workers in American industry, which force could be the most decisive in the broader world-wide Negro movement.

Mr. President, that book shows the plan of the Communist Party to control the United States. Gitlow states in it, and I state now, that every prediction he made has come true. We see the same pattern behind all similar measures, to use the Negro, to make him class conscious, to give him special privileges, in order to bring him into the Communist Party.

The argument is made that the temporary FEPC is a war measure. It was stated in the Executive order setting up this agency that FEPC was created to mobilize the full manpower resources of America into the war movement, into the production of arms and ammunition for the purposes of war. That is the reason

this organization was created in the first instance.

Let us see if those same reasons hold true today. In connection with the very bill under consideration now, on day before yesterday speeches were made in favor of an appropriation of \$13,000,000, as I remember, in order to find jobs for Negroes who were let out of war plants which closed down, in order to find employment for workers who were thrown out of employment in war industries which were reconverted, and statements were made time and again that in a few months there would be a surplus of labor in the United States. If that is true, and if the purpose of FEPC is to mobilize all the manpower for war purposes, then why is it necessary to set up this agency on a temporary basis, when we admit that within the next few months there will be a surplus of labor in the United States?

Furthermore, Mr. President, 1943 was the peak year in employment in the munitions industry in America. In that year there were 10,000,000 workers employed. In May, 1945, there were roughly only eight and one-half million workers employed in the same industry, or a decrease of 14 percent. While I cannot give the figures, as they are confidential, of the future decrease, or the rate of shut-down of war industry, I say by authority of my office as a Member of the United States Senate that within 12 months there will be 41 percent less labor in munition industries in the United States than there was 2 years ago.

In addition to that, 1,000,000 men will be discharged from the American Army to go into American industry within the next 12 months' period. That being true, what is the necessity to continue this agency? It is not to mobilize every last ounce of our manpower and scrape the bottom of the barrel in order to produce guns and munitions of war. We do not need that labor. We have passed that peak. We are on the down grade. We face a surplus of labor in American industry within the next 12 months.

Mr. President, what is the idea behind this bill? It is argued that this organization is set up to give to the Negro race and other minority groups economic equality. Of course, everyone believes in equal pay for equal work. I certainly would not argue for discrimination against any workingman because of race. But that is most certainly not the question involved here. We cannot legislate against discrimination. We cannot legislate to stamp out of one's heart the prejudices which are contained therein.

What is the object of the FEPC? Economic equality? Then why has it devoted its time to tearing down partitions between white and colored laboratories in Government buildings and war factories? Why has it gone into industry and taken measures to bring about social equality? I will tell the Senate why. It is a part of the Communist program for racial amalgamation in the United States.

I should like to read a statement as to what racial amalgamation means. This statement was made in an article

written several years ago by a great American, a former President of the United States, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt. I read:

Anyone who has traveled in the Far East knows that the mingling of Asiatic blood with European or American blood produces, in 9 cases out of 10, the most unfortunate results. There are throughout the East many thousands of so-called Eurasians, men and women and children partly of Asiatic blood and partly of European or American blood. These Eurasians are, as a common thing, looked down on and despised both by the Europeans and Americans who reside there, and by the pure Asiatics who live there.

That is exactly what happens when there is a commingling of the white race and the Negro race. If, as the late President Roosevelt said, that is bad in the case of Asiatics, Eurasians, and Americans, how much worse is it in the case of white and black peoples? The Negro race is an inferior race.

The Negro organizations which are supporting this measure know that today all the power in the world could not bring about social equality, and could not force the white people of this country to associate on terms of equality with the Negro race. So there is agitation by them for a gradual tearing down, one at a time, over a long period of time, of the safeguards which have been erected to maintain the purity and racial integrity of the white race.

I know that the intentions of Senators who support this measure are of the highest; but I say that the organizations to which I have referred realize full well that FEPC is a long step in that direction. As the record shows, the FEPC has devoted its energies toward that end. Take the case of the seamen's union, in which white boys were recruited and placed on merchant ships, and this organization attempted to force them to sleep and eat with Negro seamen, over the protests of the union.

Mr. President, we must have racial harmony in the United States. We must have racial tolerance in the United States. A great rift has been driven in American life. Our country has been divided and weakened, in accordance with Hitler's doctrine of divide and conquer, and Stalin's doctrine of making the races and classes in each country race-conscious and class-conscious in order that the state may be weakened. Has this agitation helped the Negro? Has it helped any minority group? Mr. President, whom has it helped, except the cause of communism in the United States?

There is another question which goes to the very heart of the free-enterprise system in America, involving a right which is at stake in connection with the consideration of FEPC. By establishing this organization and giving it the right to say who can be hired and who can be fired, by permitting a Government bureau—as I shall show in a moment, a bureau composed largely of Communists—to substitute its judgment as to the qualifications of an employee for the judgment of the employer, we have taken a long step toward the destruction of the American system of private enterprise. By voting for the appropriation to con-

tinue this organization we endorse a policy which deprives the employer of the right of selection of his employees.

There are several rights which go with the ownership of property in America. It is fundamental that the owner is the boss of his property so long as he does not illegally step upon the toes of someone else. Ownership makes the owner supreme so long as he does not infringe upon the rights of others. The principle of this organization deprives him of that fundamental right. Mr. President, the right of ownership to the full control of property, and the untrammelled right of selection of employees are recognized in the Constitution of the United States. They are recognized in the Declaration of Independence. They are recognized in the statutes of our country.

We are asked, under the guise of fair employment practices, to deprive business of a fundamental and sacred right, and to deprive American laboring men organized in unions of the right to say with whom they shall be associated in a union, and who shall belong.

If this agency can say that one man can have a job, it can also say that another man cannot have a job. We have established one of the most powerful agencies in the history of government, an agency which, unless it is checked, will control the business and industry of America. We have made real the dream of Sidney Hillman and the CIO Political Action Committee to take over American business, because such organizations control the Fair Employment Practice Committee and, through it, they control management in the United States. I submit that in the last analysis that is the principal objective of the leadership of the CIO, a leadership which is shot through and rotten with communism.

Mr. President, I make another statement at this time, and I will prove it in a few moments: In the interest of the future well-being of our country, Sidney Hillman should be deported, because he is one of the Communists and one of the lowest kinds of Communists we have in this country.

Mr. President, what does this agency do? We say we are not changing the American system. Let us examine the order setting up this agency; let us see what it says:

2. All departments and agencies of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for war production shall take all measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Of course, Mr. President, there is nothing to that section; it does not mean anything. But let us go further:

3. There is hereby established in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President a Committee on Fair Employment Practice, hereinafter referred to as the Committee, which shall consist of a Chairman and not more than six other members to be appointed by the President. The Chairman shall receive such salary as shall be fixed by the President not exceeding \$10,000 per year. The other members of the Committee shall receive necessary traveling

expenses and, unless their compensation is otherwise prescribed by the President, a per diem allowance of not exceeding \$25 per day and subsistence expenses on such days as they are actually engaged in the performance of duties pursuant to this order.

That section does not mean anything. But I read further, and now we get down to the meat of the coconut:

4. The Committee shall formulate policies to achieve the purposes of this order and shall make recommendations to the various Federal departments and agencies and to the President which it deems necessary and proper to make effective the provisions of this order.

What does that say? It says that the world is the limit. This agency can formulate its own policies, without regard to statute; it is an agency backed by no legislative authority. I submit that because of that provision, this order is clearly unconstitutional and, further, that the Congress of the United States, if it makes this appropriation and places its stamp of approval upon that order, would violate the Constitution. We have no constitutional authority to do such a thing, because that is a delegation of legislative power. No safeguards, no standards are placed there.

Mr. President, that provision violates Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

But I read further:

The Committee shall also recommend to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission appropriate measures for bringing about the full utilization and training of manpower in and for war production without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Well, that is bad, but it seems it does not go far enough. I read further:

5. The Committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination forbidden by this order. It may conduct hearings, make findings of fact, and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

Mr. President, what could be more sweeping? What could go further than that provision? The order states that the Committee shall receive complaints—not complaints filed by the aggrieved party, it should be noted. I submit it is fundamental under the Anglo-Saxon system of jurisdiction that the courts only hear complaints filed by or on behalf of the aggrieved part.

I repeat a portion of what I have just read:

It may conduct hearings, make findings of fact, and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

What does that do? It gives authority, without checks, without balances, without any bridle, to take any steps this organization may deem necessary to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

Mr. President, that is a wide, sweeping grant of authority by Executive order, and I submit that the Congress of the United States has no authority under the American Constitution to set up this agency or to approve it by an appropriation—which we would do if we make an appropriation—for the reason that it is a delegation of legislative authority, something which we do not have

the constitutional authority to do. No standards are provided; no checks are imposed; no formula is fixed. We cannot delegate unbridled discretion and unbridled authority, free from checks or balances, to any Government agency.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States, as the American people full well know, is the last safeguard of free government in America. When we follow this procedure without any bridle, without any standards, and attempt to delegate legislative authority, we destroy the United States.

But I read further:

6. Upon the appointment of the Committee and the designation of its Chairman, the Fair Employment Practice Committee established by Executive Order No. 8802 of June 15, 1941, hereinafter referred to as the old Committee, shall cease to exist.

Mr. President, if the old Committee had ceased to exist and a new one had not been appointed, in my judgment there would have been won a great victory for American democracy.

I read further:

All records and property of the old Committee and such unexpended balances of allocations or other funds available for its use as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Committee. The Committee shall assume jurisdiction over all complaints and matters pending before the old Committee and shall conduct such investigations and hearings as may be necessary in the performance of its duties under this order.

The same objections which apply to other sections of the order apply to what I have just read. I continue:

7. Within the limits of the fund which may be made available for that purpose, the Chairman shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel and make provision for such supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out this order.

What is the effect of that language? It gives to the Chairman unlimited authority to hire as many persons as he may desire to hire. There is provided no legislative standard. He may hire an unlimited number of persons. He may molest decent business and decent labor organizations throughout the United States.

I read further:

The Committee may utilize the services and facilities of other Federal departments and agencies and such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed.

In other words, under that language, volunteers, trouble makers, and agitators are authorized to go into a factory, cause strife and discord, and file complaints before the Committee. Men who are working their hands raw in the war effort may be subpoenaed from their work to attend a hearing before the Committee which, as I shall later show, may be composed of Negro Communists. Workers must appear before the Committee and be imposed upon and mistreated. This, I submit, may be done in the name of politics, because if it were not for political considerations, this appropriation would not receive 10 votes in the Senate of the United States.

I continue reading:

The Committee may accept the services of State and local authorities and officials, and may perform the functions and duties and exercise the powers conferred upon it by this order through such officials and agencies and in such manner as it may determine.

Mr. President, that is a sweeping delegation of authority. We have no constitutional right to make an appropriation for, and place our stamp of approval upon, such authority. We cannot delegate legislative authority. Yet, that is what we attempt to do when we approve this appropriation.

I now read section 8:

The Committee shall have the power to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be appropriate or necessary to carry out the provisions of this order.

That is another sweeping grant of authority. What does the agency do? The FEPC at its hearings, is not bound by any rules of evidence. It is not bound by those time-tested rules of evidence which mankind has found necessary throughout the centuries for the protection of human liberty and justice. Incompetent evidence may be admitted. Hearsay evidence is admissible. Any kind of evidence which a Negro Communist desires—and in the last analysis, that element controls this organization—is admitted at the hearings.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is there any definition in the order of what constitutes an unfair employment practice?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is provided no standard?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That situation has been condemned, has it not, by numerous decisions of the courts?

Mr. EASTLAND. It has been condemned. I have sent for a copy of a speech which I delivered last year against the FEPC. In that speech I cited several court decisions on the subject.

Mr. President, the FEPC could make its own rules of conduct, it could establish its own rules of behavior, and no appeal would lie to the courts from its findings of fact.

