

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 96—PART 15

APRIL 21, 1950, TO JUNE 7, 1950

(PAGES A2863 TO A4294)

and escapes for other countries. And if new matters of substance could be introduced through the procedure of interpretation, the charter should be rejected forthwith. Unfortunately, just such procedure was followed at the recent meeting of the Interim Commission in Geneva. By means of interpretation, the concept of monetary compensation was introduced. The charter provides that where the interests of a member are prejudiced, only retaliatory measures for their redress should be resorted to, such as withdrawal of concessions. While the Australian delegate pointed out that the charter was being amended substantively through interpretation, the United States delegate agreed with the interpretation. You can guess the probable target for monetary damages.

A fundamental disagreement running through the whole charter cannot be stated too often. It is the conflict between the doctrines of State socialism and the professed objective of freer trade and exchange among nations. Greater government controls are the very essence of State socialism just as they are the antithesis of freedom and private enterprise.

In the Habana charter the doctrines of State socialism are paramount.

The charter concerns itself greatly with production and employment. For example, article 3 states that "Each member shall take action designed to achieve and maintain full and productive employment." Thus full employment would become an end in itself. This pledge would undoubtedly be accomplished by unbalancing the budget, inflating the currency and imposing exchange controls. But each of these in turn would lead to contraction rather than expansion of international trade which is the supposed purpose of the charter.

Under this chapter the United States would be required not only to take action to achieve and maintain full employment within its own territory, but also to cooperate with other nations through the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, on such international measures as might be determined desirable to produce the same full employment in all member countries. In view of the widely divergent opinions expressed by Members of the Congress at the time it was considering the Murray full-employment bill of 1945 and the Employment Act of 1946, and the unwillingness of Congress to legislate full employment within the United States, we certainly should not now accept any charter which would commit the United States to international full employment.

If a member's ability to achieve full employment without resort to trade restrictions is handicapped by a persistent maladjustment in balance of payments involving other members, such members respectively shall make full contribution and take appropriate action to correct the situation (art. 4-1). These vague terms must be interpreted by ITO. In a balance of payments situation like that between the United Kingdom and the United States, what is "appropriate action" by one and "full contribution" by the other? Even if clearly defined, it presupposes planned international economy coextensive with the commitments.

The provisions of the charter on economic development are duplications of what was promised as the function of the International Bank for reconstruction and Economic Development. The more recent point 4 attempts to deal with the same thing.

Of course the bank has tried to make sound loans. The authors of the charter provisions are more open handed.

The facilities for economic development and reconstruction are listed as capital funds, materials, modern equipment, technology and technical and managerial skills. Then this obligation:

"Members shall cooperate in providing or arranging for the provision of such facilities within the limits of their power" (art. 11-1 (a)).

These are hardly trivial obligations. What is the limit of the power of government? The facilities described are in the United States privately owned and operated, the very essence of private enterprise.

While the Habana charter is submitted for approval as an executive agreement, I predict that it will be regarded both abroad and in the United States for what it is—namely, a treaty. And as a treaty, it will be the supreme law in the United States and yet no individual has any legal recourse against the decree laws of this international bureaucracy. This is contrary to the rights guaranteed American citizens under the Constitution.

Some proponents advocate ratification, bad as it is, and then improve it by amendment. We say that it is wholly unrealistic to expect to alter a contract in your favor after you have signed it.

It is also suggested that the United States can later withdraw if it is not satisfied. That is not only a poor but also a very dangerous suggestion. Political considerations might make such a step impossible.

Proponents of the Habana charter are still talking in the attractive generalities of the prospectus. But the charter is the contract which either does or does not implement those high hopes. And I say that a careful study of the document shows that it does not do so.

We ask that the Habana charter be rejected as the first necessary step toward a good charter.

Our real choice is between an effort to obtain a charter of limited scope on which there would be genuine agreement and the Habana charter which embodies ideas and practices of state socialism which we in the United States do not want and are under no compulsion to accept.

