

3-1952

Congressional Record - Mike Mansfield - UMT

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record - Mike Mansfield - UMT" (1952). *Mike Mansfield Speeches*. 71.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/71

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

UMT

SPEECH

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1952

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD to the Vinson amendment as amended: Page 1, line 5, insert "This act shall be effective on the same day that a tax bill becomes effective which will tax all corporations 100 percent of all profits and earnings of such corporation engaged in the manufacture of war materials."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order or make it now?

Mr. VINSON. I reserve it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would just as soon have the matter settled now because I think we are considering a very important issue today, so important that it is causing a great deal of consideration, I am quite sure, in the minds of a good many of the Members here.

We are now considering a measure to permanently conscript young men into the armed services of the United States. If this bill becomes law, then I believe we should conscript excess profits as well. If the emergency confronting us demands that we enact UMT, we should go all the way and make equality of sacrifice a fact and not a fiction. Nothing is more important than a man's life, and I feel very strongly that we have just as much right to conscript dollars as well as men.

As one who has served as an enlisted man in the Army, Navy, and marines, I have a pretty good idea of just what these boys will be up against. I have been disturbed by the fact that in all

our wars and emergencies, we have consistently refused to take the profit out of war. We have seen this country spend the blood of its best young men, and at the same time we have noted how our great corporations made tremendous profits out of every war in which we have been engaged. The cost of World War II was \$336,000,000,000 plus a million casualties in killed, wounded, and missing. At the same time these enormous sacrifices were being made the corporations of this country made the huge profit of \$56,000,000,000. That profit-taking spree has been accelerated and continued down to the present.

No democracy has a right to conscript men on a permanent basis for an immediate danger which is not great enough to justify and compel conscripting dollars at the same time. Corporations should be satisfied with normal, peacetime profits in time of war or national emergency. No one should complain about their dollars being conscripted if this measure to conscript our young men passes. What we do in this House on the measure now before us may well decide our future for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, as the House knows, I have offered my excess-profits amendment on three previous occasions, and each time it has been ruled out of order. I will indeed be sorry if the House is not able to vote on it today. There are other drawbacks to this bill in addition to its lack of equality of sacrifice, and, as I see them, they can be summed up as follows:

First. Both UMT and selective service would operate at the same time. Enactment of UMT would not mean the termination of selective service which, under law, is in effect until 1955. Furthermore, every man in selective service must serve 6 years in the Reserve after his 2 years of active duty are completed. This means that a Reserve has been provided for 9 years from 1952. UMT will, therefore, not be a substitute for but a supplement to selective service. The cost and the manpower ceiling would, therefore, be raised considerably.

Second. The deferment problem: how to pick some boys for 6 months' training under UMT and others for 2 years under selective service.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to all the debate on UMT with an open mind and have studied every available bit of material I could find on this matter. On the basis of what I have been able to learn about UMT in that it does not call for equality of sacrifice and that both UMT and selective service would be in operation at the same time I have come to the conclusion that I will vote against the measure as it now stands.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order that the amendment is not germane and has no relation to universal military training or to the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from Georgia makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane to the pending amendment or the bill.

The Chair has examined the amendment with some degree of care and invites attention to the fact that it provides:

This act shall be effective on the same day that a tax bill becomes effective, which will tax all corporations 100 percent of all profits and earnings of such corporations engaged in the manufacture of war materials or any other service connected with the defense effort and/or the National Security Training Corps Act of 1952.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that this amendment provides for the effective date of the pending bill to be contingent upon an entirely unrelated subject, a subject which would not be under the jurisdiction of the committee that reported the pending bill, but would be under the jurisdiction of another standing committee of the House.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is clearly not germane to the pending amendment or the bill and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

991972-42141