I submit that the right of appeal is inherent in the American system. Yet that right is denied legitimate business and legitimate labor organizations throughout the United States merely for the purpose of reaching out and obtaining a few Negro votes.

Both sides of a controversy are not, under this order, guaranteed by law equal opportunity for the presentation of their cases. In fact, there are no rules of law, and no rules of justice which would guide this organization in reaching its decisions. In other words, anything which the examiner or the FEPC desires to do, or any decision which either may wish to make, is final and binding. If the decision is not complied with an appeal may then be made to the President. If that is not legal hijacking I do not know the meaning of the word. As I have already said, the findings of fact of the Commission are final even

though they are not supported by proper evidence, and no court has the right to examine into the question of whether or not a case was made out.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is any appeal allowed from the decisions of the FEPC?

Mr. EASTLAND. There may be no appeal whatever. The FEPC's decision is absolutely binding and final. No court may pass upon the credibility of witnesses or examine into the findings of fact, even though evidence to support the findings may have been flimsy, and the proof on the other side may have been overwhelming. I assert that ordinary justice, ordinary decency, and mere fundamental elements of justice demand that a right of appeal be granted, and that the rules of law be followed in accordance with Anglo-Saxon principles of justice.

No higher authority than the FEPC may determine whether or not it acted with bias or prejudice in reaching its decisions. It files its own complaints, it acts as its own grand jury, it acts as its own prosecutor, it acts as its own judge, it acts as its own jury, and its findings of fact are final and no appeal may be taken therefrom. If that situation does not rape American justice I cannot conceive of the proper word to apply.

I submit that never before in the history of the Republic has any attempt been made to set up an agency with such far-reaching and sweeping powers, an agency which would absolutely and utterly destroy the fundamental principles of justice and equality and humanity on which our Government was founded.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. In just a second I will yield.

Mr. President, it was to get away from procedures such as these that the *Mayflower* sailed from Southampton, England, and that the forefathers created this Republic; and it was by living under principles of justice such as prevail in America, but of which we would be deprived by agencies such as the FEPC, that our country has been made great. America has been built because industry and labor were guaranteed certain rights of justice, but by this agency every single one of those rights, in cases of discrimination, is taken away. There is the opening wedge; men can be deprived of their rights in cases of discrimination, and it will be much easier a little later to set up another agency that will proceed, perhaps, even further, until finally the entire fabric of human liberty in America is destroyed. Now I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator state to the Senate what power or authority this agency has under the Executive orders? Can the agency enforce an order it issues?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. How?

Mr. EASTLAND. Ross, the head of this agency, testified last year that if an order was not complied with there was a right of appeal to the President, who could take over a plant and operate a plant and take it away from the man-

agement; and further that the agency, by appeal to the War Department and other Government departments involved, could deprive war industries of their Government contracts, which would shut them down and force them into bankruptcy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The FEPC cannot enforce a single order; they cannot force anyone to do anything whatsoever. The only authority they have now is to try to conciliate and to persuade by peaceful means in order that fair employment practices may be followed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the head of this organization testified, as the Senator well knows, that they had authority and that it could be exercised.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not recall such testimony.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not recall instances, but, as I remember, there was proof of efforts to cancel war contracts held by industries.

Mr. CHAVEZ. By this agency?

Mr. EASTLAND. Well, by appealing to another Government agency. It is legal hi-jacking.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator indulge me very briefly?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; for a question.

I will ask the Senator if, when he was talking about authority and power, he was not thinking of proposed pending legislation or a basic law, and not of the particular agency we are discussing.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I am thinking about this organization set up under the Executive order I have just read.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is immaterial what the Chairman of the Board testified to; my understanding is that they have no authority whatsoever under the Executive orders.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not immaterial if a claim is asserted to authority and it is used to hi-jack industries into complying with the orders of this organization. As I told the Senator, as I remember, there were cases where war contracts would have been canceled had not the orders of this organization been complied with.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. That statement was made during the debate a year ago time and time again.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I happen to know that this agency under the Executive order has no authority to enforce any of its rulings.

Mr. EASTLAND. The agency has not, but it can go to the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, and those Departments have authority to impose economic sanctions. If that is not punishment without right of appeal, without right of trial, I cannot conceive what punishment is.

But let us go further. By setting up this agency we grant an unfair preference to the Negro soldier or to the soldier of a minority group over the returning white soldier. We set up an organization to see that the returning Negro soldier gets a job, to help him get a job, and to see that there is no dis-

crimination in giving jobs to the white soldier. Who has won this war? Why should the white soldier, the warrior who has returned home after having achieved the greatest victory in history be penalized for political reasons?

What is the history of the Negro soldier in the American Army? Mr. President, I recently returned from Europe. While there I talked to numerous high-ranking generals of the American Army, some of them in a peculiar position to know the facts. Later I shall discuss the record of other Negro soldiers, the service troops behind the lines; but, first, what is the combat record of the Ninety-second Division the only Negro division that has seen service in Europe?

To begin with that division—and I state it authoritatively—had the best equipment of any division in the American Army; it had the best training of any division in the American Army. For political reasons—and when I say "political reasons" I quote American generals—they were forced to commission some Negro officers for that division. In not one instance, Mr. President, could they place a Negro officer in a responsible position. In not one instance could they place upon his shoulders the responsibility of combat, and I tell you now, Mr. President, that division could not be placed in an important position in the line. Had we depended upon it, the German Army would have gone south to the toe of the Italian boot and destroyed our armies in Europe. The Negro soldier was an utter and dismal failure in combat in Europe. When I make that statement, it is not from prejudice. I am not prejudiced against the Negro.

[Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that they are here at the invitation of the Senate. If they do not keep order, the Chair will order the galleries to be cleared.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I merely state facts as given to our committee by high ranking generals of the American Army, who are in a peculiar position to know the facts.

In a number of instances these soldiers would desert their posts of duty, officers would desert their posts of duty, without cause, and the whole division would, without cause, rhyme, or reason, quit fighting. The officers told us the soldiers had no initiative, no sense of responsibility, very low intelligence, and were a failure. Yet we are asked to set up an unfair preference against the white soldier for the benefit of the returning Negro veteran, solely because he is a member of a minority group which sells its vote to the highest bidder in political campaigns.

Mr. President, I understand a Negro from the War Department went to Italy, and after coming back gave out a statement that the division had not been so "hot," that it had failed in combat, and he made the excuse that it was because of discrimination in the United States and because of segregation here. Ac-

ording to his statement, that was why it failed.

Everyone knows, Mr. President, that the races will of themselves live separately. They live together in separate sections of cities. Birds of a feather flock together. Members of the black race desire to live with those of the black race. Members of the white race desire to live with those of the white race. Discrimination and segregation could not be the reason for the failure of the Negro soldier in combat.

Let us consider the Japanese-Americans. Ah, they were moved from their homes by the necessities of this war. I have read accounts in the press of instances when they were insulted in various sections of the country. They tried to work in Illinois, they tried to work in New Jersey, but, oh, no, the people did not want them there. But take the record of their sons on the battlefields of Italy. I say frankly, Mr. President, the Japanese-American division, trained in my State, distinguished itself in combat, and, further, saved a Negro regiment from annihilation. So there could not be anything to the argument that segregation was responsible for the Negroes' inability to fight, and for their tendency to run when the show-down came.

In Europe Negro soldiers are used principally as service troops behind the lines, and I state now, on the authority of many American officers, that they were lazy; that they would not work; that it was a mistake to send them to Europe, and furthermore, that they should be returned from Europe and sent to the Pacific, where there are races of color. I make that assertion by virtue of statements made by a number of high-ranking American generals. Moreover, of a committee of nine Senators who went abroad, I think practically all will back up my statement.

Mr. President, I dislike going into these things, but by the pending measure we are actually asked to discriminate against the white war veteran, and give the Negro preference over him. Let us consider what happened in Normandy. Nothing has been said in this country about this, it has all been "hush, hush," and a great deal of propaganda has been put out about the great war record and the great fighting of the Negro troops.

It was necessary during the Normandy invasion to disarm a good many Negro soldiers, I was reliably informed by a high-ranking general in Paris. Negro soldiers would go to farm houses and holler "Boche! Boche!" as if they were looking for Germans, call the men of the families out into the yards, and hold guns on them while they went in and criminally assaulted the women members of the family. In the small Normandy peninsula, from invasion date to May of this year, there were 33 cases of criminal assault, 26 by Negroes, 7 by whites.

Mr. President, how does that compare with what happened during 4 years under German occupation? During 4 years while the German Army was there there were two cases of criminal assault, and in each case the man guilty was apprehended and shot the very day the

assault happened, while in the cases of American culprits files would have to come back to Washington, the opposition of the Organization for the Advancement of Colored People would have to be faced, a fight against the infliction of the penalty would be made by the Communist Party, this group and that group, so that it would take 7 or 8 months before any sentence was carried out, and by that time the entire effect of the punishment would be lost.

Mr. President, I state that the conduct of the Negro soldier in Normandy, as well as all over Europe, was disgraceful, and that Negro soldiers have disgraced the flag of their country. They constitute roughly one-twelfth of the American Army, yet they are guilty of more than half the crime in the Army. Now it is proposed to give the Negro soldier a preference over the white veteran; it is proposed to discriminate against the returning white soldier in favor of the Negro soldier in order to get the Negro vote at the next election. That is all it means. I say again, if it were not for political considerations this proposal would not receive 10 votes in the Senate of the United States.

Yes, Mr. President; we have a color line in America, and it is in the North as well as in the South. Down in Dixie we are a little more open about it than people are in other sections of the country, but high racial pride, one of the finest attributes of mankind, is in the breast of the white man everywhere, no matter whether he comes from the North or from the South. In Europe the Negro has crossed the color line. He has gone with white girls of the very lowest caliber, and I know how the northern white boy feels about that. Thank God, the white soldier from Pennsylvania, the white soldier from New York, feels about the racial question today just as does the veteran from Mississippi or Georgia or South Carolina or Tennessee.

FEPC might be good politics now, but I have talked to literally hundreds of soldiers from every section of the country, and I know what they think about it. I know what is going to happen when the soldier returns home.

Mr. President, I state further that the conduct of the Negro soldier in Europe, the soldier to whom it is proposed to give preference, has caused the United States to lose prestige; he has caused hatred for our country and for our people. I was told in any number of cities that decent white girls could not go out on the street because they would be accosted by groups of drunken Negro soldiers. I know from conversations with Army officers, with generals in the American Army, and with civilians, that in England, in France, in Belgium, that feeling exists in a very intense degree. He has disgraced the flag of his country. He will not fight. He will not work. Yet we give him a preference. We discriminate against the white soldier in order to get some Negro votes.

Mr. President, I stated that I knew how the white soldier felt. I stated that the soldier from the North felt exactly like the soldier from the South felt. The CIO has been permitted to go to Europe

and attempt to propagandize the soldiers, but it was like pouring water on a duck's back. The soldiers are mad. We talk of racial tolerance. This agitation for social equality has destroyed racial tolerance; and I state frankly that the white soldier is openly and avowedly waiting for his chance when he returns to the United States.

There was a keen interest among the soldiers in public affairs in this country. There was a deep hatred among them of Sidney Hillman, of the leadership of the CIO, and of John L. Lewis. Many of them thought Lewis was at the head of the CIO. They did not know the difference, but they thought that by the agitation, by the raising of the racial question, and by pampering labor racketeers, the soldiers had been let down. There is a deep and great fire burning to correct that situation when they get back home.

It is no wonder, Mr. President, that these organizations desire to rush FEPC through. It is no wonder they want to pass the legislation now. There will be no FEPC when the soldier gets back home, and I make that statement as one who has visited many of our armies and talked to literally hundreds of American soldiers.