It is our opinion that if we negotiated a new charter returning to the concept of an organization initially having only consultative and advisory functions, the very exercise of these functions could in time lead to genuine agreement on principles and on the rules stemming from them. But the agreed rules should then be submitted for approval to the legislative bodies of the members. Laws would then be made in orthodox fashion and unless so ratified by legislatures would not become law.

I realize that this is too slow for the world planners, but on the other hand, a mighty oak is not created in a few months or years. Most of the greatest successes any of us know grew from very modest beginnings.

How Safe Is America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me before the Nebraska State Medical Association, Lincoln, Nebr., on Wednesday, May 3, 1950:

HOW SAFE IS AMERICA?

Members of the Nebraska State Medical Association, it is a pleasure to be back in Nebraska, speaking before the association which honored me as their president in 1939.

After 8 years in Congress, I am about convinced that I know more about the practice of medicine and surgery than I do about the practice of being a Congressman. It is interesting work, because in Congress you are giving service to 325,000 people, and this is not unlike the work you physicians do for your patients, except in Congress we are trying to relieve the economic and social ills of our Government and the world.

It was 25 years ago, this month, that I first gave a talk before the Nebraska State medical society on the subject of Uncle Sam practices medicine. I do not propose to explore this subject at this time. I prefer to group a few remarks around the subject, *How Safe Is America?* I wish my medical colleagues would remember that in this frustrated and troubled world, we must act, think, and believe in America. You ought to be either a Republican or a Democrat, or a Socialist if you desire, and you ought to vote, but first you ought to be an American. I trust you will not interpret my remarks as being partisan. I merely wish to point out some troubled spots in Government.

It is of passing interest that when I gave this paper 25 years ago, the Federal Government was then spending between three and four million dollars on public health work. At that time we had less than 500,000 on the Federal payroll; our debt was about \$16,000,000,000. Today there are more than 2,000,000 working for the Federal Government, and we have a debt of about \$260,000,000,000. It cost us about \$5,000,000,000 to run all functions of Government 25 years ago, while today it is more than \$43,000,000,000, plus a \$7,000,000,000 deficit. Indeed the present administration, in 4½ peacetime years, has spent more than 32 Presidents spent in the first 152 years of our existence. We also went through several wars and depressions during our early existence. You should remember that the party in power has a majority of 90 in this Eighty-first Congress. They have the votes to put over anything the administration desires.

I remember when I gave my paper, Uncle Sam Practices Medicine, Dr. Young, who was then at Gering, and later moved to California, as well as Dr. Stark, of Norfolk, both of whom have gone over the Great Divide, suggested that I was a little too pessimistic—that the Government would never get in for caring for people on the scale that I mentioned. At that time none of us ever thought it would reach the spending of this year.

Let's take a look presently at the spending by Government for various forms of medicine and public health. It is more than \$3,000,000,000 this year. Of the \$3,000,000,000 two billion is Federal money and one billion is State funds. Those entitled to some part of this medical care total about one-sixth of the Nation's population. Active military forces are not included.

The great bulk of State medicine is for 18,250,000 veterans who are entitled to full care if they have service-connected disability. On March 1, 1950, there were 133 veterans hospitals in the United States, with 107,000 beds. At that time there were 99,000 veterans in these hospitals. It was estimated that 63 percent were there because of non-service-connected disabilities. The veteran with a non-service-connected disability must swear he is unable to defray the cost of private hospital care. The remaining six or seven million fall into special classes, such as the 2,000,000 Federal employees, 400,000 Indians and Eskimos; and 700,000 mental cases which generally are a State obligation.

There are 40 Federal agencies which now give some medical assistance to employees and the citizens. There are nearly 8,000 doctors that work full time on the Federal and State payrolls. The Veterans' Administration, in 1949, paid \$16,500,000 to private doctors for the care of veterans. About 75,000 private doctors have indicated a willingness to take part in the veterans program

outside of veterans hospitals. Indeed it has been amazing how Federal public health projects grow. The appropriation bill for this year shows a sizable increase for all forms of public health work. It includes poliomyelitis, heart disease, rheumatism, maternal and child health and many new research programs.

There are several measures before Congress, which in my opinion, are a part of socialized medicine. I refer to the examination and treatment of all children in public schools regardless of ability to pay. The social security bill has a disability clause which is socialistic. There is another measure which gives aid to medical schools, medical students, dentists and nurses. We also have the Hill-Burton bill, which has for its purpose making Federal funds available in order to provide hospitals in isolated areas. There is \$75,000,000 recommended by the committee. This has been raised to \$150,000,000. In my opinion it is time to fold up this program. Many communities are in a better position to build their own hospitals without Government aid. In my district, the cities of Gothenburg, Chappell and Bridgeport have proceeded without Federal aid. Our Government is heavily in debt. We must stop looking to the Federal Government for assistance.

Now it would seem on the surface, that these preliminary remarks might not fit in too well with my subject on how safe is America. I have merely mentioned the growth of the Federal Government to bring home to you the fact that as Federal Government becomes bigger and bigger, you and I as citizens become smaller and smaller. The Government, instead of being our servant, can well become our master. When that happens you lose security and freedom. The course Government is now following may well mean that you can no longer live your life as you see fit, but you will be under the complete control of Government and the alien ideology which will direct your activities from the cradle to the grave.

When we consider how safe is America, we must consider the road which the Government is now following. We have several socialistic programs before the Congress. Of course, in your mind, socialized medicine leads the way. There is still much interest in this program. Mr. Oscar Ewing, and the administration, are plugging hard along, with the left wing organizations to get the program started. It is still very much alive, even though Dr. Henderson, president of the American Medical Association thinks it is not an issue in 1950. I am certain that the question of socialized medicine will be an issue in every congressional district. My opponent in the Fourth Congressional District has already made it an issue.

There is the Brannan Farm Program which is of unquestionable political interest and questionable economic soundness. It would bring about a complete regimentation and control of agriculture. If you doubt it, you should read the 15 pages of penalties in this 87-page bill.

There is socialized housing, and the Spence bill, which is nothing more than a superdupper OPA, with all the trimmings.

I want to impress upon my medical colleagues, that you ought to be interested in all phases of legislation which would lead to further regimentation and socialistic trends. You should not forget that there are other measures which are just as socialistic as socialized medicine, and when once adopted, the country will find it difficult to retrace its steps.

My colleagues complain that doctors are not interested in politics and fail to help their friends. Good government goes farther than just an interest in socialized medicine. You have one Member of the Nebraska delegation who, it seems, is for compulsory health insurance. Elect 25 more members

like him to the House and I predict the whole socialized program of the administration will be adopted. You doctors better wake up. You had better take an interest in good government and support your friends. You can be a powerful influence in every community.

When we talk about how safe is America, you naturally wonder about the spending of government. I have told you about the amount spent in 4½ peacetime years, more than \$190,000,000,000. It is your money. You pay the taxes. The two Frankenstein monsters facing the public today are increased taxes and inflation. Either one of these can destroy the American economy.

In my humble opinion, our Government, banks, trust and insurance companies, who are unofficial custodians of the people's money, should have as their first concern, sound currency. If we continue on the road of reckless spending, with deficits as a way of life, it can lead but to one conclusion, inflation and increased taxes. There are bills now pending before legislative committees which, if passed by Congress, would raise the Federal budget more than \$20,000,000,000.

In further exploring the subject of how safe is America, I wish to examine with you the number of subversives and security risks which are now, or have been, employed in the Federal Government. Mr. Peurifoy, the Under Secretary of State, testified before a Senate Committee recently that they found it necessary to fire or let resign 257 employees last year, and that 91 of this group were homosexuals. The Police Department of the District of Columbia estimates that there are about 5,000 homosexuals in the city and 75 percent are employed by government.