I spoke to a young man from Altoona, Pa., who broke down and cried when he told me that he realized there would be serious trouble in the United States in the postwar era, that the racial question would be the great domestic issue to be settled, and he said he was fearful of the results. He said he did not like the attitude of the Negro soldiers. That they had been taught they could cross the color line, and he said that under no conditions would they be permitted to do so.

There will be no FEPC, there will be no social equality, there will be no such un-American measures, Mr. President, when the soldier returns. Thank God, there still burns in his breast the fire of real Americanism. Thank God, he is going to put a stop to this agitation, to this attempt to destroy his country, when he gets back home.

Mr. President, I say it is nothing but simple justice that a measure such as this, which would fundamentally change our Government, should go over until the man who has fought for and save America can return to take part and cast his vote on such an issue.

Mr. President, who is the leading light in this matter? I stated that Sidney Hillman was a Communist. I stated that Hillman, one of the principal men behind this measure, was one of the leading Communists in this country, and that Sidney Hillman should be deported. What is his record?

Hillman was born on March 23, 1887, in Zagare, Lithuania, where his father was a merchant. He was educated in a seminary there and came to the United States when he was 20 years old. Listen to this: In his early years in New York Hillman was acquainted with and associated with Morris Hillquist and Leon Trotsky. This great political leader, who is attempting to communize and sovietize America, and who it seems controls one wing of the Democratic Party and

of the Republican Party, associated with Trotsky before the Russian Revolution, when Trotsky lived in this country. And I state from an authoritative source that at that time Mr. Hillman was a member of the Socialist Party.

In 1910 Hillman marshaled his followers in a successful strike against Hart Schaffner & Marx, and under the agreement which followed the winning of the strike he represented his organization as business agent from 1911 to 1914. His policy was clearly indicated in an editorial statement on March 9, 1917, in the *Advance*. Listen to what Hillman said in 1917, and tell me whether he is a Communist:

We have unfurled the crimson banner of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America for the tens of thousands of workers who rally around it. It is bearing a message of hope and salvation for the workers. Our banner will never be furled before we reach the goal of emancipation of the working class.

Mr. President, that is a typical Communist statement. "We have unfurled the crimson banner," says Mr. Hillman. Communism? Hillman not a Communist? He is one of the leading Communists in America today. His language then was the same as the language of Lenin, Marx, Stalin, and other Communists in the world.

In 1922 Hillman went to Russia. Let me read what Pravda had to say on October 26, 1922, about Comrade Hillman, the man who is the boss of one wing of my party and from the looks of things is the boss of the Republican Party. This is what Pravda said about him:

Comrade Hillman expressed his confidence that the Russian-American Industrial Corporation—

Which Hillman founded in order to handle money from Russia—

is but the first step toward a real practical help of the international proletariat of Soviet Russia, and that the corporation will play a great political role in the future.

A political role, said Mr. Hillman in Russia, as reported in the official news publication in 1922.

Mr. President, a suit was filed to deport Harry Bridges. The Supreme Court said that there was not sufficient evidence against Bridges to deport him. I submit that there is more evidence against Hillman than there ever was against Bridges, and I cannot understand for the life of me why an attempt has not been made to send him back to Russia and stop the agitation and the attempts to destroy our country.

In 1922 Comrade Hillman also visited Italy. It should be remembered that at that time there was a strong Communist movement in Italy. Northern Italy is industrialized, and in areas there the Communist Party had taken over industries and had raised the Red flag, with the hammer and sickle, above factories, and was attempting to set up a Communist government. What did Hillman say in Rome?

I was doubly welcomed. The secretary of the metal workers' union gave me a letter, the only key to open the gates of the factories. With my Italian comrades I

landed in front of the factory, which looked attractive—

Why did it look attractive?—because of the fine Red flag which adorns the building and the Red sentinel—

The Communist sentinel—who was keeping watch.

My God! if that is not communism, what is the name for it? Does anyone tell me that a man who would openly and avowedly support the Communist cause should not be deported? Instead, he is giving orders to the Congress of the United States.

Listen further:

I stayed for lunch with the members of the factory council. The council then took me through the factory. The first thing that attracted my attention was a series of inscriptions on the walls, including the Soviet emblem.

Let me read that again.

The first thing that attracted my attention was a series of inscriptions on the walls, including the Soviet emblem.

Sidney Hillman, the Communist, is the leading supporter of this measure. Sidney Hillman controls the organizations which are putting on the heat, and which have hundreds of representatives here to do his bidding in order to rape the American Constitution and change our way of life.

I repeat that when communism enters a country it makes the classes class-conscious. It makes races race-conscious, in order to weaken the internal structure of the country and pave the way for communism. Sidney Hillman is doing that in America today. Many God-fearing, patriotic American citizens belong to the CIO; but I state that they are being used by a rotten Communist leadership bent upon the destruction of America and the creation of a Communist state.

I spoke a few moments ago of the conduct of Negro soldiers in Europe. They disgraced the American flag. They constituted only one-twelfth of our Army, yet they had committed more than half the crimes. By the proposed measure we are giving them a preference in employment and are discriminating against the white worker.

There happened recently another thing about which I think the American people should know. It was not American Negroes who were involved. They were not constituents of any Member of this body. However, all races have certain racial characteristics, wherever their members may be found. I relate this incident to show that the Negro race is most assuredly an inferior race.

I was informed by generals and high ranking Government officials—and other members of the committee were so informed—that in the city of Stuttgart, when the French Army moved in, several thousand Christian German girls from good families were rounded up and placed in the subway, and for 4 or 5 days they were kept there and criminally assaulted by Senegalese soldiers from Africa. It was one of the most horrible occurrences of modern times. White

soldiers would not have been guilty of such a thing. The white soldier has attempted to maintain American standards in the American Army. Another bad feature of the occurrence which I have just mentioned was that those French Negroes were in American uniforms, and the population of that section of Germany thought that American soldiers were involved. I bring that into this debate because, as I said, racial characteristics are common to the members of the same race, no matter where they reside. We are dealing with an inferior people, and yet we are discriminating against the white soldier, in favor of the inferior person, and under this measure we are giving the inferior person a preference in securing employment.

Mr. President, consider Liberia. Liberia is a great monument to the capacity of the Negro race. In fact, it is a typical monument to the capacity of the Negro race. I shall go into this matter a little, to read what the League of Nations found in its report on conditions in Liberia:

For 10 years the august Council in Geneva has had a peck of trouble with those carefree "Americoes" of freedom's own republic. They are so far off—between Sierra Leone and the French Ivory Coast. Their realm has no port—luckily, seeing that yellow fever is rife and all ships liable to contagion. The powers have been haunted by this Liberia. After all, it is a "sovereign state." It has a 4-year president; a Senate, too, and a Lower House, as well as a Supreme Court and an army. America has from the first served as model and pattern for the "Americoes."

Anyhow, here is all the panoply of a "nation." It was launched (from the United States) over a century ago, apparently with the blessing of James Monroe—whose historic name an unimaginable capital bears unto this day. And yet dreadful whispers have floated overseas from harried and hunted savages of Liberia's hinterland.

Mr. President, how they ever heard of the League is a mystery; and from the facts of ignorance and disease and pestilence there, how they ever heard of anything is a mystery. But I proceed:

But their long walls boil down to this: That President King—

The president of the country—

was a "blackbirder" and a slave-raider; that his "administration" was a gang of murderous robbers; his armies (both native and hired) a merciless Attilahorde—burning and looting, raping the tribal women, and driving these "inferior" pagan blacks into the African waste, there to starve or fall a prey to prowling beasts.

The leading castes in Monrovia are yellow; they are mixed-bloods. A similar crowd in the United States is attempting to cross the color line and bring about social equality and racial amalgamation.

I read further:

The powers—

In other words, the League of Nations—were staggered at this indictment of Liberia. One of their own League members, too. Even an "ally" who had "declared war"

upon Germany and suffered a salvo or two in consequence from the five-inch gun of a submarine—until its amazed commander realized he was shooting at a tropical zero and withdrew for very shame. Yet a Christian country was his target, one settled in the long ago by dusky Puritan exiles who set up a proud Lone Star banner that bore this device: "Love of liberty has brought us here."

So the League scouted as slander all the evil tales that came from heathens of the bush frontiers. In Geneva's Council Chamber, State Secretary Grimes and Mr. Sottile gave the "facts" a different tinge. Liberia (her delegates vowed) had nothing to hide but her own lack of loans. There was a growing shyness on the part of Americans to help the "Americoes" * * *

Moreover, if white snoopers were to be sent there to inquire, they must respect the President's office, and also "the political, intellectual, and political independence of Liberia." All such investigators should be under the chief executive. If a white adviser were named by the League, he must take his advice from the "palace," from Monrovia's learned Congress, or from courts of justice of spotless Periclean purity. Furthermore, any experts in accounts and finance which the powers might send must pass Liberian examinations on landing to make sure they were up to west African standards in their several jobs.

Mr. President, I shall show in a minute what west African standards were. Those west African standards are about the same as African standards in the United States today.

I read further:

Foreign Minister Grimes made quite a hit as he laid down the republic's law to these foreigners in Geneva.

But who was to pay the expenses of the investigation?

Mr. President, there the League of Nations was. It had proof that the King of Liberia was a robber, a murderer, and was engaged in the slave trade, and the League was sending investigators there to investigate. But who was to pay the expenses of the investigation? I read further:

Why, the League itself, Mr. Grimes said with surprise. It was a League idea—

This investigation—

and the League was rich, whereas Liberia * * *! But, in fact, all the republic needed was "adjusting"; then she could go at any mileage to the gallon.

The Secretary-General demurred at this. The League could not advance funds for a commission without "an assurance of reimbursement." At last Mr. Grimes agreed to cable Monrovia on this delicate matter—"But I haf' no much hope of success." At his black elbow sat Mr. Sottile, who now hopped up with fluent pidgin English:

"No use a promise. If we gave, we may not keep." Even their state officials had not had a dollar of pay for the past 8 months.

Think of that, Mr. President. Liberia had been selected as the richest part of Africa. It consisted of the most fertile soil which could be found in Africa. The most intelligent slaves in America were selected to conduct an experiment in Liberia, to demonstrate whether the Negro possessed capacity for self-government and for self-advancement or, when taken from under the influence and control of the white man, he would fall back into savagery. We have a typical example of that situation in the Negro Republic of Liberia.

I continue reading:

To me it was highly humorous to see men like Sir John Simon and Viscount Cecil, with Barthou of France and Oloisi of Italy, debating gravely about Liberia as though that tragi-comic pest-hole were a civilized, or even a semicivilized land.

After Liberia was founded the white man ruled it for a period of from 25 to 30 years. It was doing well under white control. But 80 years after the white man withdrew, as the League of Nations found, it had not become even semicivilized. Yet, Mr. President, we talk about racial equality. I assert that the Negro race is an inferior race. The doctrine of white supremacy is one which, if adhered to, will save America.

I continue reading:

When the truth flamed out later on in the Christy Commission's report, even State Secretary Stimson found it a "shocking indictment."

Yes; the present Secretary of War found the League of Nations report a shocking indictment of the conditions existing in the only Negro republic in which a great experiment had been conducted in order to test the capacity of the colored race for self-government and self-advancement.

New facts came rolling year after year. Gradually Liberia was seen as a sort of jungle patch as big as England or New York State. Here some 15,000 black "Americoes"—

Those are yellow-skinned Negroes—

lorded it over heathen and Moslem tribes, about 2,000,000 in all. The main industry seemed to be collecting taxes—

Listen to that, Mr. President—

from those primitive folk.

That is the main industry today, as found by the League of Nations.

And the process used was simple. A ragged (but well-armed) frontier force swooped down upon tribal villages under a black general who was all medals and gold braid. Some of the victims were meek, and paid up in foodstuffs, ivory, and cattle. Other clans were meeker still, and parted twice over under threats of burning their huts and wholesale shooting of the "rebels."