I discuss this subject of homosexuality with some timidity. In looking over the literature on this topic, I find that it is seldom approached, even by the psychiatrist, and, being first a surgeon, and second a politician, I find it difficult to explore. I will direct my remarks to their employment in government, plus a brief review of this problem.

Homosexuality can be defined as the attraction for individuals of the same sex to each other. The subject is as old as the human race. It is mentioned in the Bible, was recognized by the ancient Greeks, and is practiced extensively among the Orientals. It is important to note at this point that the Russians and the Orientals still look upon the practice with favor.

Mr. Goering of German fame and General Roehn, who were executed, kept the list of homosexuals for Germany. They also had a list of these individuals in the State, Commerce, and other Departments of our Government. The Russians undoubtedly have similar lists. These espionage agents have found it rather easy to send their homosexuals here and contact their kind in sensitive departments of our Government. Blackmail and many other schemes are used to gather secret information.

The homosexual is often a man of considerable intellect and ability. It is found that the cycle of these individuals' homosexual desires follow the cycle closely patterned to the menstrual period of women. There may be 3 or 4 days in each month that this homosexual's instincts break down and drive the individual into abnormal fields of sexual practice. It has been found that if the individual can be given large doses of sedatives and other treatments during this sensitive cycle, that he may escape performing acts of homosexuality.

The problem of sexual maladjustments are most urgent and still far from a solution. In the Army, several thousand men were discharged because of homosexuality. When caught in the act, these men were generally discharged without honor, which means the loss of citizenship and the right to vote, or to belong to any organization

of veterans, or to receive many of the rewards which are granted to those who have served honorably. This is most serious. Many of the homosexuals failed to survive the rigors of warfare and the constant intimate association with men. They were painfully aware of their limitations. The majority were unable to conceal their tendencies and were eventually eliminated with disgrace, and a stigma to themselves, their families, and friends.

Jealousy is never encountered in true friendships. Never is the bond which unites two friends such that the acquisition of a new friend by one is regarded angrily by the other; but quite otherwise is the life among homosexuals. Here jealousy reigns supreme. It is similar to the love of a boy for a girl. Male homosexuals will not share their fairly with anybody. His anger is unlimited for anyone who seeks to possess the object of his love.

The sexual attraction exercised by a man on another male may be apparent in many ways. The homosexual will become excited by the mere presence of some man in a public place. They will often approach that man, even though he is a stranger. On streetcars, intimate advances are made. A taxi driver often finds his fare making indiscreet advances. The true homosexual seeks any kind of contact with the male he adores. He has no sensation whatever in the presence of the most beautiful and seductive female. Her amorous advances to him may even be repulsive.

The Bible apprises us of the fact that when the inhabitants of Sodom consorted physically with the angels who descended to the pious Lot, God, in His wrath, entirely destroyed the city. From here comes the origin of the expression "sodomy." Sodomy is used to designate a certain type of sexual pervert and homosexual.

In the Third Book of Moses (Leviticus), the Lord said to the stranger, "If man lay with mankind as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination. They shall surely be put to death and their blood shall be upon them."

Perversion is found at all levels of society. Perhaps more frequently among the higher levels where nervousness, unhappiness, and leisure time leads to vices.

The homosexual takes on many indiscretions. He has a tendency to lie and to lie on all occasions. It is a part of their defense.

Two years ago, as chairman of the Committee on Public Health in the District of Columbia, I sponsored legislation directed at a new legal approach to the sex-pervert problem. There were so many sex crimes in Washington, our parks and loafing places were no longer safe for the citizen. The police blotters of Washington contain the names of many individuals, some prominent, who are repeatedly brought to court for actions of sex perversion. Most of them merely post a \$25 collateral and are never brought to trial. Under that law these people may be treated as medical problems, and can receive treatment at the discretion of the court in one of the hospitals of the city. The results are encouraging.

Homosexuals are like birds of a feather—they flock together. Washington has several restaurants and dwelling places in palatial surroundings where these people worship at the flesh pots and cesspools of immoral sex demonstration. Recently the moral squad arrested 40 men in one house, worshipping at the flesh pots of iniquity.