In that great civilized country the monument to the capacity of the Negro race is the collection of taxes, burning, and looting.

The report continues:

But some of the Kru-coast men could fight; and often Liberia's prowling Foch had his black hands full in a hornet's nest of desperate resistance.

Then that general would hire Mendi mercenaries to help him; warrior looters from the Sierra Leone border.

He would hire others to assist him in burning the homes of the people of his own country.

I continue reading:

The havoc of a typical tax collection was conveyed to the League of Nations by Dr. M. D. Mackenzie, of its own health section. He found fierce battues going on in the Sasstown area. Forty-four native villages had been set ablaze by President King's brigand army. Over a hundred natives had been killed, and 12,000 unwilling taxpayers—men, women and children—of the Borroh, Dio, and Wissepo clans had been chased out of their flaming huts into tropic and waterless wilds beyond,

there to die of hunger and thirst in an unmapped region of gorillas and pigmy elephants.

Mr. President, what I have been reading represents some of the governmental policies of Liberia which stands as an example of the incapacity of the Negro race to govern itself and advance. From the conditions which exist there we can see quite clearly what will happen in this country unless the present drive for social equality between the races in the United States is stopped.

I continue reading:

After these raids, the army of freedom's state marched home to hand over its booty to the chief executive, his senate, congress, and treasury. Besides payments in mind, our golden general rounded up every hefty male he could get chains upon. For "black birding" and tax gathering went together as part of Liberia's national defense. Money the state must have—not for any public works, but mainly for executive and ministerial pockets.

In other words, Mr. President, that is just a nice way of saying "graft." This man was capturing members of his own race and selling them in the slave trade for money. That is what the League of Nations officially found to be taking place.

I continue with the reading:

It was there the various American loans had melted. And the sale of slaves at \$300 each formed a tidy presidential perquisite besides.

Slaves were being sold for \$300 apiece. That took place, according to the League of Nations, only a few years ago.

After all, what were these outlying pagans for if not to provide revenue for the superior "Americo-Liberian" administration which all the world knew, was molded on George Washington's own ideal policy?

I take a very grave issue with the statement that any of the conditions about which I have been reading were modeled after policies of George Washington. Our Government established Liberia. White men wrote its constitution, and for a time controlled it. But, when the white man withdrew and allowed the colored race to assume control, the colored race did not become civilized.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, the Senator is condemning the selling of slaves at \$300 each. Is that an unheard of thing in the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is absolutely wrong. I am reading a League of Nations report concerning conditions which in the Republic of Liberia, as found there during the 1920's.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am asking the Senator about conditions in the United States as found therein during an early period of its history. Slavery during those times was not unheard of in this country, was it?

Mr. EASTLAND. It was unheard of in this country in the 1920's. Eighty years ago my State and the State from which the Senator comes, were slave States, if that is what the Senator means; but the Senator certainly would

not say anything that would uphold slavery at the present time?

Mr. TUNNELL. Oh, no. But what the Senator is condemning is the sale of slaves in Africa because it was done by Negroes, as I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am simply showing, as I told the Senator, the conditions in Liberia today.

Mr. TUNNELL. But that is not any worse than the whites did with the slaves in the United States when slavery was permitted.

Mr. EASTLAND. The white people of the United States have never embarked on a program of robbery, murder, rape, and looting, as Liberia did, as she is now doing; and I shall show in a moment many worse things than that.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. We hear of murder and rape and lynching and a great many other crimes in this country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is that an official Government policy in the United States?

Mr. TUNNELL. It is something that happens.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator answer my question? Is that an official Government policy?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think that I can say that it is in some places.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has been told that. I know he is sincere, and he knows I have a great confidence in him, but I do not believe that is the policy anywhere in the United States. I know it is not the policy in Mississippi, and I know it is not the policy of the South, if that is what the Senator is talking about.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am talking about the fact that there are crimes that are winked at by Government in every section of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. But there is no State that will send an army out for the purpose of murder and robbery and loot.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sure of it; I am very confident that is not the American system—God help America if it is—and, Mr. President, it is not my idea and my opinion of my country.

I read further from the League's report:

So these hapless savages were periodically rounded up, just as the native princes of India coral their jungle elephants for labor in the teak forests of Burma. President King had an ever-ready market for his army's catch. He took bids for his slaves, body and soul, from the coco planters of the Portuguese Isles of São Thomé and Príncipe. At one time this arrogant Negro was selling 300 captives a month at the figure I named above.

What they had done was in accordance with their official government policy, under the guise of collecting taxes, to go out and burn villages, murder people, capture men, sell them into slavery at \$300 apiece and then embezzle the money.

There is a typical example from our own knowledge of what is done in that country without the influence of the white man.

Well might the League ask what was to be done about Liberia? Britain's House of Lords gave a full-dress debate to the future of a "black baby" that nobody cared to nurse. I was in the gallery of that Scarlet Chamber and caught exclamations of horror from the Archbishop of Canterbury. To His Grace, the Lone-Star Republic was "one of the most lamentable tragedies of history."

Think of it! The Archbishop of Canterbury, one of the world's great churchmen, says that Liberia under its Negro government is one of the most lamentable tragedies of history. Here is what he said further:

Neither "could we rest while this blot on civilization remained."

The Archbishop of Canterbury said that Liberia is a blot on civilization, in addition to being one of the most lamentable tragedies in history.

Both Viscount Cecil and Earl Buxton—

Two great British statesmen, by the way, Mr. President—

were for pitching Liberia out of the League forthwith. And as Sir John Simon's spokesman in the Lords, Earl Stanhope wound up the sitting with a call for "drastic action." Misery and misrule had long been Liberia's lot—

Misery and misrule—

and in the past 2 years—

Two years before this report—

"things had gone from bad to worse." The republic was riddled with a plague: "Not only was she thus a danger to herself and the rest of West Africa, but also to the whole world."

Because of the plague there, and disease, the League said Liberia was a danger to all West Africa and all the world—this shining example of the capacity of the Negro race.

Yet this monstrosity, Lord Stanhope grieved to say, was "a foundation member of the League," together with Great Britain, France, and Italy. Truly, the irony of Voltaire is justified on the crazy governance of human affairs.

How does the Monrovia government take this torrent of scathing? With injured pride, blocking every measure of reform, and only asking for more and yet more "loans."

In other words, the League found these conditions and would demand that they be remedied, and the only action was typical of the Negro race, who want to borrow more money, and I will venture to say there never was paid a dollar of that money back.

Listen:

Dr. Cuthbert Christy's report spoke of "tragic" finances. Britain's Lord Privy Seal could assure the League Council that this shabby wreck of a state "had no budget, no accounts, no money."

Think of it! A government with no budget, no accounts, and no money.

Yet, we will discriminate against white boys, who raised Old Glory on Iwo Jima, who have just won the most magnificent victory in the world's history, who have conquered the beast of nazism, we will discriminate against those returning

heroes, in order to give jobs to such people as these jobs so as to obtain a few votes at the next election.

Listen to this:

Not only did Liberia take no steps to control yellow fever and plague—she couldn't be bothered even to notice them.

No public-health system at all; no money, no budget, no tax-gathering system.

And so continued to wallow in vileness, more than pleased with her own estate.

Listen:

Did not this "abysmal" Republic break off relations with the United States over a default on a loan? And to the French Chargé d'Affairs President Barkley—

Who is President of Liberia—

complained of insult to his high office and person on the part of a very rude American Minister.

He claimed an insult by the French because the French wanted them to repay a loan.

Mr. President, let us see about the capital of that great country.

What is the metropolis of Monrovia like? It is a nightmare; a foul, yet funny, purgatory of sickening smells and obscenity. Yet what a book that dreadful warren would make; a true best seller, if done by a master hand. Why has no great newspaper put a correspondent there?

That is another thing; there is not a newspaper in the world which has a correspondent in this great and shining example of Negro culture, where they show their capacity to govern themselves. There is a black Communist in New York named Robeson, an actor or a singer, who holds forth at great length about colored culture. Here are typical examples of that, which would show, if their drive in this country for social equality is not stopped, that our country will be destroyed and we will sink down into the depths, as Egypt did.

I digress a little. At one time Egypt was a leader in world civilization, when its citizenship was Caucasian. Sitting on the bank of the placid Nile, next to the Mississippi delta the most fertile soil in all the world, they imported slaves, and later took them into their governmental affairs, and they had to cater to them, as the politicians cater to the Negro vote today. Then there was amalgamation. For 3,000 years the Nile has flowed as it always did, the same resources have been there, but in that time there has not been one single contribution to world culture, there has not been one single contribution to civilization, there has not been one single progressive accomplishment, and I say, Mr. President, the American soldier in Europe, thank God, knows of the dangers, and he will save America internally, as he saved her upon the battlefields of the world.

Let us find out more about the capital, Monrovia. I have said that no newspaper had a correspondent there, but the League of Nations said that if they had, they would tell "droller and madder tales than were ever flashed" over the world.

An army mutiny, for instance, raging outside the tumbledown treasury to get

a few dollars in exchange for soiled and tattered I O U's. A battered door opens presently, and the Minister steps out in a well-cut suit and high hat.

Now let us see the Liberian system. Soldiers have mutinied in front of the door of the treasury of the republic, and the treasury minister comes out, and what does he say?

"Soldiers of the republic," he bawls at the swaying mob. "Haf' courage, once! Practiss-s the patience yet-t-t."

Those hungry troops shamble off to "practiss" it.

Listen to this:

Four machine-gun barrels are now poked out of the broken windows.

The treasury of the country has not even panes of glass in the windows.

Weeks drag on into months. Another siege threatens. The palace itself is in peril. (A shove would overturn that ugly barn.)

That is what the treasury of Liberia is—just a barn, in a country which is a great example of Negro culture.

This time two glib Americoes hustle around among the desperate men.

"We buy yo' vouchers! Five percent of face value."

Because of graft, and because money they get from the slave trade and from robbery, which is their source of income, is embezzled, the Liberians do not even pay their army. They do not pay the army and public officials, and then when there is a mutiny, when they cannot stop it, when the people cannot be pacified in any other way, they offer 5 percent of face value for their I O U's. But the League of Nations says:

The offer is meaningless to these Negro dupes. But when it is made clear that real money is meant, there is a wild stampede to sell scraps of paper for silver dollars. Those same vouchers a grafting Chancellor—

Now listen to this—

promptly redeems at par, in the true Liberian system.

Now, what is the Liberian system? They refuse to pay the armed forces, they refuse to pay the public officials, then, when there is armed mutiny, they send men out and offer 5 cents on the dollar, and let the treasury redeem the paper from the grafters at 100 cents on the dollar.

The League says more. I am not nearly through with this League of Nations report:

And then the law court scenes and cases.

I want the lawyers who are present to listen to how the lawyers in that country, in that monument to Negro culture and capacity, handle their law courts.

One day a giant Americo had words with a real American—who was a noted boxer. The native pressed for a bare-fist fight; it was very brief and brought trouble in its wake. In the first round the huge Liberian was knocked out, and he lay lifeless for 20 minutes. The white man was at once arrested for murder.

Senators, listen to this. The white man knocked the Negro out. The Negro was out for 20 minutes, unconscious, and the white man was arrested for murder. The League report said:

Court hearings were a screaming farce. The black judge, above all, with his pompous English and still wrangle with his "prison-aire." The latter was given 20 years in jail for his heavy uppercut, plus a fine of \$20,000.

Mr. President, the white man knocked the Liberian unconscious, and he was convicted of murder and given 20 years in jail and fined \$20,000. What happened? How do they enforce their judgments there?

The condemned man strolled home laughing with his consul, and the case at least was dead and buried.

It does not say so in the report, but one can read between the lines and see that a little something passed—the payoff on the side.

Then an Englishman was haled up for exceeding the speed limit in his car on Liberia's one and only public road.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. In view of the terrible conditions which he has pictured in Liberia, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he thinks it would be a good place for the Negroes to be sent, as is suggested by his colleague?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is an argument in which I am not involved. I am quoting from the League of Nations report respecting conditions in Liberia.

Mr. TUNNELL. But the Senator's colleague has urged that the Negroes be sent to Liberia, as I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is his business.

Mr. TUNNELL. It would be the business of the United States Government if the Negroes should accept that proposal, would it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. That bill is not before the Senate.

Mr. President, I continue to read:

When he (the Englishman) proved he was doing only 10 miles an hour, the magistrate nearly choked.

Listen to this, Senators. This is in a country with a population of more than four million, in the richest section of Africa, which per square mile has more natural resources than any other portion of Africa, selected because it had greater natural resources than any other part of Africa for settlement by Negroes, and yet it has but one public road. This is what the judge said:

Haf' silence, sah; I mastah hee-yer! Nevah yo' unnahstan' Republic's law? Haf' yo' no culta?

Of course he did not, by Liberian standards.

Hed yo' no fat'er, no mo'ter to gif' yo' culta? Max'mum speed hee-yer is 15 miles, sah!

That is the speed limit on the Republic's only road, which I understand runs for 8 or 10 miles and is impassable most of the year.

An' yo' espec' me let yo' off by confessin' 10?

The judge said, "You confess you were going 10 and the speed limit is 15.

And because of that confession I am not going to acquit you." That is typical African judgment.

No, sah. Twenty dollars fine. Soldiers of the Republic!

This is what the League reports.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator making an argument that there ought to be greater speed in Liberia or on the floor of the United States Senate?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am presenting the conditions in Liberia to show the incapacity of the Negro race.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that, but the Senator was talking directly about the speed allowed there.

Mr. EASTLAND. So far as speed on the floor of the Senate is concerned, I will tell my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, that I think we are making fine progress toward the passage of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret I cannot agree with my distinguished friend, but it occurred to me that he is making about the same speed with this bill that people make in Liberia on the road he speaks of.

Mr. EASTLAND. I hope so. We have plenty of time. We can continue till Christmas. We can continue for 15 more months or 18 more months. There is no filibuster.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I know there is no filibuster.

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. LUCAS. But compared with the speed which is being displayed in the Senate at this time in connection with the pending legislation, driving on the road in Liberia at 15 miles per hour would seem quite fast.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator thinks I might be convicted by that Liberian for speeding?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator might be so far as I am concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. When the judge called the soldiers, what was said?

At the stern call, four scarecrows moved upon the victim—who promptly moved out, leaving 50 cents as a douceur for his prospective jailers.

A 50-cent tip. That is the court procedure in that country, a country in which there are no roads, no health system, no budget, no system of tax collection, but the system of justice we find is that set forth in this report, and then there is all this talk about equality. Listen to this, Senator:

Seen from the sea, this awful town showed nothing but a flimsy customs shed, flying the Lone Star flag which not one in a million could identify.

That is correct, Mr. President. There is not one person in a million who would know the flag of this country, which for its area has as great natural resources as has any other country in the world.

Your ship lies afar off, safe from all contact with a poisonous coast. The newcomer is aghast at Monrovia's "Broadway." Broad it is, a wide swathe cut in a jungly place, with a narrow strip in the center, trampled flat by slouching, half-naked Americoes.

Mr. President, a modern liner will not even call it a port. A modern passenger ship will not even go within the break-water because of the contagious diseases there. And the main street of town is just a path cut down through the jungle where a bunch of half-naked people walk back and forth. And, remember, they were selected as the very cream of the African race in America and sent there under a white government and under white control, to see if they were capable of development and of improving their conditions. And here we find a report of those conditions officially made by the League of Nations, which I submit conclusively shows what the capacity of this people is.

The sides form thickets of rank weeds and noisome gutters bridged here and there with broken gin cases. Even big rocks crop out on Monrovia's main street as when the world began.

No improvements, no pavement on the main street of the capital of the country—not even gravel—and a road on which, a part of the time, a speed of 15 miles an hour can be attained—perhaps.

What kind of houses do the people have in that country, which is so rich in natural resources, an area which God has blessed with natural resources to a greater extent than almost any other area of the earth? Listen to this:

Abject huts of rubble or unhewn stone, crumbling to bits and with yawning thatch, form teeming lanes full of black humanity and fearsome smells.

Cleanliness? Self-improvement? Plenty of water? No. Why? Inferiority. The people simply do not have the creative genius and capacity of the white race.

We hear a great deal of talk about racism, and condemnation of the idea of racism in America. It is said to be bad. It is said that when one is a racist he is a fascist. Mr. President, a man bereft of racial pride is weak. There is something wrong with him. I say frankly that I am proud of the white race. I am proud that the purest form of white blood flows in my veins. I know that the white race is a superior race. It has ruled the world. It has given us civilization. It is responsible for all the progress on earth. When we lose racial pride, when we tear it down and destroy it, as the Communists, the CIO, and other radical organizations and minority groups are attempting to do in this country, America will be destroyed, and the end of our civilization will be at hand.

History has always shown that when races are brought in close contact one with another, unless they are absolutely segregated, amalgamation results. Step by step, yard by yard, attempts are being made concertedly by the Hillman group, by the CIO Political Action Committee, by the Negro Walter White's organization, by the Communists, and by various other groups, to tear us down, and to bring political pressure to bear, through appropriations for agencies such as this, to destroy the white race in America.

Thank God, Mr. President, I do not subscribe to such a doctrine. You can take your FEPC; you can enact your permanent legislation; you can strike down by law every safeguard, but all the

fires of hell cannot force the people of the South to permit the crossing of the color line. As a southerner I am proud of racial consciousness. I am proud that it is part of the culture of the South. As a Senator from a Southern State, I am proud to uphold those doctrines upon the floor of the United States Senate, against the radicalism of all the negroid groups from New York, Philadelphia, and other metropolitan areas of the East.

What about the houses in Liberia? When America was only 100 years old we had cities with great streets, fine public buildings, and beautiful homes. In my own State the finest houses in the world were in the city of Natchez. I have been down the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge to New Orleans. I have seen there evidences of the great pre-Civil War civilization. Great homes were built. There was culture and refinement. There was the creative genius of the white man. Compare that situation with conditions in Liberia. There the houses are of rubble and unhewn stones.

What else was there? Said the League of Nations:

Here and there a bloated carcass or a heap of filth clogs up the sewage and putrid pools overflow to invade wretched hovels in which one could not house swine.

These absolutely horrible conditions existed in the capital of the country. But the League said more:

Larger dwellings lean this way and that, as though about to collapse in the reeking lanes. Through these shuffle Liberian citizens, more indecent than any nudist—

Think of such conditions on the main street of the capital of a country. The League of Nations says that the citizens are more indecent than if they were nudists—

and partly covered with dirty rags of evil suggestion.

That is a most horrible indictment against the culture and accomplishments of the black race. I know that I will be criticized for discussing race, but I do not care. It is time for someone to talk frankly to the people of America as to where this agitation will lead. It will result in the destruction of our country.

Upon holed and rotting porches loil other Liberians, hailing the stranger boldly in a lingo which is hard to make out at first. There are no railroads here—

Think of it. Not a railroad in the country—

no lights, no sanitation, or decent water supply.

Think of it—no railroads, no lights, no sanitation, and no decent water supply in the capital of a country with a population of more than 2,000,000 people, with unparalleled natural resources; and yet we talk about their capacity to govern. What more proof does any one want?

Mr. President, the position which the South takes is right; and I predict that when there is a greater migration to northern sections the white people there will have the same feeling we have, and will take the same position we take. I thank God that we do not have in the

South conditions such as those which exist in the city of New York, a mongrel city composed largely of aliens, which is attempting to foist its will and doctrines upon the Anglo-Saxon citizenship of other sections of the United States.

Besides this capital of a League of Nations member, a village of Hottentots or Zulus is a model settlement.

As for the "White House" of this black inferno—

Listen, Mr. President, to the description of the "White House" of this country, the home of its president—

And the Congress, Treasury and the public offices—

Listen to this—

These depressed me even more than the bestial squalor of the streets. How consular foreign officers, as well as American and European traders, can live there and keep their reason is an eloquent tribute to the soul-strength of civilized man.

Now let us see about the school system which exists under this great African culture:

The mission schools—

Said the League of Nations—

form a bright spot in this darkling hell. Where is the white visitor to stay? What shall he eat, how escape these frightful odors, from which our house dogs would flee?

The odors are so bad on the main streets of the town, Mr. President, that the house dogs of America or of any other country, says the writer of the article, would flee; they would not stay in such a place.

I read further:

The consular corps are very kind to callers, and so are the missionaries. And always there is the nearby jungle—

So, to get away, they have to go out into the jungle, the writer says—

And always there is the nearby jungle, where at least one can breathe without retching. One may even encounter wild beasts that are clean, and stark savages who are not "Americoes", but men and women of self-respect and poise.

Truly this Liberia is a haunting memory; it is also proof positive—if any were needed—that the Negro nation is a contradiction in terms. Look at Haiti's incredible record since Napoleon's legions sickened and died there long ago. I was in Port-au-Prince in 1915 when raging citizens dragged their President limb from limb, and then paraded past the legations, waving bits and scraps of their late Chief Executive, who had fled for refuge to the Minister of France.

So, Mr. President, the writer of the article proceeds to tell of conditions in another typical example, the Republic of Haiti. I read further:

Yet, how beautiful a land is Haiti; a tropic Switzerland, where coffee and cotton grow wild. But if that Carib paradise is hopeless, what shall I say of freedom's own realm, which calls itself Liberia?

As a political problem—

Just as the Negroes have become the great political problem of America, the League of Nations says that on the world scene Liberia is a political problem—

As a political problem, this lurching republic persists, the League wants to wash it out of Geneva, once and for all. But where?

In other words, they are like we in the United States are; the League has Li-

beria on its hands, and wants to get rid of it. But where? We have 12,000,000 of them on our hands, and we would like to get rid of them. But where?

I read further:

All signs point to the custody of the United States. But surely Washington will have a say to that. The League Council has withdrawn assistance from the Black Baby whose tantrums have disturbed its harmony these many years—just as they jarred on Theodore Roosevelt in 1909 over the endless debt adjustment.

Great Britain—after a recital of misdeeds for which her Lord Privy Seal finds it hard to apply terms sufficiently strong—seeks to dump this foundling into somebody else's arms.

Mr. President, that is typically English. England has loaned them money; she has financed them. She has found that she cannot get back any of the funds she has advanced, and now she is in trouble there, so she wants to give Liberia to the United States. The British usually do those things.

Now, listen to what the British said:

"It is the view of His Majesty's Government," Mr. Eden told the full Council in Geneva, "and I state it with the utmost earnestness—that Liberia has so grossly failed in her obligations as a member of the League of Nations, that the League is quite entitled to consider her expulsion under paragraph 4, of article XVI."

Very well. But the Black Orphan—like the dead cat in the cistern—is still there. Who is going to care for it? The British Minister goes on to tell us. "On humanitarian grounds" it was proposed "to approach the United States Government."

Mr. President, there is always some ground for turning to us when England gets her hands full. When she has something she wants to get rid of, on humanitarian grounds or business grounds or some other grounds, she approaches the United States, and we are generally gullible enough to do whatever the British want.

The writer said further:

Since that power—

Talking about us—

appeared to be most closely associated, both historically and economically, with Liberia.

Of course, Mr. President, no country can be economically associated with Liberia, because Liberia has absolutely no economy. Its principal industry is the collection of taxes by murder, robbery, loot, and the sale of human beings into slavery.

I read further:

There you have it. A back door is to be found in the White House for a black waif that nobody wants. The French Foreign Minister agreed to this.