In some respects they are more to be pitied than condemned. Some have a pathologic mind. They might be compared to the kleptomaniac, who must steal, or the pyromaniac, who sets a fire. Seldom a week passes but what Washington and the surrounding territory has several atrocious crimes closely related to sex emotions. It is only recently that the press has given some

freedom to the open discussion of the topic. The subject is still taboo among family newspapers.

It does seem to me that if we are to keep America safe this type of individual ought not to be permitted to serve in key positions of government. The Congress is writing into several appropriation bills a clause which will permit the secretary of a department to dismiss individuals who might be security risks. It always includes homosexuals.

In considering how safe is America we must also look at the report of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. They have a list of 54,174 known Communists who are in every State of our Union. These men possess a fanatic loyalty to their masters abroad. They have boasted that for every member of the party they have 10 willing and subservient stooges to carry on the party program. That would mean they have 544,000 people in the United States who support the Communist philosophy.

I have been asked about the McCarthy case. While I believe the Senator has old lists and named individuals who are not now in the employ of the State Department, there are Communists still in Government. It must be remembered that these same individuals, who are now trying to put McCARTHY in a pillory, were the same ones who defended the convicted Mr. Hiss and the 11 Communists in New York. While McCARTHY may have done some temporary damage to the State Department, it is absolutely necessary to expel these communistic skunks from Government positions. Communism is a blue-hued, cancerous growth that has for its purpose the overthrow of our Government.

Last week, Mr. Budenz, who at one time was one of the top Communists in this country, testified before a Senate committee, stating he was giving the FBI an additional 400 names of known Communists in the United States—some still employed by Government. It was the testimony of this same Mr. Budenz that convicted the 11 Communists in New York City.

Indeed, communism has grown since the end of World War II. At that time the Russians controlled about 300,000,000 people. Today it is nearly 2,000,000,000 people.

J. Edgar Hoover reported that while they had examined some 2,000,000 Federal loyalty forms, they had found only 11,403 marked for further investigation and considered subversives. This is rather a small number among 2,000,000 employees.

Mr. Hoover further reported that the Communists have intensified their program. There is still a great danger facing our country from activities of the subversives, who are trying to overthrow our Government.

These people find ways and means of entering the United States legally and illegally. There are more than 3,000,000 aliens in the country today. They come in as stowaways on vessels. They come in over our unprotected borders on the North and South. Last year the Immigration Service picked up and sent back 289,400 who had entered the country illegally from Mexico.

Mr. Hoover reported that there were 4,000 dangerous Communists in the country who ought to be deported. Approximately 100, who are faithful to their foreign ideology have been marked for deportation, but it has been impossible to get permission to ship them back behind the iron curtain. They are permitted to roam our country, spewing their venom of hate for all to see and hear. Even the 11 Communists have asked the court for permission to go on a lecture tour. I trust the court refuses the request. Just how safe can our country be under these conditions?

The foreign agents are active in our country today seeking and getting information on atomic research, radar, jet propulsion,

guided missiles, and securing topographical maps of our coastal lines, airports, and military landing fields. They gather information on biological warfare and on our industrial and military resources. They work day and night to secure our know-how and send it to the iron-curtain countries.

One of the greatest dangers of communism is the ability of its agents to infiltrate and corrupt various spheres of American life. They attempt to exploit youth, veterans, civil rights, foreign groups, educational and church organizations. They have the greatest propaganda machine of all time.

Mr. Hoover reports they are developing an underground apparatus which will decentralize their operations. They have tripled their Communist Party groups. They no longer carry cards. They have gone underground. These same Communists, pinks, and fellow travelers are trying to destroy the FBI. We can be thankful that we have men like J. Edgar Hoover and his group to help protect this country.

In considering, How safe is America? we must take into consideration that we are spending more than \$13,000,000,000 at home in keeping prepared. We are spending another \$5,000,000,000 on the Marshall plan and other foreign-aid programs. It should be remembered that 35 cents out of your tax dollar goes for defense and 18 cents for different foreign-aid programs.

I believe we have the top scientists, and the industrial know-how to keep far ahead in technical and scientific developments. The production of the atomic and hydrogen bombs is a reality. The recent development of jet planes, guided missiles, virus warfare and other, yet unpublished and still restricted, work should give us a comfortable feeling that those in charge of our Nation's defense are not asleep at the switch. Naturally, one is disturbed when he finds the President of the United States giving out optimistic reports on foreign affairs, and yet his advisers in the Defense Department informing Congress that conditions are worse now than at any time in the history of our country. They even talk of an early attack launched by Russia. Is it propaganda for more appropriations, or is the condition really serious? Certainly the President and his advisers are getting their information from different sources.

I am convinced that if the American people had knowledge of all of the new inventions and developments, not only for aggressive, but defensive warfare, they would have a comfortable feeling that the Congress and our military men are not leaving a stone unturned to protect our country. The awful destruction of the hydrogen bomb, plus virus warfare are capable of completely destroying civilization. It is my sincere hope that the leaders of the world may find it possible to sit down around a conference table and outlaw these weapons of mass destruction.

Eleven years ago, before this last World War became a reality, in my acceptance address as your president, I said that war then seemed imminent and that physicians must hold themselves in readiness to answer the call to our colors. War did come and I am proud that my profession turned in such a brilliant record in this great conflict.

Some dastardly act by the iron-curtain countries could precipitate another conflict at any time. The medical profession, I am sure, will not be found wanting.

I must also remind you that America has grown great because, fundamentally, we are a Christian Nation—a praying people. Our country has more than 266,000 churches, cathedrals, and synagogues, with more than 70,000,000 members. This brings a strength to a nation that cannot be measured in terms of dollars or material wealth. A Christian nation is a powerful nation.

We also have the know-how of production. Our scientific attainments stand out as a bright, shining beacon, pointing always to progress.

I would remind you that these great developments have been possible because free people, with free minds, have been able to work under our enterprise system. Adopt all the socialistic schemes that are presently on the trestle board of government and you will find that free enterprise—the will of free people to do things for themselves—will be greatly restricted or destroyed.

The medical profession has made more progress in the last two decades than it has made in the previous two centuries. Disease is being conquered. Research is probing the unknown—asking questions and finding answers. Life is being prolonged. Your profession is a part of this great human drama, marching down the road of progress. If we all work together—the citizen and the Government—we can build, not only here at home, but in the rest of the world, a new society which our children will enjoy and cherish because we of this generation have given our best.

Decisions on Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 15, 1950, entitled "Decisions on Southeast Asia":

DECISIONS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

The communiqué of the Foreign Ministers of Great Britain, France, and the United States, issued at the conclusion of their conference on Saturday night, is necessarily general in its terms. In respect to the critical area of southeast Asia, whose problems were explored, there is no detailed plan of action given. Possibly that is because of the generality of the declaration and possibly also because there has not yet been formulated one single unified plan to be implemented. Concrete actions, such as the proposed United States aid for Indochina and Thailand and British reinforcement in Malaya, are still not welded together.

For that reason the communiqué will be explored for every sign of agreement in policy, since it is upon the basis of such an agreement that a workable single program can be evolved. According to the communiqué, there was a substantial area of agreement and several specific decisions were reached. They represent a major step forward in dealing with the area:

1. The three western powers agree to encourage and support the newly independent states in the region in their defense against the threat of Communist expansion. This obviously refers to Burma, Indonesia, and the Philippines and certainly in the French view would extend also to the Bao Dai government in Indochina and the new States of Laos and Cambodia. The promise of United States assistance seems to indicate that this country concurs in the French view.

2. The western powers are agreed upon the desirability of regional collaboration to develop the area and to raise standards of living. All governments in the area should work toward that end, it was stated, and