Oh, yes; Mr. President, the French Foreign Minister agreed with the British that we could take over Liberia and put up several million dollars a year to run it.

I read further:

So did Baron Aloisi on Italy's behalf. The League Rapporteur said ditto, and the entire Council concurred. So Europe was through with this clinging curse. To America these "Americoes" properly belonged. Over there was their open door. State Secretary Grimes and Mr. Sottile put in a strong Monrovia protest at this slur upon their sovereignty.

Nobody heard them. Neither has anybody heard from President Roosevelt about a new code of conduct for the foundling which the League would push into his all-embracing arms!

Mr. President, what more proof could be required of the incapacity for self-government, for advancement, for social relationships, than the experiences of the Republic of Liberia?

I have no prejudice against the Negro. I believe in economic equality for him. I believe in equal pay for equal work. I believe that every Negro is entitled to kind, just, and considerate treatment. I have defended Negroes in court on numerous occasions. Several of them are personally employed by me in my business. I know their shortcomings. I know what they can do. I am speaking in behalf of racial harmony in America. There is an attempt being made by the Communist Party, which knows the desire of the Negroes for social equality, to inflame them, and, step by step, tear down the safeguards and segregation practices which have been established in the United States. I know that my country is in danger. I have discussed Liberia not for the purpose of criticizing the Negro race, but for the purpose of warning the American people of the limited capacities of the Negro race and what will happen to us if the safeguards to which I have referred are destroyed, and if the races in this country are constantly brought into contact with each other. History will repeat itself in America as it has in every country of the world which has permitted the crossing of the color line.

Mr. President, the very first step down the road to amalgamation and social equality is the granting of political equality. The Negroes vote as a unit. They place their votes upon the auction block and sell them to the politicians who promise them social rights and social privileges. We talk about economic privileges and economic rights.

Those are secondary with the agitators and with the colored leaders. They seek social equality in America.

A few minutes ago the Senator from New Mexico, my good friend [Mr. CHAVEZ] asked me if I could cite a single case on the question of constitutionality in connection with this subject, and of our inability, because of the Constitution, to make the requested appropriation. We do not have the constitutional authority to appropriate money to the agency established under the Executive order to which reference has been made because, as I have already said, no legislative safeguards were provided, and no standards set up. The authority granted was a pure delegation of legislative authority, and therefore it was unconstitutional.

The case of the *Wichita Railroad and Light Company v. the Public Utilities Commission* (260 U. S., p. 48) is a case in point. I read from the decision. The Supreme Court of the United States said:

In creating such administrative agency, the legislature, to prevent its being a pure delegation of administrative power, must enjoin upon it a certain course of procedure and certain rules of decision in the perform-

ance of its functions. It is a wholesome and necessary principle—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

that such agency must pursue the procedure and rules enjoined, and show a substantial compliance therewith, to give validity to its action.

The Court further said:

That to prevent there being a pure delegation of legislative authority which violates article I of the American Constitution, we must enjoin upon it a certain course of procedure and certain rules of decision in the performance of its functions.

A certain course of procedure and rules of decision. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that that is necessary. Otherwise we would be delegating legislative authority. However, by making the appropriation which we have been requested to make, we would be attempting to give validity to an Executive order which clothes a commission with blanket authority to write any rules, follow any course of procedure, prescribe any punishment, or do anything which it desires to do just so long as its acts result in taking white men out of jobs and giving them to members of minority groups so that votes may be obtained next November. That is the bug under the chip. It is the vote; it is politics. This is a long step toward the destruction of the American system, and by giving Government the control of management we take a long step down the road to communism.

The success of any business, Mr. President, depends upon the ability of the management to select competent, loyal employees. On that principle we have built the greatest industries in the world; we have created the greatest industrial machine in the history of the world. And now, in order to get Negro votes, we are destroying it and turning over to a board here in Washington controlled by Sidney Hillman, and crackpots like this fellow Ross, the power to say who is qualified for a certain job. Now we are transferring that authority; we are taking it away from management. We are depriving the labor unions of the right to say who can belong to them and lodging it in this board.

Mr. President, let us see who these employees are, let us see what kind of people they are. In the first place, the very least thing we could do would be to see that the white man, the Anglo-Saxon, the American, should get justice. Justice is all he wants; but under this setup, could he get justice?

I have to hold my nose when I read some of these names.

Washington office. Malcolm Ross, chairman, \$8,000 a year.

No one knows anything about Ross except that he associates with Communist groups, and we can judge him by his associates. He went to New York a few nights ago and made a speech to a radical rally in order to bring pressure on Congress, to control us from New York.

Deputy chairman, George M. Johnson, colored, salary, \$8,000 a year.

Mr. President, I am reading the personnel of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice:

Maceo Hubbard, \$5,000 a year.
Emanuel Bloch.

I shall have something to say about this Bloch later. We are placing Communists over every business and every labor organization in the United States. Bloch gets \$5,000 a year. He is a hearings examiner.

Evelyn Cooper, hearings examiner, \$5,600.
Max Berking, assistant to chairman, \$3,800.
Dorothy Alexander, secretary to chairman, a Negro, \$2,600.
J. Jeanne Clifton, secretary to deputy, \$2,000.

Mary Brooks, clerk-stenographer, \$1,800.
Myra Banting, white, \$1,800.

Dorothy Alexander, J. Jeanne Clifton, and Mary Brooks are Negroes, and Johnson is a Negro.

The Washington office is just a mixed up affair, and I am going to show in a few minutes that it is a menace to American industry and American labor.

Field operations.

They go out in the field and stir up complaints, send Communists out, send troublemakers to go out and get complaints, to subpoena people before them.

Of course, under the American system of government, and under our system of jurisprudence, the aggrieved party must file a complaint, but, ah, we have to get some Negro votes next November, so we will please them, and let anybody file a complaint. A person belonging to a minority group can be satisfied with conditions, yet a troublemaker will come forward, file a complaint, and have a trial in his behalf, even though the member of the minority group does not want it, even when he is against it, even if he should ask that the complaint be dismissed. Is that American? Must I stand on the floor of the Senate of the United States, Mr. President, and protest against procedures such as that?

Now let us take "Field operations."

Will Maslow, chief, white.

I shall have more to say about Maslow in a moment. He receives \$6,500.

Clarence Mitchell, principal fair practice examiner, Negro, \$5,600.

Eugene Davidson, principal fair practice examiner, Negro, \$5,600.

W. Hayes Beall, senior fair practice examiner, white, \$4,600.

Inez Mercer, fair practice examiner, \$3,800.
Eleanor Rogers, clerk-stenographer, Negro, \$1,800.

Otome Saito, Japanese, \$1,800.

Then there are a couple of Negro stenographers at \$1,800 apiece.

Now I read the personnel of the Review and Analysis Division:

John A. Davis, Negro, at the head, \$5,600.

He is in an important position. Am I to be told he would give white business justice? Am I to be told he would not be biased, when I say that without exception every claim that comes before them, every complaint that comes before them, will be against a white Anglo-Saxon? The white Anglo-Saxon is the forgotten man in America today. He is discriminated against, he is mistreated, and we have a country which, in my

judgment, is owned—lock, stock, and barrel—and run, by minority groups and for the benefit of minority groups, solely because they are organized, and the great masses of our people are unorganized.

Here is another Negro:

Marjorie Lawson, research analyst, \$3,800.
Cornelius Golightly, compliance analyst, \$3,200.

Another Negro.

India Hemphill, Negro, compliance analyst, \$2,600.

Carol Coan, white, compliance analyst, \$2,600.

Joy P. Davis, compliance analyst, another Negro, \$2,600.

Celia Hoffman, clerk-stenographer, white, \$1,800.

Joan Spaulding, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$1,800.

Mr. President, in that organization, in the Review and Analysis Division, there are six Negroes and two white persons.

In the Field Operations Division there are five Negroes, one Japanese-American, and three white persons.

In the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, in Washington, there are five Negroes and five white persons.

Let us consider the Legal Division of this organization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I asked the Senator to yield to me for the purpose of having inserted in the RECORD an article which appeared in this morning's Post under the heading—

Mr. EASTLAND. I yielded only for a question. If the Senator secures unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor by yielding I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I certainly do not want to have the Senator lose the floor by yielding to me. I merely wish to insert something in the RECORD.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator ask for unanimous consent that I not lose the floor by yielding?

Mr. MORSE. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Post under the heading "Negro Troops Wipe Up Japs on Marianas."

GUAM, Friday, June 29.—Reconnaissance—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator so he might have something inserted in the RECORD. I did not yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator to read something.

Mr. MORSE. I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

NEGRO TROOPS WIPE OUT JAPS ON MARIANAS

GUAM, Friday, June 29.—Reconnaissance landings on six small northern Marianas Islands by American Negro troops were disclosed Thursday.

These were scouting operations in the backwash of the American advance on Japan.

Only one shot was fired during these landings. A native guide used his pistol to eliminate a Japanese who refused to surrender.

After clearing about 24 Japanese civilians and 38 natives from the six islands—Anathan, Saigan, Alamagan, Agrihan, Ascuncion, and Maug—the two platoons of Negro Infantry and their guides returned south to Saipan.

The small islands were scouted for possible emergency landings by Marianas-based B-29's, now operating from Saipan, Tinian, and Guam. The Japanese still have forces on Rota and Pagan Islands, also in the Marianas.

Data on the survival possibilities offered by the six islands is being distributed to all Army and Navy commands operating planes in the area.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, let us now consider the legal division.

Frank D. Reeves, attorney, colored, \$4,600.
Simon Stickgold, attorney, white, \$4,600.

Jerneve Gordon, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$1,800.

Senators will note that in the Legal Division there are two Negroes and one white man to pass upon the validity of complaints.

Let us now consider the Information Division. Here is where one may obtain information concerning this outfit.

St. Clair Bourne, information specialist, colored, \$3,800.

Margaret Whiting, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$1,800.

This is the Information Division, Mr. President, which helps to propagandize Congress. It is handling the propaganda which is sent over the country. Both individuals employed in that division are Negroes. The white race is not represented. Here we have the Fair Employment Practice Committee, a committee to prevent discrimination, and yet the committee itself discriminates against the white race. Mr. President, an Anglo Saxon does not have a chance there. And, seriously, that is becoming truer every day in Government departments in Washington. We are discriminated against in most departments. Frequently young ladies, Government employees, come to my office with complaints of discrimination and say they are mistreated, that they do not obtain a square deal because some minority group wants special privilege. The way things are handled by the Civil Service Commission works in their favor, and the CIO has a union—I do not know what it is called, a union of Federal employees, which always steps in against a white person in disputes which arise in the department. I make that statement seriously and I will say that down deep in the hearts of two-thirds of us we know that to be true from our own experience and information we have received from employees in the department.

Let us take the budget and Administrative Division of FEPC. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. It is a very important Division. A white person does not have a chance there. Listen to this:

Theodore Jones, chief, colored, \$5,600 a year.

Sinclair Jeter, assistant administrative officer, colored, \$3,200.

Vivian D. Baker, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$2,000.

Bosales A. Jackson, clerk-typist, colored, \$1,620.
 Minnie A. Paynter, clerk-typist, colored, \$1,620.
 Irving Hollomon, clerk, colored, \$1,440.
 Ralph R. Selby, chief, fiscal, colored, \$2,600.
 Sylvia B. Ross, voucher auditor, colored, \$2,000.
 Otelia Nelson, accounting clerk, colored, \$1,620.
 Elizabeth Carpenter, accounting clerk, colored, \$1,620.
 Pearl T. Brent, accounting clerk, colored, \$1,620.

There we have seven employees, and not a white person among them. And yet the object of the agency is to prevent racial discrimination. Justice? Fair play? Oh, no. Mr. President, these minority groups are not seeking justice. They are not seeking fair play. They are seeking and securing special privilege. And when we provide this appropriation and set up this agency it will result in discrimination against every white soldier who returns from the war. As I have said several times this afternoon—and a number of Senators are now present who were not present when I said it before—there exists an agency to see that the Negro or other minority individual gets a job, but what have we to help the white boy who is the boy who won the war, the boy who did the fighting?

Let me digress a moment from reading the list of employees of that agency. The other day I read an article from the city of New York. A manufacturer there was fearful of the State set-up. He had cut back. He had to fire some employees, whom did he fire? Did he fire Negroes? Did he fire Jews? No. Why? He was afraid of the FEPC. He fired Anglo-Saxons. That is the effect of this law. We are asked to set up and condone a similar system for all America.* We are asked to do it in the name of freedom and democracy. The Democratic Party is founded on the basic principle of equal rights for all and special privileges for none. Here we have a group of Democrats supporting a measure to give special privileges to minority groups.

We come now to the Mail and Files Division of this agency which is to prevent racial and religious discrimination. The mail and files division has six employees, as follows:

Lela Douglas, chief, mail and files, colored, \$2,000.
 Selena Welch, docket clerk, colored, \$1,800.
 Jessie Gamble, file clerk, colored, \$1,620.
 Rose Phillips, file clerk, colored, \$1,440.
 Charles Reed, messenger, colored, \$1,380.
 Regina Mitchell, file clerk, colored, \$1,440.

All six employees are Negroes. Why was the white race discriminated against in setting up these two powerful branches of this organization?

We now come to the New York office, the office which will largely have control and supervision of the great business and industrial enterprises of the world's metropolis. Let us see what kind of persons are at the head of that organization. Let us see in whose hands we are reposing this tremendous power and authority.

Edward H. Lawson, regional director, colored, \$5,600.
 Madison S. Jones, fair-practice examiner, colored, \$3,800.

Robert G. Jones, fair-practice examiner, colored, \$3,800.
 Daniel R. Donovan, fair-practice examiner, \$3,800.

He is a white man. God help him in that organization, with that association.

Miriam Irish, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$2,000.
 Tillie Asepha, clerk-stenographer, \$1,620.

The list states that she is white. I do not believe it.

Sonia Schwartz, clerk-stenographer, white, \$1,620.

That is the group which is to assist Governor Dewey, a man who has betrayed his race, the weakest man ever nominated for the Presidency.

I come now to the Philadelphia regional office of this organization. Philadelphia is the city of brotherly love, the Quaker City, the city where everyone can get a square deal. Let us see if the white race gets a square deal through this organization in Philadelphia, a great industrial metropolis, in the State which is the industrial heart of America, a State operating under the American private enterprise system, which has built up sufficient industry in that one State to produce arms and implements of war to defeat the Japanese. Industry in Philadelphia is a monument to the genius of the American people. It is a monument to the genius of the white race in America. It is a monument to the American system of private enterprise which brought it into being.

Let us see who are the members of the crowd which, in the last analysis, will have control of all that industry. They are going to have the right to say who can be hired and who can be fired. When they say that one man can have a job, they necessarily say that another man cannot have a job. Let us look at the list:

James G. Fleming, regional director, colored, \$5,600.
 Mildred Greenblatt, fair-practice examiner, white, \$3,800.

Well, I would hate to trust my case in Mildred's hands.

Milo Manly, fair-practice examiner, colored, \$3,800.

Samuel R. Risk, fair-practice examiner, white, \$3,800.

Willard Grinnage, fair-practice examiner, colored, \$3,200.

Helen Gorgas, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$1,800.

Karyl Klinger, clerk-stenographer, white, \$1,800.

Grayce Brown, clerk-stenographer, colored, 1,400.

Out of eight individuals, five are Negroes and three are whites—Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

Mr. President, I imagine there is a great deal of brotherly love when that crowd gets together in Philadelphia.

Now, let us see whom they have down at Washington:

Joseph Evans, regional director, colored, \$5,600.

Theophilus Houston, fair-practice examiner, colored, \$3,200.

Alice Kahn, fair-practice examiner, white, \$2,600.

Ruby Chisolm, clerk-examiner, colored, \$1,800.

Dorothy Urback, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$1,620.

In the Washington office of this agency to remove and prohibit economic discrimination, they have four Negroes and one white person. Is the white race discriminated against? Oh, no; they say! As I have said before, the object of this agency is not to remove discrimination, but to grant special privileges to a certain group in this country. Regardless of what anyone may say about it, that is the way it will work. From the reports, that is the way it has already worked in the city of New York.

Mr. President, I predict that if there is a filibuster and if cloture is voted—I do not think it could happen under any conditions, provided there was a filibuster—and if this agency is set up, and is set up in other northern States, all these acts will be repealed in a few years. Say what you please, sentiment against the FEPC is much stronger in America today than it was a year ago. Why is that? Why is it growing? It is growing because labor, the industrial workers, and the masses of the people are becoming wise as to what is behind these measures.

Mr. President, I am proud of my country. We have a great country. I am proud of her system of government. I am proud of her guaranties of human liberty. I am proud of her court system. I have seen much of the world; and, thank God, America is the greatest Nation known in history. Our system, with all of its faults, is much superior, much finer, much better than the governmental and economic systems of any other nation. I hate to see all that swept away. I hate to see serious encroachments made that will destroy the system which has made my country great. Thank God, Mr. President, the man who has faced death, the man who has smelled blood, the man who has smelled the odor of decaying bodies, the man who has seen his friends offer the supreme sacrifice for his country, the man who has gone through all that hell of hells to bring glory to America—our white soldier—thank God he thinks about it just as I do.

It is proposed to rush through this measure. Oh, yes, Mr. President; I say again that the organizations behind it are afraid to wait until the soldier returns home. They want to change our government, they want to have the fact accomplished, before he gets back.

But I go on. I digressed for a moment, for which I am sorry. Now I shall proceed to discuss the Cleveland office of the FEPC. Let us see what this nondiscrimination crowd has in Cleveland:

William McKnight, regional director, colored, \$4,600. Olcott R. Abbott, fair-practice examiner, white, \$3,800. Lethia Glore, fair-practice examiner, colored, \$3,200. Berniza Kelley, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$1,620. Edna Wasem, clerk-stenographer, white \$1,800.

Mr. President, in Cleveland they have three Negroes and two whites—Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem. How will the great people of Ohio feel about being dominated by a group such as that? In a few moments I shall show, Mr. President, the connection of some of these

people with radical organizations, subversive organizations, that are enemies of my country.

Now let us consider the Cincinnati office, the city from which comes my good friend the able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I am sure the office there is not his patronage. I will bet he would have made better appointments than these:

Harold James, fair-practice examiner, white, \$4,600.

There is a vacancy there for a clerk-stenographer at \$1,800. I am going to show some matters, in a few minutes, about the background of Harold James—at least, I think I am. As I remember, he has quite a background, although I might be mistaken about that.

But let us consider now the Detroit office:

Edward Swan, examiner in charge, colored, \$4,600.

Doris K. Sese, clerk-stenographer, Japanese-American, \$1,620.

So they have a colored man and a Jap there. I certainly know that the business and labor men of Detroit are grateful for the consideration which they receive from those two individuals. So far as I have gone in reading the names of the employees in those regional offices, and in the office in Washington, it will be noted that not one of them would give a white man a chance. Not one of them would give an Anglo-Saxon a chance. The offices are established for the purpose of granting special privileges to minority groups and to discriminate against and mistreat the members of the white race in order that a few Negro votes may be won next November.

Mr. President, let us consider the Chicago office:

Elner Henderson, regional director, colored, \$5,600.

Harry H. Gibson, fair-practice examiner, colored, \$3,800.

Joy Schultz, fair-practice examiner, white, \$3,800.

LeRoy Williams, fair-practice examiner, colored, \$3,200.

Penny Zeidman, clerk-stenographer, white, \$1,800.

Marguerite S. Ingram, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$1,620.

Yes; the Chicago office has five Negroes and two whites, and I may say that I know at first hand something about the functions of the Chicago office. Today I talked to a friend of mine from the city of Chicago who has had trouble with the organization there. He was compelled to discharge some white employees in order to afford jobs to members of a minority group which he did not wish to employ, and about whose loyalty he felt rather dubious. Yet, the FEPC is an organization which, according to some, is for the purpose of eliminating discrimination. It is an organization for the purpose of taking employment from white persons and giving it to members of minority races. It is an organization for the purpose of discriminating against the white race, a movement which is under way to win some Negro votes next November.

Let us consider Atlanta, Ga., a city of the South. Mr. President, it was disgraceful to put this agency in a Southern

State. I digress long enough to state there is no discrimination in the South against the Negro. I make that statement on the strength of what has been said by a man by the name of Ross, who is the head of the FEPC. He stated that less than 10 percent of the complaints which were made to the FEPC came from the South. Many persons stated that it is a group of Negro-hating southern Democrats who are fighting the FEPC. Yet, the head of the FEPC stated that that agency had experienced very little trouble in the South, and had received few complaints from the South. Most of the complaints come from the North. What we of the South are doing, Mr. President, is to fight in order that we may preserve the American system.

Let us consider the disgraceful conditions existing in the Atlanta office. The first thing which was done there was to provide equal lavatory and wash-room facilities. The crowd in control there insisted upon tearing out the partition separating the whites from the blacks and bringing the two races into contact with each other. It was claimed that the tearing out of the partition was done on the ground of economic equality and the elimination of discrimination. Why, Mr. President, such a program as the one established in Atlanta, Ga., has followed the Communist line from the very start.

I ask Senators to listen to the names of those who constitute the personnel of the office in Atlanta:

Witherspoon Dodge, regional director, white, \$4,600.

John Hope, fair practice examiner, colored, \$3,800.

George D. McKay, fair practice examiner, white, \$3,200.

Sally Chubb, clerk-stenographer, white, \$2,000.

Thelma Ingram, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$1,800.

Mr. President, what was done in Atlanta, in the heart of good old Georgia, that great American State which is one of the seats of southern culture? I am proud of southern culture, and I believe it is superior to the culture of people anywhere else. Those in authority at Atlanta established a mongrel outfit consisting of two Negroes and three whites, and then tried to fly in the face of social customs of the southern people.

Let me read the names of the personnel at Kansas City:

Roy A. Høglund, regional director, white, \$5,600.

Eugene Ormabee, fair practice examiner, white, \$3,800.

Mildred Jones, clerk-stenographer, colored, \$1,620.

Helen G. Schlien, clerk-stenographer, white, \$1,620.

Kansas City has been treated better than has any other city. In the office there three whites and one Negro are employed. It will be noted, however, that, generally speaking, the Negroes compose more than half of the employees of this organization. In fact, they compose approximately two-thirds of the total number of employees. However, in relation to the total population of the United States, the Negro race comprise approximately one-twelfth.

It will also be noted, as my friend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, the Negroes have good jobs, some of which are the cream of the office. In spite of that fact, some will say that the FEPC does not practice discrimination against the white race.

Now let us go to St. Louis. Theodore Brown is in charge, a Negro, \$3,800.

Levine Morris, examiner, white, \$3,200.
Armatha Jackson, clerk-stenographer, Negro, \$1,620.

There are two Negroes and one white, who have been selected, I do not know where, but I have been troubled as long as I have been in the United States Senate about this.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to ask consent of the Senate that I be recognized the first thing tomorrow, provided the Senator from Mississippi has finished with his speech this evening or tonight.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be through. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is somewhere in this Government a powerful unseen force that places Communists and fellow travelers in key positions, and what has troubled me is who constitutes it and where it is located. I know it exists, and I say that in all seriousness and in all candor to my colleagues in the Senate.

I think I know what the source is, but I should dislike to make an irresponsible statement here and charge someone who is not guilty, but somewhere in this Government, in some dark and secret place, there is a powerful force which fills the departments with Communists and fellow travelers, and that fact is known, in my judgment, by a majority of the membership of the United States Senate.

Those people could not get in these places in any other way. A good part of the employees of FEPC belong to subversive organizations. Who hired them? It was some powerful, radical force. In my judgment, the greatest service the Senate of the United States could render the American people would be to ferret out that source, turn the light on that power, and see that it is exterminated.

I digress again from reading the list and turn to the current appropriation for the OWI. That organization is absolutely filled with Communists. Why? How did they get there? There is a powerful unseen force somewhere.

Mr. President, two Communists wrote a book entitled "The Races of Mankind," every page of which is false. The Army began to circulate that book, but, because of opposition on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, withdrew it. It was written by Communists—a book on social equality and racial amalgamation. Then what happened? One of the authors of the book turned up in a responsible position in OWI. I protested to the Director of OWI, and from conferring with him

I could see that his hands were tied. Down through devious lengths, from what source I do not know, the orders came that she was to be protected, and she is there today in the Overseas Branch.

Mr. President, I have stated time and again, and I repeat, there is a drive on in this country for social equality. The statement was made that OWI had never put out false information. That statement was made repeatedly on the floor of the Senate. Their representatives come before the committee and talk about the fine work they are doing, work free from communism, and no controversial subjects being discussed. Yet they did not tell of a picture they are circulating all over Europe entitled "A Better Tomorrow." During the speech on the Charter this morning I heard some reference to the better tomorrow. I saw OWI's conception of a better tomorrow, and a good part of it was entitled "An Academy of Democracy." It was nothing in the world but false propoganda for social equality, showing an alleged mixed school and horrible conditions in the city of New York, holding that out as typical of America.

Mr. President, let us get back to the Dallas office of this organization. I have been digressing.

Carlos Castenada, regional director, white, \$4,600.

There is a vacancy in the office of fair practice examiner at \$3,200. I venture to assert that it will not be filled by a white person, but that it will go to some radical Communist.

Willetta Gutlehen, clerk-stenographer, white, \$1,800.

Mr. President, that is some crowd to control the business and labor destiny of the great Southwest, the fastest growing and fastest developing section of America. This organization is a disgrace, its personnel is a disgrace, and as a high public duty, in my judgment, we should deny this appropriation.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield provided I do not lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor by yielding.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Cordon	Johnson, Calif.
Austin	Donnell	Johnson, Colo.
Bailey	Downey	Johnston, S. C.
Ball	Eastland	Kilgore
Bankhead	Ellender	La Follette
Barkley	Ferguson	Langer
Bilbo	Fulbright	Lucas
Brewster	George	McClellan
Bridges	Gerry	McFarland
Brooks	Green	McKellar
Burton	Guffey	McMahon
Bushfield	Gurney	Mead
Butler	Hart	Millikin
Byrd	Hatch	Mitchell
Capehart	Hawkes	Moore
Capper	Hayden	Morse
Chavez	Hill	Murdock
Connally	Hoey	Murray

Myers	Stewart	Walsh
O'Daniel	Taft	Wheeler
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Overton	Thomas, Utah	White
Pepper	Tunnell	Wiley
Radcliffe	Tydings	Willis
Revercomb	Vandenberg	
Smith	Wagner	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has the floor.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I see no point in continuing the session at this time or in attempting to run it into the night. Under the rules of the Senate there must be a vote Monday on the cloture petition, and I see nothing to be gained by remaining in session and simply talking. It is my purpose, therefore, to move that the Senate take a recess, but before that is done, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] desires to have action taken on a bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have not concluded, Mr. President, but a recess is satisfactory to me.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I send to the desk an amendment to House bill 3368, under rule XXII, and ask that it may be received, printed, and read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,500,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,370,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, with almost the full membership of the committee in attendance, unanimously reported House bill 3278, which provides an additional authorization of \$30,000,000 for carrying on essential public services under the original Lanham Act. The bill was unanimously reported to the House by the House committee, and passed the House unanimously. It carries no authorization of money for additional construction of any kind under the Lanham Act, but only for essential public services such as child care, some health work, schools, and things of that kind.

I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that House bill 3278 be considered at this time.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that since the Senator from Alabama spoke to me about the bill I have talked with all the minority members of the Committee on Education and Labor, and I find no objection voiced to the bill by any one of them.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3278) to amend section 204 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, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated therein, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAUL T. THOMPSON—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Paul T. Thompson, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$2,750" insert the figures "\$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
DAN R. MCGEEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Is this a claim bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, recently I asked the Petroleum Administration for War for a statement concerning the present gasoline situation and what the outlook was for the future. I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by the Petroleum Administrator for War on this subject be printed in the body of the RECORD for the information of Members of Congress.

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

Gasoline rationing can be neither ended nor further liberalized. There is no surplus of civilian grade motor gasoline as is demonstrated by the fact that stocks at refineries and terminals throughout the Nation fell from 53,487,000 barrels on May 24 to 46,370,000 barrels on June 16. On June 30 of 1941—some 5 months before Pearl Harbor—civilian grade motor gasoline stocks totaled 75,070,000 barrels.

So far as petroleum products generally are concerned, the stocks are critically low in the producing areas of the Midwest and Southwest on which the Atlantic seaboard and other sections of the country rely heavily for their supplies. These petroleum stocks have declined from levels of a year ago despite the fact that the industry is producing at the highest rate in its history.

Intensified fighting in the war against Japan will mean that longer distances will have to be traversed by naval units; that heavier equipment must be used and that land, sea, and air operations must be stepped up vastly—all requiring immense quantities of petroleum products.

These factors point to restricted civilian supplies of petroleum products until after

VJ-day, and it is a situation which may grow worse before it gets better.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Pay Director David W. Mitchell to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of June 1943;

Commodore Virgil E. Korn, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving on the staff (shipping) of the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty; and Sunday captains to be commodores in the Navy, for temporary service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Pearl C. Flinders, to be postmaster at Albertson, Montana, in place of I. G. Nichols, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elbert W. Franklin to be postmaster at Floresville, Tex.

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

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luther H. Evans to be Librarian of Congress.

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

ADDITIONAL POSTMASTER NOMINATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lester J. Williams to be postmaster at Canastota, N. Y.

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

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

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

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, June 30, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of June 25), 1945:

LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

Luther H. Evans to be Librarian of Congress.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be scientists, effective date of oath of office

Wallace D. Armstrong Heinz Specht
Floyd S. Daft G. Robert Coatney
Howard L. Andrews

To be assistant surgeons, effective date of oath of office

Gaston E. Blom	Marvin W. Evans
Robert H. High	Vincent G. Peiffer
Robert J. Bryan	Charles D. Bahl
Emory S. Moore, Jr.	Warren W. Kreft
Edwin E. Wleckowski	Ardell B. Colyar
James K. Martins	Willie G. Simpson
Louis C. Floyd	Keith F. Farr
Robert L. Smith	Stephen Fromer
Leo J. Gehrig	Charles D. Muller, Jr.
William P. Blocker, Jr.	Norman C. Morgan
Clinton C. Powell	Martin J. Ittner
Arthur L. Koven	Robert L. Cannon
Manrico A. Troncelliti	Leo P. Krall, Jr.
Charles E. Carter	Eric P. Lofgren
Irwin M. Boozer	Robert E. Staff
Leland C. Burrill	Robert J. Burleson
Lee H. des Bordes	Wade H. Etheridge
Thomas O. Dorr	John Simon, Jr.
Edward N. Maxwell	John W. Smillie 2d
Warfield Garson	Robert A. Brennan
Arthur E. Rikli	Sidney Krohn
Walter D. Richards	William P. Ramey
Junius A. Evans	Richard E. Markley
Philip T. Williams, Jr.	Elliott L. Harlow

To be passed assistant surgeons, effective date of oath of office

Leonard M. Schuman	John C. Hume
Lewis E. Nolan	Harry E. Tebrock
Burnet M. Davis	Roy Hertz
Fred W. Thyng	William C. Bown
Leroy R. Allen	Mark E. Myers
John K. Stalvey, Jr.	Daniel MacKillop
Theodore E. Hynson	Lewis C. Robbins
Sol R. Baker	Raymond Hofstra
Bernard B. Davis	Charles W. Jones
Gilcin F. Meadors	Frederick C. Kluth
Emerson Y. Gledhill	Elton S. Osborne, Jr.
L. G. Johnson	Philip L. Spencer
Glenn H. Algire	Robert W. Rasor
Mary Walton	Jack A. End
Leo W. Koster	

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

Isaac M. Zigler, April 1, 1945.
Francis S. Schwarz, Jr., May 1, 1945.
Rheim M. Jones, May 1, 1945.
Reuben B. Widmer, June 1, 1945.
George W. Gibbins, June 1, 1945.

To be temporary surgeons, effective date indicated

Harry F. White, Jr., May 1, 1945.
Gene B. Haber, May 1, 1945.
Albert N. Sarwold, May 1, 1945.
Curtis G. Southard, January 17, 1945.
David W. Scott, Jr., May 1, 1945.
Verne C. Waite, May 1, 1945.
Michael J. Clarke, May 1, 1945.

To be temporary senior surgeons, effective date indicated

Waldemar J. A. Wickman, May 1, 1945.
Eugene W. Green, May 1, 1945.
Dean A. Clark, June 16, 1945.

To be temporary medical directors, effective June 1, 1945

Kenneth R. Nelson
Oliver C. Wenger.

To be senior dental surgeon, effective May 29, 1945

Allen M. Perkins

To be passed assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

David S. Ruhe, July 1, 1945.
Elmer L. Hill, July 1, 1945.
Otis W. Yeager, July 1, 1945.
Robert S. McClintock, July 15, 1945.
William H. Errgong, July 1, 1945.
Anthony J. Lund, July 1, 1945.
George A. Shipman, June 30, 1945.
James L. Elliott, July 1, 1945.
George W. Comstock, July 1, 1945.
C. Dudley Miller, July 1, 1945.
Herbert E. Pedersen, July 1, 1945.
Robert H. English, July 1, 1945.
Marion B. Richmond, July 3, 1945.
William C. Lewis, July 6, 1945.
Chester M. Sidell, July 1, 1945.
William C. Jenkins, July 1, 1945.
Robert M. Foote, July 1, 1945.
Frank A. Buell, July 13, 1945.
Randolph P. Grimm, July 1, 1945.
I. Ray Howard, July 1, 1945.
Carl R. Kunstling, July 1, 1945.
Willys M. Monroe, July 1, 1945.
Andrew P. Sackett, July 1, 1945.
Robert N. Bord, July 1, 1945.
Lloyd F. Summers, July 1, 1945.
H. Charles Franklin, July 1, 1945.
Herbert F. Hager, May 11, 1945.
Carruth J. Wagner, July 1, 1945.
Edward T. Blomquist, July 1, 1945.
Roy A. Darke, July 1, 1945.
John C. Cutler, July 1, 1945.
John J. Davies, July 1, 1945.
Leon A. Heppel, July 1, 1945.
Eugene J. Gillespie, July 1, 1945.
Bertrand E. Bennison, July 1, 1945.
Robert M. Thomas, July 1, 1945.
John B. Spriggs, July 1, 1945.
William L. Hewitt, June 1, 1945.
Arthur Kornberg, July 1, 1945.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

James E. Johnson	Albert E. Bailey
Julian Willcox	George S. Walz
Henry Brzezinski	Keigler E. Flake
Ross V. Swain	Bruce G. Warren
John D. McLaughlin	Welby W. Cronk
Theophilus A. Pierce	

POSTMASTERS

NEW YORK

Lester J. Williams, Canastota.

TEXAS

Elbert W. Franklin, Floresville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Beneath Thy mighty hand, Almighty God, we humble ourselves and praise Thee that Thy sway is not over a broken humanity, but over free and loving hearts. How marvelous is Thy providence; each day it dawns upon us with the beauty and promise of the morning. Thou hast spoken through holy men of